

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0265/2006**

31.8.2006

**\***

## **REPORT**

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing a management plan for fisheries exploiting stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea  
(COM(2005)0714 – C6-0034/2006 – 2006/0002(CNS))

Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Albert Jan Maat

### ***Symbols for procedures***

- \* Consultation procedure  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*I Cooperation procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*II Cooperation procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position*  
*majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend the common position*
- \*\*\* Assent procedure  
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- \*\*\*I Codecision procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*\*II Codecision procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position*  
*majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend the common position*
- \*\*\*III Codecision procedure (third reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission.)

### ***Amendments to a legislative text***

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

## CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION ..... | 3    |
| EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....                            | 3    |
| PROCEDURE.....   | 3    |

## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing a management plan for fisheries exploiting stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea  
(COM(2005)0714 – C6-0034/2006 – 2006/0002(CNS))

(Consultation procedure)

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2005)0714)<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to Article 37 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0034/2006),
  - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries (A6-0265/2006),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
  2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 250(2) of the EC Treaty;
  3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
  4. Calls for initiation of the conciliation procedure under the Joint Declaration of 4 March 1975 if the Council intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
  5. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;
  6. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

---

Text proposed by the Commission

---

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1  
Recital 6

(6) The objective of the management plan should be to ***ensure exploitation*** of North Sea plaice and sole ***that provides sustainable economic, environmental and social conditions***.

(6) The objective of the management plan should be to ***restore stocks*** of North Sea plaice and sole ***to the precautionary level***.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C ... / Not yet published in OJ.

### *Justification*

*As a debate has yet to take place concerning MSY exploitation strategies, the objective of this regulation should be to restore stocks. It would be premature to implement an MSY exploitation strategy for these stocks at this stage, and this would also be contrary to the opinion delivered by the Regional Advisory Council and to the measures already adopted for sole in the Western English Channel and the Bay of Biscay.*

### Amendment 2 Recital 6 a (new)

***(6a) Consequently, in drawing up the management plan, account should also be taken of the fact that the high fishing mortality rate for plaice is due to a great extent to the large discard from beam-trawl sole fishing.***

### *Justification*

*The Commission report does not touch on the problem of the high fishing mortality rate for plaice, which is due to a great extent to the discard from beam-trawl sole fishing.*

### Amendment 3 Recital 7

(7) Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 requires inter alia that to achieve the objectives of the Common Fisheries Policy, the Community is to apply the precautionary approach in taking measures to protect and conserve stocks, to provide for their sustainable exploitation and to minimise the impact of fishing on marine ecosystems. The Community aims at a progressive implementation of an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management, which contributes to efficient fishing activities within an economically viable and competitive fisheries industry. The present Regulation should aim at providing a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing plaice and sole in the North Sea taking into account the interests of consumers.

(7) Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 requires inter alia that to achieve the objectives of the Common Fisheries Policy, the Community is to apply the precautionary approach in taking measures to protect and conserve stocks, to provide for their sustainable exploitation and to minimise the impact of fishing on marine ecosystems. The Community aims at a progressive implementation of an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management, which contributes to efficient fishing activities within an economically viable and competitive fisheries industry. The present Regulation should aim at providing a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing plaice and sole in the North Sea taking into account the interests of consumers. ***The Community bases its policy partly on the policy recommended by the appropriate***

***Regional Advisory Council (RAC).***

*Justification*

*The opinions of the various RACs should be given serious consideration when formulating policy.*

Amendment 4  
Recital 10 a (new)

***(10a) In 2006 the Commission will initiate a debate concerning a Community strategy for a gradual reduction in fishing mortality in all major fisheries by means of a communication concerning the attainment of the MSY (maximum sustainable yield) objective by 2015. The Commission will submit this communication to the RACs for their opinion.***

*Justification*

*The Commission recently stated that it wished to initiate this debate.*

Amendment 5  
Recital 10 b (new)

