


# Procedure file

Basic information	
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic) <a href="#">1998/2127(COS)</a>	Procedure completed
Common fisheries policy: monitoring of fisheries, action plan	
Subject 3.15.07 Fisheries inspectorate, surveillance of fishing vessels and areas	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	<b>PECH</b> Fisheries	GUE/NGL <a href="#">NOVO Honório</a>	25/06/1998
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
05/06/1998	Non-legislative basic document published	SEC(1998)0949	Summary
01/07/1998	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
25/11/1998	Vote in committee		Summary
25/11/1998	Committee report tabled for plenary	<a href="#">A4-0462/1998</a>	
15/01/1999	Debate in Parliament		
15/01/1999	Decision by Parliament	T4-0043/1999	Summary
15/01/1999	End of procedure in Parliament		
14/04/1999	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1998/2127(COS)
Procedure type	COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)
Procedure subtype	Commission strategy paper
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 142
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	PECH/4/10200

Documentation gateway
-----------------------

Non-legislative basic document		SEC(1998)0949	05/06/1998	EC	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		<a href="#">A4-0462/1998</a> <a href="#">OJ C 098 09.04.1999, p. 0005</a>	25/11/1998	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0043/1999 <a href="#">OJ C 104 14.04.1999, p. 0178-0192</a>	15/01/1999	EP	Summary

## Common fisheries policy: monitoring of fisheries, action plan

**OBJECTIVE:** to propose an overall plan for revision of the monitoring of the common fisheries policy (CFP) extending over three years (1999-2000). **SUBSTANCE:** Following on from the Commission's report on fisheries monitoring under the common fisheries policy (COM(98)92 - COS0685), the Commission proposes, as agreed, a general action plan seeking to strengthen Community monitoring. To this end it sets out a plan for what should be done in each of the main areas considered in the communication and puts forward a timetable of priority measures for 1998, 1999 and 2000 to be implemented at both Community and national level. The idea is to define an overall strategy which should lead to a strengthening of fisheries monitoring. To this end the Commission is stepping up activities in five key areas: transparency, cooperation, non-member countries, those involved in the common fisheries policy and optimising the cost-effectiveness of fishery controls. For each of these fields priority activities are set at budgetary, regulatory or other levels on a year by year basis. The main actions can be summarised as follows: 1)transparency: the main priority is to create the conditions for ensuring genuine transparency, which presupposes that correct information is forwarded by the Member States on all the physical monitoring resources available, the human resources and the effective and vigorous application of penalties. From 1998 to 2000 the Commission proposes organising consultations with the Member States to detail the types of information required as regards resources and effort and to define the different kinds of inspections, to redefine in the framework of Regulation 2847/93/EEC the most serious infringements and to strengthen the cooperation between national administrations, encouraging exchanges of inspectors. The Commission also suggests more in- depth annual reports; 2)cooperation: all forms of cooperation should be strengthened (cooperation among services within a Member State, cooperation at Community level). A national administration should be able if necessary to take over from another national administration for inspections and following up infringements. Contacts between administration should be improved in order to deal with horizontal methodological problems (satellite monitoring, engine power, adapting the layout of administrative documents, validation procedures, etc.) or pilot fisheries (checks on catches and landings in specific zones, mesh size, etc.); 3)non-member countries: the aim is that the vessels of non-member countries landing their catches in Union ports should be checked as effectively as Community vessels. To this end international cooperation must be strengthened and measures adopted within strengthened international organisations. The principle of responsible fishing worldwide must be encouraged and 'ports of convenience' must be avoided. The Commission would also like to see the measures which currently apply to Community vessels as regards monitoring by satellite and landings to apply also to vessels from non-member countries, the aim being to prevent a catch which is landed being attributed without proof to an unregulated area; 4)involvement of those working in the industry in the implementation of effective checks: the idea is to convince fishermen of the need for more effective controls. It is also necessary to avoid any increase in work for fishermen (information to be transmitted) which is why the Commission suggests increased computerisation. Lastly, work must be done to increase awareness among those concerned; 5)optimising the cost-effectiveness of fishery controls: in this context the Commission suggests three fold action: - use of new technologies in order to meet the challenges of increasingly effective fishing gear and equipment (strengthening the use of satellite transponders), - covering the whole marketing chain: the idea is to strengthen checks after landing and not to be restricted to the standard inspections at sea and on landing. The Commission therefore suggests using 'traceability' in relation to the marketing of fishery products (i.e. to identify the source of the product even after catch). A harmonisation must also be achieved of the methods used to monitor engine power, - establishment of rational strategies for the deployment of monitoring resources: so that the overall strategy can be effective there must be a clear overview of the resources available, these resources must cover all possible monitoring measures, the cooperation mechanisms should serve to link the actions of different departments, synergy must be created with the provisions in Regulation 2847/93/EEC and other measures, the major problems must be identified so that resources can be concentrated on them and the cost-effectiveness of the various monitoring strategies must be analysed. Various activities have already been started in this area. The Commission now proposes strengthening the identification of major problems and strengthening the rules on allocating monitoring resources between fisheries and types of intervention. These various proposals are listed in the Commission document with a timetable for implementation in 1999 and 2000. ?

