



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 24.01.2000  
COM(2000) 14 final

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION**

**on the regional meetings arranged by the Commission in 1998-1999 on the Common  
Fisheries Policy after 2002**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	GENERAL REMARKS.....	5
1.1.	Background and objective of the regional meetings.....	5
1.2.	Organisational arrangements .....	5
1.3.	Evaluation by the Commission.....	6
1.4.	Follow-up action.....	6
2.	OUTCOME OF THE REGIONAL MEETINGS.....	7
2.1.	The issue of access to the 6/12 mile zone .....	7
2.2.	Access to the North Sea .....	7
2.3.	Shetland Box.....	7
2.4.	TACs and Quotas.....	7
2.5.	Individual Transferable quotas (ITQs).....	8
2.6.	Relative stability and quota allocation keys .....	8
2.7.	Discards.....	8
2.8.	Fishing effort regime and MAGPs.....	8
2.9.	Environmental issues .....	8
2.10.	International co-operation and fisheries agreements .....	9
2.11.	Markets and trade in fishery products.....	9
2.12.	Rationalisation and support measures.....	9
2.13.	Enforcement, monitoring and surveillance .....	9
2.14.	Fisheries research.....	9
2.15.	Aquaculture .....	10

2.16. Mediterranean.....	10
2.17. Decision-taking process – Institutional arrangements .....	10
2.18. Other issues .....	10
<b>3. INDIVIDUAL REPORTS BY MEMBER STATE .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1. BELGIUM.....	11
3.2. DENMARK.....	12
3.3. GERMANY .....	15
3.4. GREECE .....	16
3.5. SPAIN .....	18
3.6. FRANCE .....	23
3.7. IRELAND.....	26
3.8. ITALY .....	28
3.9. THE NETHERLANDS.....	30
3.10. AUSTRIA.....	31
3.11. PORTUGAL.....	32
3.12. FINLAND.....	36
3.13. SWEDEN .....	37
3.14. UNITED KINGDOM .....	39

## **TABLE OF ANNEXES**

ANNEX I	Glossary of abbreviations used
ANNEX II	Commission's questionnaire on the CFP after 2002
ANNEX III	Report on the replies to the questionnaire by NGOs and other organisations consulted at the European level
ANNEX IV	Table of dates and venues of the regional meetings on the CFP after 2002

## **1. GENERAL REMARKS**

### **1.1. Background and objective of the regional meetings**

The Commission launched in March 1998, a consultation process on the Common Fisheries Policy after 2002, in two phases.

In the first phase, some 350 questionnaires were sent to representative organisations and associations with an interest in fisheries, in all the Member States of the European Union.

These organisations and associations were asked for their views, not only on those issues which according to the Council Regulation n° 3760/92 and the Acts of Accession of 1985 and 1994, are subject to review in 2002, but also on all other aspects of the Common Fisheries Policy.

The Commission received 175 answers to its questionnaires which, often critical to the CFP, have highlighted the main concerns of the fisheries sector and of the other interested groups with respect to the future of fisheries in the European Union.

A report on the answers to the questionnaire was made available by the Commission in 1998.

The second phase of the consultation process on the CFP after 2002, involved the organisation of 30 regional meetings in the Member States, with the participation of a wide range of interested parties (some 1500 participants attended the meetings).

The objective of these regional meetings was twofold:

First, to give an opportunity to the representatives of the fisheries sector and other interested groups in the Member States to engage themselves in a direct dialogue with the Commission's services on the future of the CFP. Thus, participants were given the chance to elaborate on their answers to the questionnaire and to express their national/regional/local views on the review of the CFP in 2002, as well as on any other issue of particular interest to them.

Second, to allow the Commission's officials to get a first hand contact with the various actors and their demands in all the Member States. The Commission needed to obtain the broadest possible range of views and proposals before the elaboration and submission to the Council and the European Parliament of its report on the fisheries situation in the European Union, as foreseen in Article 14(2) of Council Regulation n° 3760/92 establishing a Community system for fisheries and aquaculture.

### **1.2. Organisational arrangements**

The Commission organised 30 regional meetings, from September 1998 until June 1999 (c.f. annex IV with the dates and venues of the regional meetings).

The Commission invited, among others, professional fishermen's organisations, the processing and marketing sectors, trade unions, non-governmental organisations with an interest in fisheries, consumer associations, research institutes, the specialised press, national administrations and members of the European Parliament.

The agenda of the meetings followed the structure of the questionnaire and allowed participants to discuss in an exhaustive manner, all issues related to the CFP. (Access to

waters and internal resources, resource management and conservation, international co-operation and fishery agreements, markets and trade in fishery products, structural and support measures, control, decision-taking process, fisheries research, aquaculture, etc.).

Documents on the written replies to the questionnaire at national/Community level were distributed at the meetings.

The Commission's officials presented those documents and chaired the meetings.

### **1.3. Evaluation by the Commission**

The results of the regional meetings met the expectations of the Commission.

The Commission is generally satisfied with the level of participation, with the degree of representation of the various interests, as well as with the quality of the interventions and proposals presented.

Unlike the first phase of the consultation process (questionnaire) which by definition was accessible to a limited number of representative organisations, the regional meetings in situ allowed for a greater number of people to personally participate in the consultation process .

Thus the Commission received many original contributions which were not included in the material gathered through the questionnaire process. On the other hand, some participants found the opportunity to further elaborate on their written proposals and/or to inform the Commission about strictly local/regional problems which by their nature can rarely become the subject of discussions in the Community institutions.

Some participants criticised the Commission for organising consultation meetings whose outcome, in their view, would not be taken into account by the Commission in its final proposals. However, the majority of the parties involved in the consultation process welcomed the Commission's initiative and participated in the debate on the future of the CFP, in a very constructive manner.

### **1.4. Follow-up action**

The Commission will submit the present report on the regional meetings to the Council, to the European Parliament and to all the parties which participated in the consultation process on the CFP after 2002.

In the meantime, the Commission has started gathering the necessary material and data for the elaboration of its report on the fisheries situation in the European Union, foreseen by article 14(2) of Council Regulation n° 3760/92.

It is the intention of the Commission to present the report at the beginning of 2001 to allow for sufficient time for discussion in the Council and the European Parliament on the future of the CFP.

## **2. OUTCOME OF THE REGIONAL MEETINGS**

The regional meetings showed that there is a large consensus to pursue a Common Fisheries Policy, beyond 2002.

However, at the same time, it became clear that the parties consulted believe that many components of the CFP need to be reviewed, modified or even completely changed.

Some demands, criticisms and proposals formulated during the meetings, are sometimes contradictory because their supporters are pursuing conflicting objectives. However, it is natural that fishermen in the North Sea or in the Mediterranean do not face the same problems or that the producers and the processing sector do not always share the same views on imports.

Taking those factors into account, the main conclusions of the regional meetings can be summarised as follows:

### **2.1. The issue of access to the 6/12 mile zone**

There are virtually no demands for the establishment of a free access regime "up to the beaches". There have been some demands for the strengthening of the current regime in favour of the coastal fishermen, in the United Kingdom, Ireland and Portugal. (For example, extension of the current limit up to the 24 miles, or more, abolition of the current neighbouring rights etc.).

### **2.2. Access to the North Sea**

Fishermen from Spain, Portugal, Finland and Sweden supported the abolition of all discriminatory restrictions on access.

However, organisations from the North Sea coastal States expressed concern about the increase of the fishing effort in the North Sea, which could result from the free access to the zone, despite the fact that access to most of the resources is already regulated.

### **2.3. Shetland Box**

The retention of the Shetland Box did not receive unanimous support. While some organisations supported the continuation of the current regime (also being in support of boxes in general as an efficient conservation tool), many other organisations especially in Spain, the Netherlands but also a big fishermen's federation in the United Kingdom, were against the Shetland Box. In their opinion the establishment of this Box has no scientific basis and it is purely political in nature.

### **2.4. TACs and Quotas**

It was widely held during the meetings that the TACs and quotas regime has failed to restrict stock exploitation rates due to lack of proper enforcement and of sound scientific advice. At the same time however, there was no consensus to scrap the regime altogether and replace it with something else.

The reinforcement of monitoring, the introduction of more selective gears, the reduction of discards and the adoption of alternative fishing effort regimes were proposed, among other ideas, as means to improve the current regime .

## **2.5. Individual Transferable quotas (ITQs)**

Most of the participants were against ITQs, fearing the creation of oligopolies and the loss of jobs. There was more support for the ITQs in the Netherlands, Spain and Denmark.

Support for a free trade of quotas inside the European Union, (under the supervision of national/public authorities for some) was also supported in Spain and the Netherlands.

In the UK there was strong support for the existing national quota allocation system.

## **2.6. Relative stability and quota allocation keys**

The principle of relative stability was widely supported. In many cases relative stability was considered as a necessary "evil", whose change or abolition could create bigger problems.

Strong demands for changes in the relative stability keys were voiced in Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland (abolition of the Hague Preferences).

Adjustments of the allocation keys for specific species and zones were proposed in many Member States. The argument often used was that keys in force do not reflect current fishing patterns.

## **2.7. Discards**

The current discard rules have been heavily criticised.

The landing of all catches was widely supported by fishermen in some Member States.

There were however voices in favour of the current discard policy both by fishermen who fear the costs of a discard ban and by scientists who believe that it is better to face the discard problem through the use of more selective gear.

## **2.8. Fishing effort regime and MAGPs**

The current definition of fishing effort as far as the engine power element is concerned, was strongly criticised in many Member States (Italy, Greece, Netherlands, Portugal).

On MAGPs, there were voices in favour of stronger penalties on States not meeting their MAGP targets (e.g. in Belgium, Germany, Portugal). However in other Member States participants strongly criticised MAGPs and asked for greater flexibility in the current rules (e.g. United Kingdom, Finland).

## **2.9. Environmental issues**

Fishermen asked for greater protection of the marine environment against land-based pollution and other industrial activities.

In some cases, measures were asked for to compensate fishermen for the losses of catch and gear provoked by seals and other marine mammals (Scotland, Greece, Finland).

## **2.10. International co-operation and fisheries agreements**

As far as multilateral co-operation is concerned, support was expressed for the policy and efforts undertaken by the Community. In some States ( Spain, Italy, etc) there were calls for the strengthening of Community's presence in international organisations.