***(10b) The Commission's legislative proposal should be preceded by an impact assessment that is based on accurate, objective and comprehensive biological and financial information; that impact assessment should be annexed to the Commission's proposal before 1 January 2007.***

*Justification*

*The Commission has not yet produced a proper socio-economic impact assessment on its proposal*

Amendment 6  
Recital 10 c (new)

***(10c) This regulation does not set any limits on the use of beam trawls in fishing for plaice and sole in the North Sea. However, there is a need to reduce the potential***

*negative consequences of the use of beam trawls on ecosystems and the marine environment. Accordingly, immediately after the entry into force of the regulation, the Commission should carry out a study of the impact of beam trawl fishing on ecosystems and the marine environment in the areas where this fishing method is used. On the basis of that study an action plan should be drawn up for the gradual phasing-out of fishing methods and gear which have a negative impact on ecosystems and the marine environment in favour of lower-impact fishing methods and gear.*

#### *Justification*

*It is important to carry out an environmental impact assessment to ascertain the impact of beam trawl fishing on ecosystems and the marine environment. On this basis the Commission will be able to draw up an action plan for the gradual development and introduction of lower-impact fishing methods and gear so as to reduce the impact on the marine environment and reduce discards.*

#### *Amendment 7* *Article 2*

1. The management plan shall ensure ***the sustainable exploitation of*** the stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea.

2. ***The objective provided for in paragraph 1 shall be attained while maintaining the fishing mortality rate on plaice in the North Sea at a rate equal to or no lower than 0.3.***

3. ***The objective provided for in paragraph 1 shall be attained while maintaining the fishing mortality rate on sole in the North Sea at a rate equal to or no lower than 0.2.***

1. The management plan shall ensure ***that, in so far as the stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea are not already at the precautionary level, they reach that level again.***

2. ***That objective must be attained by gradually reducing the fishing mortality rate for these stocks.***

### *Justification*

*This amendment brings the regulation into line with other similar multiannual plans.*

#### Amendment 8 Article 3, paragraph 1

1. ***Each year***, the Council shall decide, by qualified majority on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, on the Total Allowable Catches (TACs) for ***the following year*** for the stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea.

1. The Council shall decide, by qualified majority on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, on the Total Allowable Catches (TACs) for ***a period of 3 years*** for the stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea.

### *Justification*

*A multiannual quota will more clearly hold out the prospect of a structural recovery of stocks and will give the fishing industry more reliable information as a basis for planning its operations. Any intermediate problems can be solved by means of measures to reduce fishing effort (e.g. rules on numbers of days at sea).*

#### Amendment 9 Article 3 a (new)

##### *Article 3a*

##### ***Legislative measures and three-yearly decisions on TACs***

***1. When the ICES assessment shows that the spawning stock biomass has been returned to the precautionary level or a higher level, the Council, acting on a proposal from the Commission, shall adopt a decision by a qualified majority concerning:***

***(a) a target level for fishing mortality in the long term;***

***and***

***(b) a percentage for the reduction of fishing mortality which must be applied until the level of fishing mortality referred to at (a) has been attained.***

***2. On the basis of the target figures and a scientific ex-post assessment, the Council***

***shall decide a TAC for plaice and sole stocks for three years at a time.***

*Justification*

*This amendment brings the regulation into line with other similar multiannual plans. It also provides for a TAC to be decided for three years at a time which affords a high level of certainty regarding further growth of stocks, while at the same time creating a certain degree of stability for the fishing industry.*

Amendment 10  
Article 4

***1. The Council shall set the TAC for plaice at that level which, according to a scientific evaluation carried out by Scientific Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), is the higher of the following:***

***(a) that TAC whose application would result in a 10% reduction in the fishing mortality rate in its year of application compared to the fishing mortality rate estimated for the preceding year;***

***(b) that TAC whose application would result in a fishing mortality rate of 0.3 on ages 2 to 4 in its year of application.***

***2. Where the application of paragraph 1 would result in a TAC which exceeds the TAC of the preceding year by more than 15%, the Council shall set a TAC which is 15% greater than the TAC of that year.***

