

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0161/2007**

7.5.2007

**\***

## **REPORT**

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community on the one hand, and the Government of Denmark and the Home Rule Government of Greenland, on the other hand  
(COM(2006)0804 – C6-0506/2006 – 2006/0262(CNS))

Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Joop Post

### ***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

	<b>Page</b>
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION .....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	8
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS .....	9
PROCEDURE.....	13



## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community on the one hand, and the Government of Denmark and the Home Rule Government of Greenland, on the other hand (COM(2006)0804 – C6-0506/2006 – 2006/0262(CNS))**

**(Consultation procedure)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2006)0804)<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to Article 37 in conjunction with Article 300(2) of the EC Treaty,
  - having regard to Article 300(3), first subparagraph, of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0506/2006),
  - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries and the opinion of the Committee on Budgets (A6-0161/2007),
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 2 a (new)

***(2a) If fishing opportunities are established  
by the Joint Committee at a lower level***

---

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

***than that set out in Chapter I of the Annex, Greenland should compensate the Community in subsequent years by corresponding fishing opportunities or in the same year by other fishing opportunities, or by deducting a corresponding proportion of the agreed payment.***

*Justification*

*In the unlikely event that compensation involving fishing opportunities is not possible, payment should be adjusted accordingly.*

Amendment 2  
Recital 2 b (new)

***(2b) The Community should reserve the right to adjust quotas where, after 2010, they are found not to be in line with EU policy on sustainability.***

*Justification*

*EU fisheries policy should be consistent both within and outside the EU.*

Amendment 3  
Recital 2 c (new)

***(2c) In implementing Article 2(1) of the Protocol, the conditions referred to in Article 1(2) of the Protocol should be observed.***

*Justification*

*EU fisheries policy should be consistent both within and outside the EU.*

Amendment 4  
Article 3 a (new)

***Article 3a***

***The Commission shall report annually to***

***the European Parliament and the Council  
on the results of the sectoral fisheries  
policy described in Article 4 of the Protocol.***

*Justification*

*In order to evaluate whether the compensation paid by the EU is properly accounted for and does in fact promote the sustainable use of fishery resources in Greenland, the Commission should report annually to the Parliament.*

Amendment 5  
Article 4, paragraph 1 a (new)

***The Commission shall evaluate each year whether Member States whose vessels operate under the Protocol have complied with reporting requirements. Where they have not done so, the Commission shall refuse their requests for fishing licences for the following year.***

*Justification*

*Vessels that do not comply with the most basic requirement, reporting what they catch, should not benefit from financial support from the EU.*

Amendment 6  
Article 4 a (new)

***Article 4a***

***Prior to the expiry of the Protocol and before the beginning of negotiations for a possible renewal, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and the Council an ex post evaluation of the Protocol, including a cost-benefit analysis.***

*Justification*

*An evaluation of the current protocol is necessary before new negotiations begin in order to know what changes, if any, should be included in any possible renewal.*

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

This fisheries partnership agreement between the EU, Denmark and Greenland is a special agreement. Related payments are in fact higher than might be expected on the basis of a fisheries-only agreement.

What is noticeable is that the sector's own contribution is relatively low, all of which indicates that this fisheries agreement is part of a broad Greenland-EU cooperation package. It is striking that the agreement has little to say about joint efforts concerning sustainability or joint management of stocks. Current ocean warming makes it likely that fish species are migrating further northwards and that, for instance, low cod stocks in the North Sea are offset by levels in the Northern Seas. The Commission would do well to work on a stronger integrated approach for the North Atlantic area.



11.4.2007

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS**

for the Committee on Fisheries

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community on the one hand, and the Government of Denmark and the Home Rule Government of Greenland, on the other hand (COM(2006)0804 – C6-0506/2006 – 2006/0262(CNS))

Draftswoman: Helga Trüpel

### **SHORT JUSTIFICATION**

Greenland has had a fisheries agreement with the EU since it ceased to be a member in 1985. The previous protocol, from 2001 through 2006, was criticized by the European Parliament<sup>1</sup> and the Court of Auditors, as acknowledged by the Commission in its Explanatory Memorandum, since it attempted to do two things simultaneously - to pay compensation for access to fish in Greenlandic waters, and to provide budgetary support to the Greenland Home Rule. At the mid-term review of the agreement in 2004, the Commission acted upon these concerns to an extent, by bringing the quotas allocated to the EU more into line with reality, which was a welcome move. At that time, Council stated its intention to base cooperation with Greenland on two separate pillars - a fisheries partnership agreement and a broader arrangement to provide cooperation with Greenland. The present agreement is the former, and the second will be the subject of a separate Council Decision.

The Budgets Committee should welcome the separation of these two aspects of relations with Greenland, for it will make it much more clear what money is being spent to do what, thus increasing transparency and accountability for the Community budget.