In the case of bilateral agreements, there is a clear split between North and South. Fishermen and ship-owners from countries mostly benefiting from agreements funded by the Community budget asked for the strengthening of the external fisheries policy (e.g. the extension of the number agreements) and a for greater participatory role for themselves during the negotiations.

In the North however, there was a call for a shift of the Community's attention towards the northern agreements and requests to allocate part of the external budget for internal policy measures.

## **2.11. Markets and trade in fishery products**

The discussions in some meetings were "overshadowed" by the proposal of the Commission for the reform of the Common Market Organisation, presented in February 1999 .

However, this did not impede participants from expressing their views on issues like consumer protection or imports from third countries. It was evident at some meetings that the processing sector on the one hand and the producers on the other, did not share the same perspective on the functioning of the markets.

While the processors asked for greater and easier access to raw materials, fishermen asked for greater protection against low-priced imports from third countries.

## **2.12. Rationalisation and support measures**

The Commission's proposal for a new FIG regulation became inevitably the subject matter of some discussion and the Commission's officials had the opportunity to clarify some aspects of the new proposal.

In many Member States there was support for structural measures and aid for the renewal of fleet, for the training and support of young fishermen and for the assistance of the small in-shore fleet .

## **2.13. Enforcement, monitoring and surveillance**

There was a widespread demand for the strengthening of enforcement and of monitoring and a call to ensure a level-playing field between fishermen throughout the Union.

Fishermen from one Member State often complained about being better policed than their colleagues from other Member States or from third countries.

Some even called for the strengthening of the Commission's powers in this field.

## **2.14. Fisheries research**

Many fishermen argued that scientific data are often "flawed" and that, in reality, "there is more fish" to be fished, despite the scientific evidence to the contrary.

They asked for greater transparency, for the dissemination of the scientific studies and for greater co-operation with the scientists .

In many cases, participants asked for encouragement of multidisciplinary research covering all aspects of fisheries and not just the biological ones.

### **2.15. Aquaculture**

The aquaculture sector often complained for not being considered as an integral part of the Common Fisheries Policy, and for not receiving enough support from the Community.

### **2.16. Mediterranean**

Mediterranean organisations and associations expressed specific views on the application of the CFP in that region that merit a separate presentation.

Thus, many participants emphasised the "specificity" of Mediterranean fisheries, highlighted the need for homogeneous rules binding on all those fishing in the region, including third countries, and asked for the strengthening of the Community's international policy in the region, both with third countries and within multilateral organisations, so as to ensure fair treatment for Community fishermen .

Italian fishermen strongly criticised the technical measures in force, while Spanish organisations advocated a "regional approach" for the Mediterranean (e.g. regional MAGPs)

### **2.17. Decision-taking process – Institutional arrangements**

There was a unanimous request for greater transparency on the part of the Commission and for greater participation and contribution of the sector in the elaboration of Community decisions.

The "regionalisation" of the fisheries management process (or the adoption of "regional" solutions on discards or other issues) was strongly supported in the UK, Ireland, Finland and Sweden but it was met with suspicion in other States, namely France and Spain (with the exception for the latter of some Mediterranean associations)

The debate showed that there is some confusion about the term "regional". For some, it means a transfer of powers/competencies from the Community institutions back to national/regional level, whereas for others, it simply means the taking into account of regional particularities in the Community decisions, with no institutional implications.

Many parties also supported a flexible management policy, able to respond quickly to local problems and crisis situations. Given the fact that Community decision-taking is often cumbersome and time-consuming, they proposed transfer of powers to local/regional authorities.

### **2.18. Other issues**

Among other issues raised during the meeting not specifically mentioned in the questionnaire, the Commission notes the call for regulation/measures on recreational fisheries and the preoccupations in some countries for the consequences of the forthcoming enlargement .

### 3. INDIVIDUAL REPORTS BY MEMBER STATE

#### 3.1. BELGIUM

The meeting was held in Ostende, on 12 January 1999.

Representatives from the main Belgian fishermen's organisations, the processing/trade, aquaculture and the scientific sectors, trade unions and national authorities attended the meeting. The participants welcomed the Commission's initiative of coming down to the grass-root level and exchange views with the actors. The atmosphere was that of an open and constructive debate.

The contributions made at the meeting can be summarised as follows :

##### Access to waters and resources :

- Concerning the 6/12 miles issue, there is a general agreement in favour of the current situation.
- The need for improvement in the TAC system was stressed. It was emphasised that the artificial division of the Channel in sectors, sometimes very small ones, creates problems related to the fishing of straddling stocks, and it should be changed.
- There was a positive attitude of the sector for the exchange of quotas among Member States.
- There was a positive opinion regarding the ITQ system, provided that it is combined with an improvement in control.

##### Resource management and conservation :

- Regarding discards, the use of more selective fishing gear should be promoted. The use of new and more advanced technical measures should be compulsory. The Commission should encourage experimentation with new kinds of nets.
- Regarding the precautionary approach and in a general sense, the failure to respect MAGPs, the fact was highlighted that when a Member State does not respect its MAGP and, consequently, overfishes, the TACs for the following year diminish for everybody. Countries which have not respected their MAGPs should be penalised .

##### Market :

- There is no real European market, due mainly to the lack of standardisation in the rules applied in the different countries, which leads to a lack of competition and transparency. Another problem is the bad transport system, which hinders the arrival of fresh products from one part of Europe to another.
- A strong opposition was expressed, to the Commission's proposal for granting aid to encourage contracts between fishermen and processors, leaving the auctions out. It was considered that this kind of contracts suffocates competition and encourages over-fishing in order to fulfil the obligations of the contract. The same kind of aid should be given to the auctions, if in the end this new measure is adopted.

- The view was expressed that it is at the first point of sale where the marketing is badly organised. The proposal of training fishermen in order to let them keep the added value of the first sale, was also put forward. The lack of data on marketing makes impossible for producers to know prices and market conditions throughout Europe.

#### Control :

- There was a strong support for the strengthening and standardisation of controls throughout the Community. There was an unanimous rejection of the new control regulation and more specifically, of the obligation to register in the logbook even the smallest quantity of by-catch. The sector complains that logbooks are not big enough to register small catches of 30 different species.

#### Research :

- There is a lack of data and information. Fishermen's opinions should be taken into account in scientific assessment, so that the results might be more acceptable to them. More research on aquaculture, focused on restocking the Community waters, should be promoted by the EU.

#### Aquaculture :

- Regarding aquaculture, aid to improve the knowledge of the sector in modern aquaculture was proposed. Aquaculture aimed at restocking seas should be fostered. The extension of socio-economic measures to the aquaculture sector was also proposed.

### **3.2. DENMARK**

Two meetings were held in Denmark: one in Copenhagen on the 27 October 1998, and one in Viborg, Jutland, on the 29 October 1998.

Representatives from the main Danish fishermen's organisations, the processing/trade, aquaculture and scientific sectors, environmental NGOs, trade unions and national authorities attended the meetings. The participants welcomed the Commission's initiative of "coming to the grounds" and exchanging views with the industry. The atmosphere was that of an open, positive and constructive debate, with a high degree of oral contributions, especially at the meeting in Viborg.

The contributions made at these meetings can be summarised as follows :

#### Access to waters and internal resources/conservation and management :

- Those vessels which repeatedly infringe the CFP regulations (overfishing beyond the established quota, fishing of juveniles or other types of infringement), should be banished from their usual ports.
- The possibility of fixing "real time" closures of fishing zones was proposed. Participants mentioned the cessation of fishing activities informally agreed by Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands, in German waters, when a strong concentration of cod juveniles was detected. There were nevertheless opponents to this proposal, claiming that some months

later these same protected resources can be, anyway, freely caught. Furthermore, it should be necessary to secure the closing of the area for all the fleets, because otherwise the measure is useless.

- There were opinions against the Shetland box and in general against all kind of boxes, arguing that their creation had a weak scientific base, and that these boxes had been kept in place just for political reasons. The need for an exhaustive scientific analysis of the situation in each box, in order to eliminate the ones that are not strictly necessary, was stressed several times.
- Proposals in favour of quotas covering several years, or a common TAC for several related species (e.g. all flat species in the same key) were made. Secondly, there was a proposal to allow fishing, during the current year, of a percentage of the quota of the following one. That would be done for those species in good shape and in those cases where the year at stake has been good for fishing and the assigned quota has been overshot. Thirdly, it was proposed not to let the quotas oscillate more than  $\pm 15\%$  per year, in order to avoid unpredictable oscillations in catches with dramatic consequences for the processing industry.
- Finally, while accepting that for political and administrative reasons all the TACs should keep on being negotiated together, it was proposed that the “TAC year” should not begin to run automatically for all the species on 1 January, but to adapt the beginning of that period to the biological rhythm of each species.
- The proposal of preventing the fishing of individuals that had not reproduced at least once, was highly discussed In Viborg. Other alternative, although not unanimous among fishermen, ideas for TACs and quotas were:
  - The increase of mesh sizes and the use of more selective fishing gear, to ensure that a fish is caught only when it has had the chance to reproduce at least once.
  - the possibility of measuring the fishing effort by the consumption of gas oil and not by kilowatts.

#### Structural measures :

- There was a positive opinion regarding the performance of the FIGG, but unfavourable with respect to PESCA. The excess of regionalisation of the measures dependent on the programme, as well as the problem of co-ordination of the competent authorities of the different funds has slowed down too much the performance of PESCA.

#### International agreements and organisations :

- It was agreed that the Commission should have a strong representation in international organisations. The sector would like to attend the negotiations as observers, as it is the case in Norway.

### Rationalisation measures :

- Regarding subsidies, there were complaints that coherence does not always reign among the principles that govern the granting of subsidies and the rest of the CFP. Greater specification of the types of subsidies in relation to the fishing types was demanded: coastal fishing for example has different kind of needs for subsidies than industrial fishing, and these needs are not reflected in the current regulation.

### Control :

- There was a strong support for the strengthening and the uniformity of controls throughout the Community. The Commission's competencies in this regard should be increased. The fulfilment of the MAGPs is impossible without a suitable Community control. The reciprocal national distrust regarding control can only be overcome by a greater Community control.