***3. Where the application of paragraph 1 would result in a TAC which is more than 15% less than the TAC of the preceding year, the Council shall set a TAC which is***

***1. If the spawning stock biomass of plaice is estimated by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), on the basis of the latest ICES report, to be less than the precautionary level of 230 000 tons, the Council shall set a TAC for a period of 3 years. This shall be set in such a manner that, according to the STECF's estimate, there is a reasonable likelihood that stocks will be restored to the precautionary level in 3 years.***

***2. If this leads to a reduction of more than 15% in the multiannual TAC, the Council shall decide to implement the reduction in stages, so that the differences between years do not exceed 15%.***

***3. If this leads to an increase of more than 15%, a maximum increase of 15% shall be proposed<sup>1</sup>.***

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator's note: Amendment 7 has 'voorgesteld' (proposed) here, while Amendment 8 has 'vastgesteld' (decided). It has not proved possible to ascertain which was intended.

***15% less than the TAC of that year.***

#### *Justification*

*This amendment brings the regulation into line with other similar multiannual plans and also introduces the element of multiannual TACs. An increase in the three-yearly TAC is limited to 15% even if stocks have grown much more. This is intended to make it possible, in due course, to move gradually towards the application of the MSY principle, after the European Parliament and the Council have decided in favour thereof.*

#### **Amendment 11**

##### **Article 5**

***1. The Council shall set a TAC for sole at that level which, according to a scientific evaluation carried out by STECF, is the higher of the following:***

***(a) that TAC whose application would result in the same proportionate change in the fishing mortality rate on sole as is generated by the application of Article 4(1) concerning plaice;***

***(b) that TAC whose application would result in a fishing mortality rate of 0.2 in its year of application;***

***(c) that TAC whose application would result in a 10% reduction in the fishing mortality rate in its year of application compared to the fishing mortality rate estimated for the preceding year.***

***2. Where the application of paragraph 1 would result in a TAC which exceeds the TAC of the preceding year by more than 15%, the Council shall set a TAC which is 15% greater than the TAC of that year.***

***3. Where the application of paragraph 1 would result in a TAC which is more than 15% less than the TAC of the preceding***

***1. If the spawning stock biomass of sole is estimated by the STECF, on the basis of the latest ICES report, to be less than the precautionary level of 35 000 tons, the Council shall set a TAC for a period of 3 years. This shall be set in such a manner that, according to the STECF's estimate, there is a reasonable likelihood that stocks will be restored to the precautionary level in 3 years.***

***2. If this leads to a reduction of more than 15% in the multiannual TAC, the Council shall decide to implement the reduction in stages, so that the differences between years do not exceed 15%.***

***3. If this leads to an increase of more than 15%, a maximum increase of 15% shall***

*year, the Council shall set a TAC which is 15% less than the TAC of that year. be decided<sup>1</sup>.*

*Justification*

*This amendment brings the regulation into line with other similar multiannual plans and also introduces the element of multiannual TACs. An increase in the three-yearly TAC is limited to 15% even if stocks have grown much more. This is intended to make it possible, in due course, to move gradually towards the application of the MSY principle, after the European Parliament and the Council have decided in favour thereof.*

Amendment 12  
Article 6, paragraph 2

2. Each year, the Council shall decide by a qualified majority, on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, on the maximum number of days at sea available for Community fishing vessels **deploying beam trawl gear of mesh size equal to or greater than 80 mm** and subject to the system of fishing effort limitation referred to in paragraph 1.

2. **For each year of the three-year period**, the Council shall decide by a qualified majority, on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, on the maximum number of days at sea **(calculated in kilowatt-days)** available for Community fishing vessels **fishing for plaice or sole or catching them as by-catch** and subject to the system of fishing effort limitation referred to in paragraph 1.