This, then, is to be a more typical fisheries partnership agreement, similar in many respects to those with ACP countries. The financial contribution is fixed at EUR 15,847,244 per year, including an amount of EUR 3,261,449 to aid Greenland develop and implement its multiannual sectoral programme for fisheries. In exchange, the EU fleets will receive quotas for several important stocks of fish, including cod, redfish, Greenland halibut, Atlantic halibut, shrimp, capelin and snowcrab. The compensation also includes a reserve of EUR 1,540,000 to be used if the EU gets increased access to cod and capelin stocks in addition to

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 209, 2.8.2001, p.1.

those provided for in the annual quotas; this would be based upon scientific assessments of the stocks.

A major difference between the Greenland agreement and the ACP agreements was the lack of licence fees to be paid by EU ship-owners, which led to complaints about discrimination. The Commission thus introduced licence fees at the mid-term review in 2004. Under the present agreement, the Commission estimates such fees to be approximately €2 million per year.

As your rapporteur has stressed before, the idea of a multiannual sectoral fisheries programme, to be jointly decided upon by Greenland and the EU via a Joint Committee, has the potential to improve the management of the agreement and, if the information is made public, its transparency as well. Committee on Budgets should insist that it be kept informed of these evaluations. As this is a new development in protocols, it is too early to tell if it will prove useful, leading to more responsible and sustainable fisheries in Greenland, so we must follow this development carefully.

Three amendments are proposed. Two relate to information that the Commission should provide to the Parliament, including a detailed ex post evaluation of the agreement before it is renewed and reports on the results of the multiannual sectoral programme. The third proposes that if Member States do not report their catches to the Commission as they are required to do under the Common Fisheries Policy, then they should not be given fishing licences the following year. Commissioner Borg has quite rightly given a very high priority to the fight against Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing, and if EU Member States do not fulfil their basic responsibilities to report catches, it seems reasonable to not allow them to benefit from the significant subsidies that these fisheries access agreements provide.

## AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Fisheries, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Text proposed by the Commission<sup>1</sup>

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1  
Article 3 a (new)

### *Article 3a*

***The Commission shall report annually to the European Parliament and the Council on the results of the multiannual sectoral fisheries policy described in Article 4 of the***

---

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

**Protocol.**

*Justification*

*In order to evaluate whether the compensation paid by the EU is properly accounted for and does in fact promote the sustainable use of fishery resources in Greenland, the Commission should report annually to the Parliament.*

Amendment 2

Article 4, paragraph 1 a (new)

***1a. The Commission shall evaluate each year whether Member States whose vessels operate under this protocol have complied with reporting requirements. Where they have not done so, the Commission shall withhold their requests for fishing licences for the following year.***

*Justification*

*Vessels that do not comply with the most basic requirement, reporting what they catch, should not benefit from financial support from the EU.*

Amendment 3

Article 4 a (new)

**Article 4a**

***Prior to expiry of the Protocol and before the beginning of new negotiations for a possible renewal, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and the Council an ex post evaluation of the Protocol, including a cost-benefit analysis.***

*Justification*

*An evaluation of the current protocol is necessary before new negotiations begin in order to know what changes, if any, should be included in any possible renewal.*

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the EC on the one hand and Denmark and Greenland on the other hand
<b>References</b>	COM(2006)0804 - C6-0506/2006 - 2006/0262(CNS)
<b>Committee responsible</b>	PECH
<b>Opinion by</b> Date announced in plenary	BUDG 17.1.2007
<b>Drafts(wo)man</b> Date appointed	Helga Trüpel 20.9.2004
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	10.4.2007
<b>Date adopted</b>	10.4.2007
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 22 -: 2 0: 0
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Richard James Ashworth, Reimer Böge, Herbert Bösch, Simon Busuttil, Joan Calabuig Rull, Hynek Fajmon, Szabolcs Fazakas, Salvador Garriga Polledo, Ingeborg Gräßle, Louis Grech, Nathalie Griesbeck, Catherine Guy-Quint, Jutta Haug, Monica Maria Iacob-Ridzi, Anne E. Jensen, Wiesław Stefan Kuc, Janusz Lewandowski, Nils Lundgren, Vladimír Maňka, Francesco Musotto, Gérard Onesta, Nina Škottová, Helga Trüpel, Kyösti Virrankoski

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the EC on the one hand and Denmark and Greenland on the other hand	
<b>References</b>	COM(2006)0804 - C6-0506/2006 - 2006/0262(CNS)	
<b>Date of consulting Parliament</b>	22.12.2006	
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date announced in plenary	PECH 17.1.2007	
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b> Date announced in plenary	DEVE 17.1.2007	BUDG 17.1.2007
<b>Not delivering opinions</b> Date of decision	DEVE 30.1.2007	
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Joop Post 21.12.2006	
<b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>	Albert Jan Maat	
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	22.3.2007	10.4.2007
<b>Date adopted</b>	3.5.2007	
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 15	-: 2
	0: 1	
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Stavros Arnautakis, Marie-Hélène Aubert, Iles Braghetto, Niels Busk, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, David Casa, Zdzisław Kazimierz Chmielewski, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Ioannis Gklavakis, Alfred Gomolka, Hélène Goudin, Heinz Kindermann, Philippe Morillon, Seán Ó Neachtain, Struan Stevenson, Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna	
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Thomas Wise	
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	Iratxe García Pérez	