### Research :

- Fishermen's opinions should be taken into account in scientific assessment so that the results could be more acceptable to them. The information exchange mechanisms should be improved.
- It was highlighted that research on fishing activities is not profitable in itself, so it depends basically on aids and grants. The importance and the need for a greater research on the socio-economic aspects, on the search for new markets and on the internationalisation of the latter, on the marine ecosystems and on the influence of fishing in the marine food chain, on the influence of pesticides on fish and molluscs, (on which hardly any research is carried on now), were stressed.
- There are no sufficient scientific data to evaluate the stocks. However, the assessment on the situation of the stocks and the subsequent share of TACs are the cornerstone of the current CFP. Therefore, Danish fishermen ask for improvement in scientific research and the collection of data, to assess the stocks with rigour. It was indicated that our competitors (Japan, US), do more scientific research than us, regarding fishing and aquaculture.
- Finally, the establishment of a Community framework where fishermen and scientists could discuss together the available data and the situation of the stocks, was asked for, in order to try to unify criteria and for the better use of the data obtained by the fishermen.

### Decision-taking process :

- Greater participation by fishermen is needed. Information on the socio-economic effects of the decisions taken is lacking. However, there was a warning against "too much" consultation which can provoke a "devaluation" of the contributions, since the Commission has a limited capacity to make a synthesis of all this advice.

### Aquaculture :

- It was proposed to support the improvement of the knowledge of the sector on modern aquaculture.

### 3.3. GERMANY

One meeting was held in Hamburg on 2 December 1998. There were participants representing more or less all the branches of the sector, the Federal Ministry and the ministries of the coastal Länder. In general, the Commission's efforts to consult those involved in the sector are regarded as being very positive.

The main points raised were: The TACs and quotas system, international co-operation and fisheries agreements, the need to reinforce and standardise controls and penalties, and research.

#### North Sea access arrangements :

- Maintaining the current limited access arrangements was advocated so as to avoid increasing pressure on stocks and adverse effects on the structure of the German fleet.

#### TACs and quotas system :

- The TACs and quotas system was fundamentally regarded as a reasonable system for which there was no alternative. However, although the system was good, its results were often open to criticism because of poor implementation and monitoring.
- Monitoring needs reinforcement and producer organisations should be involved. The Norwegians' strict control and penalties system was cited as an example to follow. It was regretted that the Commission did not have executive powers.
- In addition, the annual changes in TACs and quotas should be lessened so as to help operators with their planning. Quota administration should remain the responsibility of the producer organisations.

#### Individual transferable quotas (ITQ) and relative stability :

- There were strong objections to the introduction of ITQs. Such a system would concentrate quotas in the hands of a minority possessing capital and controlling fishing activity. It would also be difficult to monitor.
- It was the unanimous opinion of the meeting that the principle of relative stability should be retained.

#### Fishing effort and MAGPs :

- Participants noted that the information sent by the Commission on exhaustion of stocks took too much time and that often delayed the start of negotiations on compensation.
- The lack of sanctions on Member States not complying with MAGP objectives was deplored.

#### International co-operation and fisheries agreements :

- There were calls to reinforce research on stock status (for stocks subject to fisheries agreements), to increase the number of EC staff involved in negotiating fisheries agreements (bi- and multilateral) and not to pay the Community financial contribution until the end of the year on the basis of actual catches.

#### Commercial policy :

- The problem of imports from low-wage countries was raised. The EC should draw up instruments permitting better and more rapid protection for Community producers faced with such imports.

#### Aid :

- It was feared that the Community's new structural rules could result in a reduction in the amounts of aid in the fisheries and aquaculture sector in outside Objective 1 regions.
- Aid (national and Community) should be available for the development of selective fishing methods and for co-operation between fishermen and scientists.

#### Controls :

- There was agreement on the need to standardise and to strengthen policing and penalties in all Member States.
- The problem of checking on large factory vessels was also stressed: by comparison, small-scale coastal fishing was much easier to check. Satellite monitoring and strict monitoring of landings were proposed as solutions.

#### Research :

- The Commission's attention was drawn to the unsatisfactory situation in data collection. Co-operation between the industry and scientists was felt to be good in general, but with some local disparities.
- In the Baltic region, co-operation was very intensive; scientists even accompanied fishermen on their sea trips. However, co-operation was unsatisfactory when it came to negotiating certain fisheries agreements (e.g. with Norway) The agreements were negotiated too rapidly and without offering satisfactory participation to fishermen and scientists.

### **3.4. GREECE**

One meeting was held in Athens on 11.3.1999.

Representatives from the Greek Ministry, various fishermen's associations, ship-owners, trade unions, research institutes, environmental NGO's and the specialised press, attended the meeting.

Participants welcomed the Commission's initiative to consult with all the interested parties on the future of the CFP after 2002.

However, they criticised the fact that only a limited number of organisations had received the questionnaire last year.

The following demands/proposals were made at the meeting :

#### Access to waters and resources/ Conservation and management :

- To keep the current restrictions on access to 6/12 miles.
- To create fisheries zones in the Mediterranean beyond the current 6 or 12 miles zones, so as to safeguard the interests of community fishermen.
- To impose on third countries, linked with the EU with various association or co-operation agreements, obligations related to the respect of Community environmental standards and to ensure that there is no unfair competition between those third country fishermen and companies and Community fishermen.
- To face the discard problem through the use of more selective fishing gear rather than allowing landings of all catches, was proposed by some scientists. However some fishermen proposed to allow landings of all catches and to promote consumption of discarded fish.
- To review the definition of fishing effort : the engine power element is linked to the security of the vessels and it must be seen against that background .Limitation on the engine power might jeopardise the security of vessels and crew.
- To encourage fishermen to withdraw older vessels.
- To adopt measures against unregulated recreational fisheries.
- To better inform and train young fishermen .

#### International co-operation / Mediterranean :

- To ensure that third country authorities do not impose on community ship-owners, hidden or new conditions not included in the fisheries agreements.
- To strengthen the GFCM and to continue the efforts for the establishment of a harmonised conservation and management regime in the Mediterranean, binding for all those fishing in that sea.
- Representatives from fishermen's organisations strongly criticised the Commission for not continuing the efforts undertaken in 1994 and 1996 under the first and second Diplomatic Conferences for the management of fisheries resources in the Mediterranean.

#### Rationalisation and support measures :

- The Commission's proposal for a Council regulation on the Community structural assistance in the fisheries sector, was widely discussed. Certain figures used in the Commission's proposal (e.g. the age of vessel for the scrapping premiums and the percentage of capacity to be withdrawn under the conditions related to fleet renewal with public aid ) as well as the supporting studies for those figures were criticised.
- Other suggestions made during the meeting include the following :
  - Research for new fishing grounds.

- Provision for compensation in case of force majeure damages, caused by weather or dolphins.
  - Dissemination of the scientific studies to the fishermen and other interested parties.
  - Special protective measures for the inshore fisheries.
  - Specific mention was also made to the development of aquaculture activities and the necessary conditions for such development.
- It must be emphasised that many of the proposals/criticisms of the participants were essentially addressed to the national authorities and /or to the sector itself :
- Need for the recruitment of more biologists and inspectors.
  - Need for better organisation of the fishermen themselves.
  - Need for improved functioning of national fish markets.
  - Measures against pollution by industrial activities etc.

### **3.5. SPAIN**

Six meetings were held in Spain: Vigo (19 January 1999), Barcelona (21 January 1999), Las Palmas (25 January 1999), Cadiz (27 January 1999), Madrid (29 January 1999) and San Sebastian (4 March 1999).

Representatives from all parties concerned – producer groups representing all the types of fleet that exist in Spain, the aquaculture sector, processing companies, the marketing sector (wholesalers and retailers), NGOs, members of various bodies and research institutes – attended and spoke at the various meetings organised.

Attendance was good and a wide range of constructive comments was made by all the interested parties represented.

A large number of representatives from the deep sea and industrial fleets and from the processing sector took part in the Vigo meeting. The Barcelona meeting focussed more on the problems of the inshore and Mediterranean fleets. The Las Palmas meeting dealt with problems specific to fishing in extremely remote regions that are highly dependent on fishing in Moroccan waters.

In Cadiz, concern over the fleet's dependence on the agreement with Morocco was also raised. Finally, the Madrid meeting took a broad overview of all the ideas presented previously, with contributions focussing more on those aspects about which the Commission will have to come with a proposal during the review of Council Regulation N° 3760/92, such as on access to the 6/12-mile zone.

The main points raised in the San Sebastian meeting were the TAC and quota system, fishing effort and MAGPs, fishing agreements, joint ventures, uniformity of controls and sanctions.

The discussions can be summarised as follows:

Access to the 6/12-miles :

- It appeared at the meetings that the current regime will not be put into question by the sector. Representatives of the deep-sea fleet limited itself to indicating its theoretical position on the disappearance of the current restrictions.

Access to the North Sea and to the Shetland box :

- There was widespread support for free access to the North Sea and for the abolition of all types of “box” except in those cases where it is scientifically proven that restricted access is really necessary.

TACs and quotas, ITQs and relative stability :

- At the meetings in Barcelona, Cadiz and Madrid, there were proposals related to the establishment of multispecies TACs in the Mediterranean.
- With regard to the TACs the following suggestions were made:
  - that greater attention be paid to fishing effort and technical measures, and less to the TACs, to ensure improved conservation and management of resources.
  - that a system that is easier to control be created. For example, fishing effort allows total control more easily than do gear, sizing, temporary rest periods and above all, TACs.
- With regard to ITQs, representatives of the inshore fleet came out against a system that, according to them, only favours large companies that can raise the funds to buy fishing rights. Those in favour believe that the ITQ system would help companies improve their calculations of their investments and cost-effectiveness.

Discards and precautionary approach :

- With regard to discards, the majority opinion was against the current system. It was recognised that in the Mediterranean the continental shelf is limited and resources are easily exhausted, but discarding was condemned.
- The general feeling was that the practice of discarding encourages indifference on the part of fishermen. For example, during the spawning season, more discards are caught than are target fish. The possibility of discarding in this case encourages indiscriminate fishing. Obligatory temporary closures during the spawning season were suggested as an alternative.
- Another proposal is to set multispecies TACs, especially in the Mediterranean. Greater flexibility of quota exchange between countries is also sought, which could, moreover, facilitate maintenance of relative stability as it is currently defined and apportioned.
- Amongst those opinions in favour of the current discard system, it is held that it is more costly and difficult for the fishermen to have to deal with the “banned” catch until they return to port. There isn’t enough space in the boats for the cargo and the discards and, under certain circumstances, discarding is inevitable and is a natural part of fishing.