*Justification*

*The maximum number of days at sea should be decided for types of fishing in which plaice or sole are caught, either deliberately or as by-catch. This accords with the approach opted for in the cod recovery plan.*

Amendment 13  
Article 6, paragraph 3

3. **The annual adjustment of** the maximum number of days referred to in paragraph 2 **of this Article shall be in the same proportion as the annual adjustment in** fishing mortality rate **provided for in accordance with Article 5(1).**

3. The maximum number of days referred to in paragraph 2 **must be related to the reductions in the** fishing mortality rate **provided for by the multiannual TACs decided by the Council.**

*Justification*

The reference to the fishing mortality rate in Article 5(1) is no longer appropriate. There

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator's note: see footnote to Amendment 7.

should be a relationship with the fishing mortality rate which accords with the multiannual TACs.

Amendment 14  
Article 6, paragraph 4 a (new)

***4a. In adopting this management plan for fisheries exploiting stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea, the Council decides that Community fishing vessels which are used for demersal fishing for flatfish should no longer be subject to the days-at-sea rules provided for by the recovery plan for cod.***

*Justification*

*As there may be Community fishing vessels which fall under both this regulation and the regulation relating to the recovery plan for cod, the Council should have the option of clarifying which days-at-sea rules apply.*

Amendment 15  
Article 8, paragraph 1

1. By way of derogation from Article 5(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 2807/83, the permitted margin of tolerance, in estimation of quantities in kilograms live weight retained on board of Community fishing vessels that have been present in the North Sea shall be **8%** of the figure entered in the logbook. In the event that no conversion factor is laid down in Community legislation, the conversion factor adopted by the Member State whose flag the vessel is flying shall apply.

1. By way of derogation from Article 5(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 2807/83, the permitted margin of tolerance, in estimation of quantities in kilograms live weight retained on board of Community fishing vessels that have been present in the North Sea shall be **10%** of the figure entered in the logbook. In the event that no conversion factor is laid down in Community legislation, the conversion factor adopted by the Member State whose flag the vessel is flying shall apply.

*Justification*

*For purposes of practical application, a margin of tolerance of 8% would be confusing.*

Amendment 16  
Article 9

The competent authorities of a Member State shall ensure ***in respect of landings***

The competent authorities of a Member State shall ensure ***that any quantity of***

*made by any Community fishing vessel that has been present in the North Sea that:*

*(a) all quantities of plaice and sole landed by any Community fishing vessel carrying on board any quantity of plaice exceeding 500 kg or of sole exceeding 300 kg are weighed;*

*(b) the weighing of plaice and sole is carried out in the presence of controllers and before transportation from the point of landing and before first sale;*

*(c) weighing is undertaken using scales that have been certified as accurate within a reasonable margin of tolerance by the competent authorities of the Member State.*

*plaice exceeding 200 kg and any quantity of sole exceeding 100 kg which has been caught in the North Sea is weighed before its first sale.*

Weighing *shall be* undertaken using scales that have been certified as accurate within a reasonable margin of tolerance by the competent authorities of the Member State.

#### *Justification*

*This amendment brings the regulation into line with other similar multiannual plans. It will also prevent unnecessary bureaucracy and obviate measures which require subsequent monitoring.*

#### Amendment 17 Article 9

The competent authorities of a Member State shall ensure *in respect of landings made by any Community fishing vessel that has been present in the North Sea* that:

*(a) all quantities of plaice and sole landed by any Community fishing vessel carrying on board any quantity of plaice exceeding 500 kg or of sole exceeding 300 kg are weighed;*

*(b) the weighing of plaice and sole is carried out in the presence of controllers and before transportation from the point of landing and before first sale;*

*(c) weighing is undertaken using scales*

The competent authorities of a Member State shall ensure that *each quantity of plaice exceeding 200 kg and each quantity of sole exceeding 100 kg caught in the North Sea is weighed before first sale in accordance with current European rules.*

*Weighing shall be undertaken using scales that have been certified as accurate within a reasonable margin of tolerance in accordance with Community legislation by the competent authorities of the Member State.*

*that have been certified as accurate within a reasonable margin of tolerance by the competent authorities of the Member State.*