## Common fisheries policy: monitoring of fisheries, action plan

By adopting the report of Mr.NOVO (EUL/NGL,P),the Committee endorsed the Commission's action plan to improve the implementation of the fisheries policy .If the control measures, which should be operational by 2000 and run until 2002, are to be effective it is vital to secure the support of fishermen as well as shipowners and producer organisations by involving them fully in the entire process, stresses Mr NOVO. The controls have to be applied fairly, across the EU (both on land and at sea), with standard penalties for the same offences and a set of harmonised criteria for data on fleets. There must also be tighter controls on non-EU vessels fishing in Community waters. Adequate funding for the controls is essential, says Mr NOVO, and fisheries must cease to be the "poor relation" in the Community budget. If the current shortcomings in the fisheries policy are to be corrected and responsible fishing encouraged, money must be found for more inspectors and new technology, particularly satellite monitoring systems. Monitoring should not stop at fishing vessels. Post-landing controls must be stepped up so that the entire production, processing and marketing chain is covered right up to the end product on the consumer's plate.It is the Member States who carry the main responsibility for fisheries controls and they must meet all their obligations. If fleets are to be monitored properly the necessary data must be provided and Mr NOVO suggests introducing some form of penalty where information is repeatedly withheld.The Fisheries Committee regards control measures as part of a wider approach to fisheries in which fleet reductions should not be the only response to the decline in stocks. Funds should also be provided for training and retraining.

## Common fisheries policy: monitoring of fisheries, action plan

The resolution drafted by Honorio Novo (EUL/NGL, P) which welcomes the Commission working document on an action plan for improving the implementation of the common fisheries policy was approved by the European Parliament. The report expresses the Parliament's concern that control measures should not be pursued as a priority in isolation, to the detriment of other policies which are equally crucial to the proper application of the common fisheries policy. In monitoring and control activities, the Parliament considers it essential that the Commission should take the initiative to achieve closer and more effective cooperation between itself and Member States, among the Member States and with fishermen and producers' and vessel owners' organisations. It believes that any new system of controls must be based on reliable data enabling information to be processed correctly and contributing to greater transparency within the system. For this reason and in order to promote stability in the industry, it believes that it is essential to maintain the existing legislation on access to resources and to follow up its resolutions on international fisheries agreements and the common fisheries policy after 2002. The Parliament is concerned that fishing effort should be matched with resources, not only restricted to funding fleet reduction. It feels that any measures should be accompanied by suitable financial compensation to vessel owners, fishermen and, where justifiable, processors as well as flexible training and retraining programmes (funded by increased ESF allocations) and aid for social integration. The report stresses the need for harmonised criteria to compare the characteristics, size, capacity and productivity of the different Community fleets, evaluate their fishing efforts, examine the impact of modernisation and intensified, high-technology resource exploitation and take the necessary measures of adaptation. The Parliament also requests: - full cofinancing of expenditure on improvement of controls (in particular the generalisation of satellite control systems); - a plan for scientific research on the state and evolution of resources and their impact on fishing and pollution. - equitable and uniform application of both land and sea control measures irrespective of the flag flown by the vessel under inspection; - closer cooperation to exercise the necessary controls over the marketing channels for fisheries products and greater recourse to certification and standardisation of fisheries products landed and marketed in the EU; The report urges the Commission to rectify the existing imbalances between controls in Community waters and those in international waters and to submit proposals for stepping up post-landing controls on both EU and third-country fisheries products. The Parliament urges all Member States to fully undertake all control activities and abide by their legal obligations as regards the provision of information and advocates some form of penalisation if information is repeatedly withheld. It also advocates greater use of new technologies to reduce the inefficiencies of the current paper-based system. The Parliament considers it a matter of urgency that a uniform system of penalties be drawn up for fishermen across the E.U and also urges the Commission to give priority to financing Community inspections and establishing a code of conduct for inspection procedures.?