### Fishing effort and MAGPs :

- With regard to the Mediterranean, criticisms were expressed regarding the appropriateness of scrapping ships .Temporary or permanent closure of zones would be more appropriate..
- Calls were made for research to be carried out and requirements for more selective fishing gear to be established. It was proposed that training be given to producers, so that the first stage of processing stays in their hands, and the value-added from this first sale passes to them, compensating them for production losses.
- In general, opinion is in favour of establishing rest periods.
- The need to take into account other Community regulations (health and hygiene, safety on board vessels, etc.) at the time of setting boat tonnage, was mentioned.
- At Vigo, the suggestion was made to keep MAGPs only for those parts of the fleet where restructuring is needed.
- Finally, there was a strong request that the Commission ensures the application of sanctions on those Member States which are not complying with MAGPs.

### The environment :

- In the Canaries, attention was drawn to the destruction of the seabed as a result of tourist-related building. The creation of more marine reserves was requested.

### International cooperation and fishery agreements :

- It is believed that the Commission should:
  - negotiate and conclude agreements in new areas, such as Brazil and Indonesia, etc.
  - favour first generation agreements.
  - play a greater part in the international organisations (FAO, GFCM) so as to be able to impose the same fishing effort on vessels flying a flag of convenience as on the Community fleet, with regard to conservation of resources etc.
  - ensure that the new Member States have the same access within the framework of the agreements signed with Greenland and Norway.
- Amongst the ideas developed during the meetings the following should be noted in particular:
  - The broad rejection by representatives of the industrial fleets of the new FIFG proposal which binds joint ventures to the fishery agreements.
  - The fact that concluding agreements has repercussions across the whole sector:
  - The fact that the Commission bases its proposals on information obtained from theory experts, who misrepresent the real situation, instead of listening to the sector affected by the agreement in question.

- It was proposed that the EU should be able to speak with one voice, but that it should have multiple votes. In this regard, the example was cited of organisations where Greenland and St Pierre and Miquelon have one vote, i.e. the same number as the EU. In the same way, the Commission was requested to allow Member States to become members of organisations where the EU is currently negotiating its own accession, on the understanding that they will withdraw as soon as the EU's accession is finalised.
- The unions requested better social cover under international agreements.

#### The Mediterranean :

- With regard to the issue of regionalisation, various organisations and representatives from the autonomous authorities taking part in the meetings at Barcelona, Cadiz and Madrid, suggested dividing the Mediterranean into regions and create a Community policy that would be regional rather than national .
- Some also proposed extending the control of different neighbouring Member States over waters beyond the 12-mile limit, as has already been done by Spain and the possibility of opening access to this zone to all Community vessels wishing it, provided that they respect the regulations of the relevant Member State, concerning authorised fishing gear, biological rest periods, etc.
- With regard to relations with non-member states bordering the Mediterranean, the viability of the GFCM as the only forum for debate and co-operation was called into question, the participants declaring themselves to be in favour of additional links with the various neighbouring states.

#### Markets :

- A certain minimum size is required across the Community, and fish that cannot be caught may not be sold, irrespective of its origin.
- A balance has to be struck between Community preference and WTO obligations.
- Stricter checks on imports were requested, as was the creation of stronger and more homogenous transnational producer organisations with a view to harmonising the European market. Greater cohesion between market policies and resource policies was called for.
- There is no consensus regarding the proposal to require all unloaded fish to pass through auctions.
- A seal of quality for Community products with a logo such as “traditional method of preparation” is favoured.
- At Vigo, it was asked for the CFP to be more balanced in the future and for CFP resources to be shared between the fleet, processing and marketing sectors.
- The encouragement of mergers, as the single method of creating a homogenous CMO and a Community market that is not fragmented and national in the way that it is now, was also suggested.

- There should be greater integration and use of the market as a weapon within the framework of the CFP, as it is done by Iceland and Norway.
- Representatives from the tuna fishing group questioned the usefulness of the current system for compensatory aid.

#### Research :

- Apart from biological research, research into all aspects of fishing should be developed: research into the socio-economic influence of activities, better understanding of the particular problems of each ecosystem, multispecies relationships, further research into new discarding practices, into the exploitation of other marine produce, and into the possibilities available to the small-scale fleet, etc.
- It was suggested that the Commission looks for experts with less academic and more practical backgrounds.

#### Advisory Committee for Fisheries :

- The reform of the Committee has been criticised by various parties. Some in particular, complained that the Advisory Committee can only provide the Commission with information and that it is not allowed to play an active role in making proposals.

#### Aquaculture :

- Representatives of the mussel producers are appealing for a European aquaculture programme and for a list of sensitive products such as exists in agriculture.

#### Control :

- There should be equitable control by national authorities regardless of the flag of the vessel. Harmonisation of sanctions was proposed in San Sebastian.

#### Other issues :

- Simplification of Community regulations was called for, particularly of those concerning the inshore fleet.
- The new inspection regulations have been criticised, particularly the need to indicate the tonnage of completely marginal catches.
- The unions insisted at all the meetings on the need to pay greater attention to the CFP's social aspects.
- At Vigo, great concern was expressed over the proposals to regionalise the CFP within the framework of a process that in fact constitutes, according to these views, covert renationalisation. Participants were in favour of a Community fisheries policy with common resources, fleets and CMO.

### 3.6. FRANCE

The French meeting took place on 19 May 1999 in Paris. Participants representing almost all the branches within the sector, as well as numerous local committees attended the meeting which took place in a very constructive atmosphere .

#### Access to internal resources / resource management and conservation :

- a) All those who took the floor spoke in favour of retaining the status quo with regard to access to the 6-12 mile band.

Representatives from Guyana insisted that shrimp trawlers (industrial fishing) should not have access to those areas of less 30m depth in order to avoid placing this resource in great danger.

- b) It is advocated that the current system of limited access to the North Sea should be maintained in order to avoid an increase in pressure on stock.

Representatives of fish-workers called for the presence of industrial waste in the North Sea to be taken into account and for it to be dealt with , as it is an important cause of the decrease in recruitment.

- c) As regards the Shetland Box, those attended the meeting seemed to favour its retention, for some because of the effect it has on the preservation of resources and for others for simply political reasons.

- d) The system of TACs and quotas was judged as being the most appropriate system in principle and it was estimated that it should be kept.

However, some improvements would appear to be necessary: the way in which the application of the system is monitored requires considerable strengthening. The TACs should be based on a solid scientific basis, whence the demand to intensify research.

Some participants called for excessive quota fluctuations from one year to the next to be avoided in order to facilitate understanding of the system by those involved in the sector. Furthermore, they added, the quota exchanges between the Member States and above all between producers' organisations should be more flexible, under the control of national authorities.

Some also expressed their opposition to multi-annual TACs which would lead to mismanagement of resources.

- e) All those who took the floor on this issue stated their opposition to the ITQs.

Some participants did not oppose individual quotas intended to increase the responsibility of those involved in the sector and offer them a better overview thus allowing them to adapt their fishing capacities better to the quotas granted. It was suggested that these quotas could be managed collectively, perhaps within the framework of the professional organisations.

However, there was a convergence of opinion against transferable quotas as they would lead to a concentration of the quotas in the hands of a small number of companies and would increase pressure on fishing.

- f) The principle of relative stability received broad consensus.

Specific points were noted on the subject of resource management in the Channel:

It was pointed out that the Channel is a multispecies area where 80% of the resources do not fall under community quota regimes and which are exploited by coastal fishermen. It would, therefore, be appropriate to ensure that the fishing effort does not move towards the Channel as other zones become exhausted. Fishing in the Channel should also be placed within the framework of a resource management decentralisation process to the benefit of regional coastal organisations.

Others expressed the concern of coastal fishermen related to the direct competition they get from industrial fisheries in the 6 miles zone .

An NGO made a contribution regarding resource management in the Gulf du Lion. In view of the fact that the sea beyond the zone of the territorial waters is now open to all boats and that the possible failure of the negotiations aiming towards a fishing agreement between the EU and Morocco could lead to the redeployment of Spanish flotillas in the Mediterranean, thus creating an imbalance over the whole basin, it advocated the introduction of a territorial model for fishery management and protection, to be carried out by residents of the Gulf aided by scientific support.

- g) MAGPs were criticised for failure to achieve their goals. An organisation from the Mediterranean pointed out that MAGPs had negative effects on jobs and that the lack of KW available and the resulting prices of boats were making very difficult for young people to enter the profession.

#### International agreements and external resources :

- It was emphasised that fishing agreements should not encourage the employment of a low-cost workforce on Community boats. Certain social regulations should be respected on board vessels flying the flag of a Member State and that these should furthermore appear in all of the agreements signed by the Community.
- Some denounced the pillage of the waters of those countries with which the Community has signed fishing agreements.
- Others maintained that the fishing agreements made with the ACP countries of the same type as those regarding tuna-boat fishing, have facilitated real local development in these States, as well as the supply of the Community market at reasonable prices to the consumer.
- Finally, some called for the direct participation of professionals to negotiate alongside the Commission for agreements with third countries.

#### The market in fishery products :

- The producers' organisations expressed worries regarding maintaining Community customs protection and external Community border controls. In more general terms, even if the globalisation of the market for products from the sea is inevitable, Community producers still have the right to fair competition.

- Others demanded the inclusion into appendix IV of the CMO regulations of species which are regionally very important and, in particular, of shellfish, which cannot be included under aquaculture, contrary to what DG XIV claims (e.g. scallops).
- Representatives from the auction managers believe that the globalisation and liberalisation of the market will signify an increase to excess in the number of direct commercial contracts, which are all too often exempt from the regulations governing public procurement contracts.
- Participants from Guyana expressed their concern regarding competition in Martinique and Guadeloupe caused by processed products originating from Surinam and Brazil, which are not subject to the constraints imposed on community processors.
- As regards the information provided to the end consumer, work should be done on providing the origin of products (in particular in differentiating between the Community and external sources) and the production methods used .