*Justification*

*This amendment brings the regulation into line with other similar multi-annual plans. It also prevents unnecessary bureaucracy and measures which would have to be subsequently verified.*

Amendment 18  
Article 11, paragraph 2

2. ***Containers holding*** plaice ***or*** sole shall be stowed ***separately from other containers.***

2. Plaice ***and*** sole shall be stowed ***in separate fish boxes.***

*Justification*

*The original text suggests that there are various separate storage places on fishing vessels.*

Amendment 19  
Article 13 a (new)

***Article 13a***

***Action plan for the development and use of low-impact fishing methods and gear***

***Immediately after the entry into force of this regulation, the Commission shall carry out an in-depth study of the impact of beam trawl fishing on ecosystems and the marine environment in areas where this fishing method is used.***

***Based on the conclusions of this study, the Commission shall draw up an action plan to promote research into low-impact fishing methods and gear – including research on the size and shape of nets, which can ensure the sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources – and the development of such research. At the same time, this action plan shall set guidelines for the gradual phasing out of fishing methods and gear which have a negative impact on ecosystems and the marine environment in***

***favour of lower-impact fishing methods and gear. Initiatives under this action plan shall be financed from the European Fisheries Fund in accordance with the objectives of the Fund.***

*Justification*

*The regulation lacks a section on the development and use of low-impact fishing methods and gear, hence the addition of this article. To secure sustainable fishing in Europe, low-impact methods and gear need to be developed and introduced, with a view, inter alia, to reducing discards and thus reducing the fishing mortality rate for fish such as plaice. Funding may be obtained from the European Fisheries Fund, since the objectives of the Fund are in line with the aims of such research.*

Amendment 20  
Article 15

In the event that the STECF advises that either or both the spawning stock size of plaice or that of sole is suffering reduced reproductive capacity, the Council ***shall*** decide by qualified majority on the basis of a proposal from the Commission on a TAC for plaice that is lower than that provided for in Article 4, on a TAC for sole that is lower than that provided for in Article 5, and on a number of days at sea that is lower than that provided for in Article 6.

In the event that the STECF advises that either or both the spawning stock size of plaice or that of sole is suffering reduced reproductive capacity, the Council ***may*** decide by qualified majority on the basis of a proposal from the Commission on a TAC for plaice that is lower than that provided for in Article 4, on a TAC for sole that is lower than that provided for in Article 5, and on a number of days at sea that is lower than that provided for in Article 6.

*Justification*

*As different options are referred to here, a choice is possible.*

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In terms of strategy, the proposal for a Council regulation establishing a management plan for fisheries exploiting stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea accords with the European policy of seeking to establish a sustainable Community fisheries policy. It is a logical follow-up to the measures to restore sole stocks in the Western English Channel and the Bay of Biscay (COM(2003)0819).

The Commission rightly states in its explanatory memorandum on the proposal that the North Sea Regional Advisory Council (NSRAC) is the principal forum for advice relating to the proposal. The NSRAC comprises representatives of the fishing industry and, inter alia, environmental organisations.

It is striking that the Commission acknowledges that the NSRAC is the principal advisory forum but never subsequently refers to the NSRAC's opinion. The only evidence on which the proposal is based is opinions delivered by two technical advisory bodies: the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) and the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF).

In view of trends in plaice and sole stocks in the North Sea, it is right that the Commission should propose a management plan. But ignoring the opinion of the main forum where the Commission can consult the fishing industry and environmental organisations is surely a prime example of why the gulf between Brussels and residents of the European Union has grown so wide. Forums such as the NSRAC were established precisely in order to ensure that policies formulated in Brussels were not all too often produced 'about you, without you'.