#### Rationalisation and support measures for fishing :

- In view of the heavy investments to be made in the fishing sector, the need for a structural policy was emphasised, in particular in order to renovate the ageing fleet and to allow young people to enter the profession.
- For some, the overcapacity of the fleet cannot be reduced through a simple reduction in engine power and that it would be useful to look for alternative management methods for the fishing effort, within the framework of subsidiarity (reduction in work time for example).
- Representatives of the ship-owners oppose the proposal for structural regulation currently being discussed before the Council. The very opportunity of the reform project was called into question insofar as it continues to contribute to judicial insecurity.
- Some called for the specific characteristics of Mediterranean fishing to be taken into account and for the management of the fishing effort to be handed back to local fishers.

#### Control :

- There was convergence of opinions regarding the need to harmonise and to strengthen enforcement and sanctions in all the Member States in order to ensure a level-playing field throughout the EC for all fishermen.
- For some, the Commission alone would be in a position to achieve greater equity and homogeneity of enforcement at the Community level.

#### Decision-making process :

- The general opinion was that the participation of professionals in the decision-making process should be greatly increased, perhaps in the form of a type of written procedure guaranteeing, through greater transparency, that a consultation procedure would be carried out far in advance of decisions.

#### Research :

- In the opinion of representatives of the ship-owners, there is a lack of co-ordination between the scientists in the different Member States.
- Some called for research to be carried out on the quality of the aquatic environment, following a deterioration in water quality which can lead to bans on certain aquaculture products being brought onto the market.

#### Aquaculture :

- Some consider that the CMO regulation is not appropriate for the needs of aquaculture. This would justify the consideration of a sector-specific CMO for aquaculture.

#### Other points :

- An organisation deeply regretted the fact that the role of women in fishing today has not been taken into account.

### **3.7. IRELAND**

Three meetings were held in Ireland : in Cork on 22 September 1998, in Dublin on 24 September 1998 and in Donegal on 28 September 1998.

Representatives of the main Irish fishermen's organisations, the processing/trade industry, the aquaculture and the scientific sectors, attended the meetings. The participants welcomed the Commission's initiative of "coming to the grounds" and exchanging views with the industry although there was some scepticism as to whether it would be possible to introduce changes in the CFP.

The discussion can be summarised as follows :

#### Access to waters and internal resources :

- An extension of the 6/12 miles band was called for, mainly for conservation reasons. The re-introduction of the Irish box was also claimed by some organisations. The basic assumption was that the activities of fleets from outside the region were less responsible and less sustainable. There was also the feeling the Irish fishermen should get a bigger share of "their" fish resources.
- The fishing pattern of vessels from other Member States which have fishing rights in the internal waters has changed, and Irish small-scale fleet is confronted to big vessels from other Member States. The rules should be changed accordingly.
- Irish fishermen cannot fish in certain areas during a certain period of time whilst other Member States can. This is an inconsistency that should be properly addressed.
- Most of the fishermen's organisations wanted the allocation keys, on which the relative stability is based, to be changed in order to reflect the current fishing activities in Ireland. Their opinion was based on the argument that the level of fishing activities was low for

historical reasons when Ireland joined the Community but that it has developed since and it is now blocked by a too low share especially of resources in the Irish EEZ.

#### Resource management and conservation :

- The management system is over-centralised. A coastal/regional management system should be implemented instead. The sector felt that it would lead to a higher degree of responsibility and motivation to comply, if the rules were established at this level.
- There was criticism of the delay in taking decisions at the EC level. A mechanism should be put in place allowing for the quick adoption of conservation measures when needed.
- The need for the protection of stocks was very much emphasised. Measures such as closed zones or periods of fishing or the increase of mesh sizes should be promoted.
- The current discarding rules should be scrapped.

#### International agreements :

- There was criticism of the percentage of the EU budget committed to fisheries agreements which benefit only some Member States.

#### Markets :

- The duty-free imports from third countries were criticised as they lead to a depression of prices in the European market.

#### Other issues :

- Irish fishermen and the processing industry wanted to receive subsidies on the cost of transport, which is higher than in other Member States due to the peripheral situation of Ireland. They claimed to be in a situation quite similar to the one of other remote regions which benefit from specific Community support.
- Accompanying measures : something should be done in the field of social and working conditions.
- Small-scale fishing should receive more support from both EC and national authorities.
- Coastal zone planning: the principle of subsidiarity should apply.
- Control: there was a strong support for the strengthening and the uniformity of controls throughout the Community. The Commission's competencies in this regard should be increased.
- Research : fishermen's opinions should be taken into account in scientific assessment so that the results could be more acceptable to them. The information exchange mechanisms should be improved. Fishermen claimed that their experience showed often a better shape of stocks than the one reported by scientists who did not conduct enough on the spot activities.

- Decision-taking process: Greater involvement of fishermen is needed. Information on the socio-economic effects of the decisions taken is lacking. Better compliance with rules could be reached this way.
- The aquaculture sector criticised once again the lack of support that this sector receives from the Commission.

### **3.8. ITALY**

Three meetings were held in Italy : in Civitavecchia on the 1 June 1999, in Ancona on 3 June and in Palermo on 7 June 1999

Representatives of the main Italian fishermen's organisations, the processing industry, the aquaculture and the scientific sectors, environmental NGOs, and trade unions attended the meetings.

The main points raised in those meetings, were the following:

#### Mediterranean

- There was a consensus on the idea of the “specificity” of the Mediterranean fishery, and, on the idea of the sub-sectors within the Mediterranean Sea, such as Adriatic fishery, Sicilian fishery, etc. In the name of such “specificity”, the Italian sector asked for a specific policy for such sub-sectors, regarding technical measures, minimum sizes, etc.
- The need of a real Mediterranean Common Policy was strongly outlined in the three meetings as a means to solve issues such as access to waters or border lines.
- The perception of an unfair treatment of the EU fleet in relation with that of third countries fishing in the Mediterranean has been a leitmotiv in the three meetings.
- The Italian sector refuses to apply tougher rules than those applied by the competitors (either from neighbours like Tunisia or Libya, or from third countries fishing in the Mediterranean).
- The EU should negotiate its co-operation agreements with Mediterranean countries, taking into account the fishing interests of the Community fleet. The international agreements with Mediterranean countries should be open to all Member States, unlike the agreement with Morocco.
- The EU should be able to “export” the notion of responsible fishing in the Mediterranean, and to impose it through the regional organisations (ICATT, GFCM). The Italian sector asks for the possibility to allow Italy to solve out directly their problems with third countries such as Croatia.
- The sector is in favour of temporary joint ventures and joint enterprises with their neighbours in the Mediterranean .

### Fishing effort and MAGPs :

- Against the current definition of fishing effort. The Commission focuses itself more on reducing capacity than on reducing activity.
- There was strong support in favour of temporary cessation of activities financed through state aid. In small fishing, the owner and the crew are usually either the same persons, or closely related. There was a request for aid to the crew, if aid to the owner cannot be approved.
- Reference was made to problems caused by Italian administrative procedures, regarding, above all, aid applications for the definitive cessation of activities and for the licences to open a fish farm. The willingness of the fleet to reduce its capacity and fulfil the MAGP is clearly stated by the amount of applications which still are waiting for an answer.

### Conservation measures :

- There were complaints on the current TAC for bluefin tuna and the current share of quotas. Regarding tuna, it was pointed out that while the Community reduces its fleet, third countries like Tunisia increase theirs and their catches. The sector complained against the presence of flags of convenience vessels and of third country vessels which do not respect the ICATT regulations.
- In Palermo, fishermen have also criticized the "spadare" ban as dangerous for the swordfish resource. According to them, 70% of the catch of "palangari" (the fishing gear which is replacing the "spadare") are under the minimum size.
- Fishermen asked for the inclusion of a kind of “cultural specificity” in EU regulation. Such a “specificity” would allow them not to apply some rules, or to fish with certain “traditional” gears and methods.
- On technical measures, the existence of certain contradictions among the Community regulation and the national and regional (in the case of Sicily) regulations were mentioned. This leads to a lack of transparency and to enforcement difficulties.
- There is opposition against the current regulations on minimum sizes, which do not take into account the special characteristics of the Mediterranean (70% of the fleet is in-shore in nature, there is high unemployment rate, the small fishing is very difficult to reconvert-failure of “piano spadare”).

### Other issues :

- Accompanying measures: Fishing regions are usually poor ones, with no alternative employment opportunities. Therefore, aid for the training of fishermen is required.
- Control should be improved. Landings should be centralised in some specific landing points, controlling that there's no more landing elsewhere in the coast.
- Markets : The sector favours quality labels, distinguishing between fresh and processed products, and including the date and place of fishing. Aid would be required to help fishermen to implement such a new system and to keep the first added value by making themselves the first sale. Aid to improve health conditions in the handling of fish on board

has been requested as well. The aim is to transmit a quality mark to the consumer, from the very moment of the catching. It was also said that the auctions in Italy need modernisation.

- Environment: A Community framework on the pollution of seas has been requested.
- Research: There should be research on the consequences of coastal tourism on fisheries. Goodwill between researchers and fishermen is needed, to come up with accurate data and to be able to fix zones and periods to close fishing, and to assess afterwards the results of such a close.
- Aquaculture: The market encourages products with a bigger value. The sector should then evolve and integrate with processing industry. Research should also focus on more ecological techniques, and on the forecasts of the tendencies of the market. The forthcoming Community regulation should take more into account the economic reality and problems of the aquaculture sector.

### 3.9. THE NETHERLANDS

On 20 April 1999 a meeting was held in Noordwijk .

Representatives from the main Dutch fishermen's organisations, the trade industry, the scientific sector, environmental NGOs, trade unions and national authorities attended the meeting. The participants welcomed the Commission's initiative of "coming down to the grass-roots level" and exchanging views with the industry. The atmosphere was that of an open, positive debate.

The main proposals can be summarised as follows :

#### Access to waters and resources/ Conservation and management :

- Support for the maintenance of the current 6/12 miles zone.
- Need to take a decision on the non-TAC species in the North Sea, and on the by-catch problem of TAC species while fishing for non-quota species.
- Support for the current system of TACs and quotas.
- Regarding discards, different opinions were expressed:
  - Need for clearer, simpler rules concerning discards and need to try new fishing methods (like electro-fishing for flat fish).
  - Need to let fishermen set up their own system and land all their catches. ITQ system is the best way to diminish discards.
- Against the current definition of the precautionary approach. In favour of the implementation of specific measures for specific problems.
- Against the current definition of fishing effort. Engine-power does not influence fishing capacity.

- Against the MAGP system. The fleet has been already reduced to a sensible dimension.
- To introduce a “closed areas/seasons” system to control over-fishing, instead of such a tight MAGP system.
- MAGPs should include new considerations into their final goals, like improving the ecological fishing, protecting the environment, etc. so that some divergences from the fleet reduction objective could be accepted, provided that other goals have been respected.

#### Other issues

- There was a call to improve contacts between scientists and fishermen, to avoid the current contradictions and to increase the financial aid in order to improve the quality of data collection;
- There were requests for more training for young fishermen, and for fishermen in general on new techniques and fishing gear;
- It was emphasised that the Dutch co-management system should be studied by the EU and other Member States, since it is able to allow the fleet to make profit without further capacity reduction. It is a fact that in the Netherlands fishing is an economically-viable activity. It encourages fishermen’s responsibility and awareness regarding fishing problems.

### **3.10. AUSTRIA**

The consultations in Austria were held on 18 and 19 March 1999 at Waidhofen (Waldviertel) and in Vienna. The atmosphere was very constructive. The Commission's effort to consult the sector was welcomed. Since Austria has no access to the sea, consultation was in essence restricted to aquaculture, inland fishing and the processing industry.

In the face of reform of the structural funds all the aquaculture representatives stressed the importance of continuation of the present structural policy in order to guarantee a stable framework permitting medium and long-term investment planning and competitive production, particularly in view of the future Eastern enlargement and of the fact that Austrian aquaculture consists mainly of small family businesses.

In this context the question of eligibility of the purchase cost of second-hand machines (essentially machines for handling, transport and excavation (for ponds) like those used to some extent in other sectors) was raised.

The aquaculture representatives expressed their concerns over forthcoming Eastern expansion of the Community and the mass arrival on the Community market, especially on the Austrian, of much less expensive aquaculture products originating notably in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia. These applicant countries would profit from much more advantageous production conditions (e.g. very low wages, cheaper inputs, hygiene, quality and environmental standards not yet corresponding to those of the Community etc.) A long transition period with exemptions in favour of the applicant countries would therefore be very bad for Austrian aquaculture.

The residues of medicaments administered to fish in the applicant countries would cause a particular problem. The reliability of Czech health control and the possibility of action following detection of irregularities were raised in this context. On the price difference for carp between Austria and the applicant countries the aquaculture representatives stressed the need for maintaining a reference price.

On the question of review of the structural Regulation and the eligibility of inland fisheries the Ministry representatives wanted retention of the possibility and said that a formal request for this would be made.

After a very detailed presentation of the market situation for fishery products in Austria, discussion turned to the following subjects: imports from outside the Community, the new "market" regulation, fears over the accession of the Eastern European countries and the problem of listeria.

A representative of the processing industry criticized the fact that imports from certain countries (e.g. Poland) would be subject to neither duty nor adequate control (quantity and quality) in contrast to EC exports to these countries.

On accession of the East European countries the processing industry representatives expressed more or less the same concerns as those of aquaculture, stressing the need to avoid transitional periods as much as possible in order to avoid distortion of competition.

A representative of the processing industry drew the Ministry's and the Commission's attention to the fact that the Austrian health authorities would in their health control on smoked salmon products be applying stricter restrictions than those of other Member States, namely "zero tolerance" in analysis for the presence of listeria. This would be against Community law.

### **3.11. PORTUGAL**

#### **I. Lisbon – 9 February 1999**

Those attending included representatives of the Portuguese authorities, along with representatives of fisheries, aquaculture and environmental organisations.

The atmosphere of the meeting was very constructive. Participation by the Portuguese sector was much more important than in the first phase of the consultation process.

#### Access to internal waters and resources :

- The large majority of organisations represented were in favour of retaining the present system of restrictions in the 12-mile band. Two organisations asked for the zone to be extended to 24 miles and 50 miles respectively.
- There was a feeling that the restrictions on access to the North Sea were unfair and discriminatory. The industry organisations supported the removal of all restrictions on access from 2003 onwards.

- The system of TACs and quotas was valuable but inadequate. The distribution keys should be altered in the light of the situation now, as present-day Europe bore no comparison with the Europe that existed when the keys were established.
- Relative stability was regarded as a fundamental aspect of the CFP. One of the associations only said it was in favour of individual transferable quotas.

#### Management and conservation of resources :

- The management and conservation of resources made responsible fishing a necessity, but the way in which fishermen are remunerated was incompatible with the requirements of responsible fishing, which can only exist if trade is responsible. Penalties for the same type of infringements needed to be applied uniformly, otherwise there will always be a strong sense of injustice.
- A study needed to be made of the environment, in particular the effects of pollution on resources.
- The MAGPs should be strictly observed. Member States which fail to meet them should be penalised. Gross tonnage should be the only measurement accepted as measurements in kW are very difficult to make in practice. Social aspects should not be overlooked. Producers' organisations should have a more responsible role as they are involved in the management of resources and play a part in regulating fishing effort. This called for the support "not simply financial", but of all the actors involved.
- The present rules on discards should be abolished, according to the organisations represented. The benefits of abolishing them would be greater than the drawbacks.
- The concept of fishing effort could not be applied technically to fishing by sardine seiners.
- Fisheries inspection required the necessary resources if it was to be effective.

#### International co-operation and fisheries agreements :

- Fisheries should be included in general trade and co-operation agreements. A few organisations felt that joint-enterprise agreements had no value. Efforts should be made to conclude new fisheries agreements with other non-member countries, giving access to resources. Existing agreements should be strengthened.

#### Market in fishery products :

- The use of the withdrawal mechanism should be rationalised. The market was being controlled by middlemen. Measures needed to be put in place to prevent this form of control. Health checks should be stepped up and labelling standards made as stringent and comprehensive as possible.

#### Aid – Structures :

- Representatives from the sardine industry asked for aids to establish a system of contracts, for storage and for compensating measures to offset liberalised imports of canned Moroccan sardines.

- The concept of fishing capacity in conjunction with fishing effort was not properly understood by ship-owners and the shipbuilding industry. Ship-owners' associations regarded fleet renewal as the key to ensuring the future of the industry along with quality products and the improvement of health and safety conditions on board fishing vessels. They expressed concern that the new regulations, in putting forward less comprehensive aid measures for the fleet than provided for in Regulation (EC) No 3699/93, could endanger the future of the Portuguese industry.

#### Research :

- International co-operation and exchanges of scientists should be developed and promoted. Scientific advice should be more transparent. Trust between the industry and scientists should be fostered. Aquaculture would play a major role in the future and consequently must not be overlooked.

#### II. Ponta Delgada – Azores – 23 February 1999

Those attending included: Portuguese authorities and representatives of fisheries, aquaculture and environmental organisations.

The meeting was held in a very constructive atmosphere with a wide-ranging discussion at which concerns were aired regarding the development of the common fisheries policy, in particular access of foreign fleets to the waters of the EEZ, the management of the principal stocks in the archipelago (tuna and swordfish), the assistance needed to modernise the fleet and port facilities and to survey and monitor fishing activities, etc. The characteristic features of the status of a remote region and the importance of POSEIMA to the Azores were also underlined and deemed to be of fundamental importance to the region.

#### Access to internal waters and resources / Management and conservation of resources :

- The majority of those present wanted the present restrictions in the 12-mile zone to continue to apply.
- Representatives of the ship-owners and other organisations asked for the maritime zone under "Azores jurisdiction" to be transformed into a genuine Azores Box .
- The organisations requested in addition that sport fishing be properly regulated.

#### Market in fishery products :

- Health checks needed to be tightened.
- Representatives of the producers' organisation and industry associations considered that, because there were very few local buyers, a system of contracts should be introduced with support from the Community.

#### Aid – Structures :

- Representatives of the ship-owners' associations felt that modernisation of the inshore fleet (over 700 vessels) was critical for ensuring the future of the industry. They believed that the tuna fleet should be replaced by vessels that were more up-to-date in terms of health and safety standards.

- They also felt that support should be given for the training of young fishermen.

#### Research :

- Some scientists expressed concern that the "studies projects" might be terminated. They believed that it would be very difficult to find the funds needed to develop the basic studies required to obtain a sound understanding of marine resources and their balanced environmental development.

#### Monitoring :

- All the organisations considered it essential that the monitoring of fisheries in the EEZ and the ports of the archipelago be properly organised and developed. This would have to cover pollution in the EEZ caused by, among other things, oil tankers passing through the area.

### III. Funchal – Madeira – 25 February 1999

Those attending included Portuguese authorities and representatives of fisheries, aquaculture and environmental organisations.

The main items discussed were: access to waters, the management and conservation of resources, fisheries agreements and joint ventures/enterprises, the common market organisation, POSEIMA and the structural policy.

#### Access to internal waters and resources :

- Members of the industry and other organisations wanted the present system of restrictions within the 12-mile zone, to continue to apply and if possible to be extended to a preferential fishing zone of up to 50 nautical miles.
- They asked also for sport fishing to be properly regulated and treated as a genuine business activity linked with tourism.

#### Management and conservation of resources :

- Discards should be avoided and landed for processing as fish meal.
- Representatives of the ship-owners asked for tuna fishing in the Mediterranean to be banned during the breeding season.

#### Fisheries agreements :

- The organisations took the view that the policy on fisheries agreements is very important. The majority of shipowners were in favour of joint enterprises, preferably with the ACP countries, and regarded them as a means of helping the industry out of a difficult situation, securing supplies for the industry and providing work for fishermen.

#### Market in fishery products :

- Representatives of the canning and processing industry in general, regarded the difficulty of obtaining supplies of raw materials as the main problem. They requested the

Commission, under POSEIMA, to consider authorising imports of tuna from non-member countries, as an exception when none was available in Madeira and on the EU market.