Thus, in totally ignoring the NSRAC, the Commission has missed an opportunity to generate support for its own policy. The NSRAC has shown that it is perfectly possible even for fishing and environmental organisations and biologists to agree on practicable ways of conserving adequate stocks of plaice and sole. For example, an ex ante scientific calculation based on the NSRAC opinion concerning immediate, short-term measures relating to plaice (July 2005) showed that, by implementing the NSRAC proposals, the intended aim of restoring plaice stocks to well above the precautionary level within 3-5 years by reducing fishing effort was virtually certain to be achieved (RIVO, 2006).

The Commission has also missed another opportunity in that the current proposal differs from previous decisions to restore sole stocks in the Western English Channel and the Bay of Biscay. Credible policies are marked by consistency and a constant approach and ensure that regions are not treated in different ways.

Finally, your rapporteur has an objection to the Commission proposal based on an issue of principle. The proposal is based on the MSY objectives. However, the development of MSY exploitation strategies has yet to be debated by the European Parliament and the Council. The

Commission has indicated that it wishes to initiate this debate in the first half of 2006<sup>1</sup>. In your rapporteur's opinion, it is premature to implement a method which has not yet been agreed within Parliament and the Council and to do so does not accord with the Community principle of 'good governance' as set forth in the relevant white paper.

For these reasons, your rapporteur has formulated amendments which:

- ensure consistency of policy, bringing the proposal into line with management plans and multiannual plans in other sea areas for the same species,
- take account of the opinions of regional forums in which both the fishing industry and nature and environmental organisations are represented,
- are intended to restore plaice and sole stocks in the North Sea to the precautionary level before implementing an MSY exploitation strategy in one way or another.

**On behalf of the European Parliament, your rapporteur therefore urges the Council and Commission to amend the ultimate Council decision in accordance with the amendments adopted.**

---

<sup>1</sup> COM(2006)0103, p. 10.

## PROCEDURE

|   |   |           |           |           |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Title</b>  | Proposal for a Council regulation establishing a management plan for fisheries exploiting stocks of plaice and sole in the North Sea  |           |           |           |
| <b>References</b>   | COM(2005)0714 – C6-0034/2006 – 2006/0002(CNS)   |           |           |           |
| <b>Date of consulting Parliament</b>  | 30.1.2006   |           |           |           |
| <b>Committee responsible</b><br>Date announced in plenary                                     | PECH<br>2.2.2006  |           |           |           |
| <b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b><br>Date announced in plenary                         | ENVI<br>2.2.2006  |           |           |           |
| <b>Not delivering opinion(s)</b><br>Date of decision  | ENVI<br>30.1.2006   |           |           |           |
| <b>Enhanced cooperation</b><br>Date announced in plenary                                      |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Rapporteur(s)</b><br>Date appointed  | Albert Jan Maat<br>15.2.2006  |           |           |           |
| <b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>   |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Simplified procedure – date of decision</b><br>Date of decision                            |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Legal basis disputed</b><br>Date of JURI opinion   |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Financial endowment amended</b><br>Date of BUDG opinion                                    |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Parliament to consult European Economic and Social Committee – date decided in plenary</b> |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Parliament to consult Committee of the Regions – date decided in plenary</b>               |   |           |           |           |
| <b>Discussed in committee</b>   | 23.2.2006   | 18.4.2006 | 20.6.2006 | 11.7.2006 |
| <b>Date adopted</b>   | 28.8.2006   |           |           |           |
| <b>Result of final vote</b>   | +: 16<br>–: 0<br>0: 1   |           |           |           |
| <b>Members present for the final vote</b>   | Iles Braghetto, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, Paulo Casaca, Zdzisław Kazimierz Chmielewski, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Alfred Gomolka, Pedro Guerreiro, Heinz Kindermann, Henrik Dam Kristensen, Albert Jan Maat, Philippe Morillon, Willi Piecyk, Dirk Sterckx, Margie Sudre |           |           |           |
| <b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>   | Carl Schlyter   |           |           |           |
| <b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>                             | Alfonso Andria, Kyriacos Triantaphyllides   |           |           |           |
| <b>Date tabled</b>  | 31.8.2006   |           |           |           |
| <b>Comments (available in one language only)</b>  | ...   |           |           |           |