#### Aid – Structures :

- As the fleet was a non-industrial one, representatives of the ship-owners believed that modernisation aid was essential together with aid for installing equipment to allow catches to be kept on board (refrigeration and freezer systems).
- They considered that old vessels must be replaced by new ones, but if this entailed a reduction in GT it would be unacceptable since the number of fishermen on board would have to be cut. In Madeira the profitability of pole-and-line tuna vessels was closely dependent on the number of fishermen.
- The organisations believed that support should be given also for occupational training, especially for young fishermen.

#### Monitoring :

- The organisations considered it essential that monitoring of fishing in the Madeira EEZ be properly organised and developed. This could be undertaken using appropriate instruments and facilities and for that financial assistance would be needed.

### **3.12. FINLAND**

One meeting took place in Helsinki (7.5.1999)

Participants representing all the various components of the national fisheries sector were very active during the meeting underlying the specificity of the Finnish sector, both in terms of geography (specificity of the Baltic Sea) and general operational pattern.

Representatives from the aquaculture sector and wholesalers expressed their disappointment for what they perceive as an abandonment of the sector by the CFP managers and decision makers. They believe that the CFP should include in its scope, trade in fish and aquaculture at an equal level with fishing activities. A more positive attitude by the Community on aquaculture, was strongly asked for.

The main points/proposals that came out of this meeting are as follows :

#### Conservation and management :

- The CFP should leave outside the quota system the salmon spawning in the Gulf of Finland.
- There should be an increase of the Baltic salmon quota for Finland.
- MAGPs are very rigid and do not take into account the specific situation in the Gulfs of Finland and Botnia. MAGPs should be more flexible and allow for the possibility of introducing new vessels.
- There should be regional solutions to the discard problem.

- There is an urgent need to address the issue of damages caused by seals and seabirds on fishermen and fish farmers. A compensation scheme must be established for such damages.

#### International co-operation :

- There is a strong wish for an agreement with Russia which could expand the fishing possibilities for Finnish fishermen. The international agreements policy should benefit all Member States.

#### Aquaculture :

- The dumping of Norwegian salmon and rainbow trout has caused very serious problems. The Community's reactions have been so far weak. This situation threatens the competitiveness of the Finnish aquaculture industry.

#### Markets :

- Producers' organisations are almost non-existent in Finland. The CMO should also support co-operatives which is the main institution used in Finland.

#### Rationalisation and support measures :

- The structural policy must also foresee measures in case of financial crisis, as the one provoked recently in Russia which had a strong negative impact on the Finnish sector.
- There is a need to adopt measures to help attract young fishermen to the sector.
- Structural aid must be awarded for the purchase of fishing rights and gear, for information and training, for investment to meet environmental standards in aquaculture, etc.

#### Other issues :

- The importance of recreational fisheries and fish tourism in Finland was underlined.
- Research should focus on damages caused by seals.
- There is a need for extensive campaigns to promote the consumption of fish.

### **3.13. SWEDEN**

A meeting took place in Gothenburg (4.5.1999)

Some organisations were generally supportive of the consultation process as well as of the marketing policy.

Others however, were critical and sceptical of the consultation process and expressed support for national solutions and approaches to the problems of the CFP.

Representatives from the processing sector expressed their well known wish that the EC guarantees access to raw material.

On specific issues the following points were made :

Access to waters and resources/ Conservation and management :

- Support for the retention of the current 6/12 mile zone regime was expressed.
- There was support for local management plans and development of fisheries with the involvement of local communities.
- The need for the Commission to achieve better knowledge of national/regional particularities and management models was emphasised.
- There was support for a less centralised and more flexible CFP able to respond quickly to local problems and particularities.
- There was support for improved technical measures and selective gear.

International Co-operation :

- The need to take into account the needs of local inshore fisheries of the third countries during the negotiation of bilateral fisheries agreements, was spelled out.
- The need to reduce the budget for the international agreements in favour of other Community actions in the context of the CFP was stressed.

Markets :

- Some expressed support for the CMO proposal, whereas other participants strongly criticised it, feeling uncomfortable about the roles assigned to producers' organisations in the Commission's proposal. They underlined that the approach in Sweden is totally different and that the Commission's proposal takes on board the views of some Member States only.
- It was emphasised by some, that it is impossible to ensure free market and security of fishermen at the same time, given the constraints of the international environment (WTO).
- A representative of an NGO expressed satisfaction with the consumer protection provisions of the Commission's proposal.

Rationalisation and support measures :

- There was a call for the inclusion of trawlers in the aid schemes, by increasing the limit from 12 m to 15 m, and a call for better co-ordination of the various structural programmes.
- Participants also underlined the usefulness of PESCO type programmes as well as the difficulty of certain remote regions in Northern Sweden to get aid because of the presence of small dispersed communities.

Other issues :

- There was a call to relieve the burden of fishermen on data compilation and to avoid limiting research grants.

### 3.14. UNITED KINGDOM

Four meetings were held in the UK . It has to be reminded that the degree of participation by the UK organisations was very high during the first phase of the consultation process (questionnaire).

The Commission had received exhaustive answers to its questionnaire by 49 organisations and associations covering all the components of the fisheries sector and all quarters of the UK.

Those answers also contained original and detailed proposals, especially on the issue of conservation and management of resources. For example, the whole debate on regionalisation/decentralisation of the CFP has its origins on proposals emanating from the UK.

Given the exhaustive and detailed character of the replies to the questionnaire, it was normal that the debate at the regional meetings in the UK was maybe less thorough than it has been in those Member States where there was a lower degree of participation during the written phase of the consultation.

However, discussions were still very intense and constructive. Questions related to the access to waters and resources, conservation and management measures, as well as regionalisation or decentralisation of the CFP, were the main points of discussion at the UK meetings.

In general , the UK organisations are against further access to the 6/12 miles zone / North Sea / Shetland Box. However the biggest national federation of fishermen's organisations supports the scrapping of Shetland Box.

There was also widespread support for a regionalised / decentralised CFP.

The main remarks raises at the meetings can be summarised as follows :

#### I. Aberdeen -7 October 1998 (East and North Scotland)

##### Access to waters and resources :

- Participants raised issues related to the legal situation with regards to access to the 6/12 miles/North Sea/Shetland Box after 2002: The sector is worried that newcomers will have access to the territorial waters and the North Sea and that relative stability might be changed.

##### Conservation and management :

- There was extensive discussions on discards and on the merits of the Norwegian system.
- The impact of the explosion of the seal population on fisheries was also raised.
- There were demands for:

- an increase of the nephrops quota in the west of Scotland,
  - reconsideration of the current MAGP criteria (request for a mechanism allowing access to structural funding in favour of certain segments of the fleet having met their individual targets, even when overall national targets are not met)
- Support was aired for zonal or regional fisheries management.

Other issues :

- On aquaculture, participants referred back to their written replies.
- There was a call for simplification of the structural programmes.
- Issues related to the operation of the agreement with Norway were also raised.
- The audience felt reassured with the Commission's explanations on the legal situation on access to waters and resources after 2002.

II. Glasgow -9 October 1998(West Scotland)

The main issues raised in Glasgow were the following:

Access to waters and resources :

- Access to the 6/12 miles zone: extension of the zone was called for. Moreover participants asked for the creation of a permanent regime and for the review of historical rights in the 6/12 miles zone.
- The future of relative stability after 2002 was also discussed.

Conservation and management :

- There were requests for greater flexibility in management (real time/short term closures), and great support for regionalisation of the CFP.
- There were requests for access to structural funds when MAGP targets are not met (proposal for a split-up of MAGPs into regional units, so that segments of the national fleet do not "hold in ransom" other segments which have met their targets) .
- Representatives from some environmental groups asked for the incorporation of the OSPAR Convention and the Habitats Directive into the CFP and for exploring the possibilities for the CFP offered by the Commission's Coastal Zone Management Demonstration Programme.

Other issues :

- Participants criticised the inconsistencies in the application of finer throughout the EC.
- There were requests for access to structural funding for the installation of VMS and for the modernisation of the inshore fleet.

- Finally, the fishermen's capacity to contribute to research was underlined.

### III. London -13 October 1998 (England and Wales)

Many participants criticised the CFP and the Commission for lack of transparency. Some also claimed that contrary to what the Commission alleges, all the CFP "goes down" in 2002, including relative stability.

There were also questions about the weight the Commission attaches to the various ideas put forward by the sector.

The issues raised in London included:

#### Access to waters and resources :

- The access to the 6/12 miles : request to give a solution to the fishermen's anxieties now, not in 2002, by either extending the 12 mile limit or by transforming the current derogation to a permanent regime.
- The future of the Shetland Box: It has no biological justification and it should be abolished.
- The access to the North Sea and the discard problem that would result from free access to the zone. Participants were against further access to the North Sea of newcomers.

#### Conservation and management :

- Participants criticised the TACs and quotas system (e.g. minimum sizes too small)
- Strong support was expressed for the current restrictions on access to waters and for the regionalisation/decentralisation of the CFP.
- There were demands for changes in the current philosophy/methodology of MAGPs (request for review of the terms, basis and figures of current MAGPs) and a proposal for incentive payments to reward fishermen using gear which goes beyond the legal requirements.

#### Other issues :

- The lack of level-playing field in enforcement throughout the EC and the need for further harmonisation to be promoted by the Commission, were underlined.
- The negative consequences of the EC agreements for the local populations was stressed. Some participants were also worried that the non-renewal of the EC-Morocco agreement might result in the deployment of more Spanish vessels in Community waters.
- The over-regulation of the market sector and the discrepancies in the application and enforcement of health standards throughout the Community was also put forward as a criticism to the CFP.

#### IV. Belfast-16 October 1998 (Northern Ireland)

The meeting in Belfast was focused on specific local/regional problems of the Northern Irish fishing sector and on the issue of regional/local decentralised management.

Doubts were expressed about the weight the Commission would give to the consultations and the opinions of fishermen.

The main points of view raised were the following:

##### Access to waters and resources :

- The Hague Preferences had disastrous consequences for the local industry and need to be scrapped. Participants strongly criticised the lack of transparency regarding the adoption and interpretations of the Hague Preferences.
- Demands included the continuation of restrictions on access to waters, the ending of the "temporary measures" in the Douglas Box, permission to catch haddock in the Irish Sea because it is in good shape, the scrapping of the Shetland Box etc.

##### Conservation and management :

- There is a feeling that the Community decision-making process is too remote for fishermen. Regionalisation in management was supported.
- The CFP lacks the flexibility to respond rapidly to specific situations at a local/regional level because of the centralisation of the management process. When a fishery is in good shape fishermen should be allowed to fish (e.g. herring and haddock in the Douglas Box and the Irish Sea ).
- The scientific advice going to the Commission is often "flawed" because the opinions of the fishermen are not being taken into account..
- There is a lack of level-playing field in enforcement throughout the EC.
- The MAGPs suffer from many setbacks (unrealistic targets, technological creep phenomenon not taken into account, lack of the age element in the equation, bureaucratic approach).
- Days at sea limitations are not practical and they should be scrapped.

## **ANNEX I**

### **GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS USED**

CFP:	Common Fisheries Policy
ITQs:	Individual Transferable Quotas
MAGPs:	Multi-Annual Guidance Programmes
FIFG:	Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance
NGOs:	Non-Governmental Organisations
GFCM:	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean
VMS:	Vessel Monitoring System
WTO:	World Trade Organisation
EEZ:	Exclusive Economic Zone
ICCAT:	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
POSEIMA:	Programme of options specific to the remote and insular nature of Madeira and of Azores

## ANNEX II

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### **Introduction**

Article 14(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 3760/92 of 20 December 1992 establishing a Community system for fisheries and aquaculture states that by 31 December 2001 at the latest the Commission shall present to Parliament and the Council a report on the fisheries situation in the Union and on implementation of that Regulation. On the basis of the report the Council is to decide before 31 December 2002 on any necessary adjustments, in particular as regards Article 7 (Shetland box), and to adopt any follow-up provisions required to Article 6 (access to 6/12 miles zones).

The Commission considers it important to start thinking now about adjustments to the common fisheries policy (CFP) to be made by the 2002 deadline. This operation will not however be restricted to the matters explicitly mentioned in Regulation 3760/92. The Commission wishes to make the exercise a wide-ranging reflection on improvement of all aspects of the CFP to enable it to cope with the challenges facing it.

The exercise will not affect the reforms already under way, some solely concerned with fisheries, notably for the market (Commission communication to the Council and Parliament on the future for the market in fisheries products in the European Union) and control (Commission communication to the Council and Parliament on fisheries monitoring under the CFP), and others with Community policies in a more general way (reform of the Structural Funds, Agenda 2000).

The intention is to engender an open and constructive debate with all parties with an interest in fisheries in the European Union at whatever stage or level. Involvement of all operators in the fishery sector is the key element of the exercise that the Commission wishes to pursue.

The attached questionnaire is the first stage in this reflection exercise on the CFP after 2002. It will allow you to express your opinions on the various aspects of the CFP but is not a referendum. The answers given will enable the Commission to identify the main wishes and concerns, on which the reflection process will have to focus, of operators in the sector and other parties consulted.

Following this initial analysis the parties consulted will be able to discuss the CFP after 2002 in greater depth at meetings to be organised by the Commission in all Member States from September 1998 onwards. These will be held before the Commission presents its proposals to the Council and Parliament.

There is no obligation to answer all the questions put. Please indicate in your replies the **name and country of origin of your organisation.**

Replies are to be sent **before 15 April 1998** to the following address:

European Commission  
Directorate-General for Fisheries (DG XIV-1)  
Rue de la Loi 200  
B-1049 Brussels

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### 1. General assessment of CFP

1.1. *Do you think that the aims of the CFP have generally speaking been attained?*

1.2. *What should be the priority aims of the CFP after 2002?*

### 2. Access to waters and internal resources

2.1. At the present time access within the 6/12 mile limits (territorial waters of coastal Member State) is normally reserved to fishermen of the coastal State. In the absence of a Council decision before 31 December 2002 this element of the CFP will disappear.

*Do you think it should be retained? If so, on what grounds? If not, on what grounds?*

2.2. The 1985 and 1994 Acts of Accession include transitional arrangements for access by the new countries to certain Community waters (North Sea). These arrangements end on 31 December 2002.

*What should be the arrangements for access to these waters after that date?*

2.3. In the "Shetland box" zone access is limited by licensing in order to protect certain species of particular importance in the region that because of the way they are exploited are biologically sensitive.

*Has the Shetland box fulfilled its purpose? Should it continue after 31 December 2002?*

2.4. TACs (total allowable catches) were conceived as a means of restricting the exploitation rates of fish stocks.

*Have they done so? What other means could be used?*

2.5. At present quotas are assigned by the Council to the Member States, which make allocations from them to fishermen or their associations. It has sometimes been suggested that quotas should be assigned directly to fishermen's organisations or to the fishermen themselves. They would then be able to trade them among themselves (ITQ (individual transferable quota) system).

*Would ITQs have advantages over the present way of doing things? What would be the main difficulties in setting up the system? If ITQs are introduced who should administer quota transfer and utilisation?*

2.6. Quota assignment to Member States has to respect the principle of relative stability, i.e. each Member State retains the same fixed percentage of the available amount. Member States can exchange their quotas on their own responsibility.

*Does this principle allow a fair distribution of fishery resources and guarantee the requirements of the sector? What are your arguments for or against it?*

2.7. *Should the quota assignment formulae be altered? In what way?*

### **3. Resource management and conservation**

- 3.1. To prevent frauds, the present technical rules require fishermen to discard fish that they are not authorised to catch and retain on board.

*Should the Community rules on discards be retained? What improvements or alternatives do you propose to limit discards?*

- 3.2. The precautionary approach implies that no fishing activity be allowed unless it can be proved that it does not damage the environment.

*Should this approach govern management of fishery resources? What are your reasons for or against?*

- 3.3. One way of limiting exploitation rates is to manage fishing effort as defined by two factors: fleet capacity in terms of tonnage and kW and activity in terms of days spent in zone. This method is used in western waters (west of 4°W) and in the Baltic Sea. The multiannual guidance programmes (MAGPs) are another way of adjusting fishing effort to available resources.

*Are the present methods making an effective contribution to limiting exploitation rates? What improvements or alternatives do you propose?*

- 3.4. The MAGPs set maximum fleet capacities and fishing efforts in order to lessen the problem of overcapacity.

*Is this approach suited to the aims behind it? What improvements would you propose?*

- 3.5. The environmental impact of human activities (agriculture, oil and mining industries, sea transport etc.) is often harmful to fishery resources. The fishing industry itself can also damage marine ecosystems (discards, catches by lost or abandoned gear, catches of untargeted species, destructive fishing practices).

*Does the present CFP take sufficient account of environmental considerations? If not, what improvements do you propose?*

### **4. International cooperation and fishery agreements**

- 4.1. Fishery agreements safeguard the traditional activities of the Community fleet. At present the Union has agreements with African, Indian Ocean, North Atlantic and Baltic countries and with Argentina.

*Does the present fishery agreement set-up appear to be satisfactory? What changes would you like to see made?*

- 4.2. Some fishery agreements, e.g. with Argentina and Greenland, provide for joint enterprises and joint ventures between Community operators and those of the partner country.

*Are these useful instruments which merit expanded use? What improvements could be made?*

4.3. *Do you favour extending cooperation under the agreements to embrace the entire fishery product chain (more partnership between enterprises in the Community and in other countries)?*

4.4. Regional organisations play an increasingly important role in international fishery relations. They are for example responsible for conservation and management of straddling stocks and highly migratory species such as tuna and swordfish. This is the case for NAFO and ICCAT. The Union participates in the work of most of these organisations as a member, representing the interests of all Member States.

*How do you judge the Union's participation in the work of these organisations? What changes would you propose in its role?*

4.5. *Is the international side of the Union's fisheries policy on the whole satisfactory? If not, why is this and how should matters be improved?*

4.6. The Union has adopted resource management measures for the Mediterranean and over the last few years has sought to promote international cooperation in resource conservation and management in the region.

*How do you assess application of the common fisheries policy in the Mediterranean so far? What improvements should be made?*

## **5. The market in fishery products**

5.1. The present common market organisation for fishery products (CMO) operates through four main instruments: marketing standards, producer organisations, price arrangements and intervention arrangements. The Commission has recently presented a communication on the future of the fishery product market in the Union.

*What is your assessment of the functioning and effectiveness of the CMO?*

5.2. *What should be the aims of a CMO in future and how should it operate?*

5.3. The Union is highly dependent on imports to supply its market in fishery products and the market in these is now globalised.

*Does the external commercial policy achieve a satisfactory balance between market supply needs and fair competition between Community operators and those of other countries?*

*If not, how should the commercial policy be adjusted given the international constraints imposed on it?*

5.4. *What other general comments do you have on the fishery product market in the Union?*

5.5. Consumers are entitled to fishery products that meet certain minimum health and quality standards. They are also entitled to be adequately informed on the quality and origin of these products.

*Are consumers given adequate information about fishery products? If not, what information must be provided (you may wish to distinguish between fresh and processed products)?*

## **6. Rationalisation and support measures**

- 6.1. At present the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) primarily grants investment aid to fisheries sector enterprises ranging from the fleet through aquaculture and processing to the distribution system.

*Are the fleet aids an effective way of reducing fishing effort?*

*What should be the priority areas for aid?*

- 6.2. The FIFG Regulation includes some accompanying measures (early retirement and cessation premiums).

*Is this type of measure in line with the needs of the sector? Should it be expanded?*

- 6.3. It is often said that in the multiple uses made of the coastal zone proper attention must be given to the interests of the fisheries sector.

*How can inshore fishing be integrated into coastal zone planning and development?*

*Should the Union be active in this area and if so how?*

- 6.4. The importance of small-scale fishing and fishing using simple methods for jobs, incomes and a reliable food supply is widely recognised.

*How could the Community aid this type of fishing?*

## **7. Horizontal matters**

- 7.1. Under the present system monitoring and control of fishing activities falls essentially to the Member States. It is often said that in this area practices vary between Member States.

*How could monitoring and control be made more effective?*

- 7.2. Management of fishery resources calls for decisions taken on the basis of scientific analysis. The role of fisheries research is thus very important and constantly evolves along with the requirements of the common fisheries policy.

*How can maximum effectiveness of research activities at national and Community level be ensured? What should be the Union's priorities in fishery research?*

- 7.3. *How could cooperation between scientists and fishermen be strengthened? How should dissemination of information and of the practical implications of research be improved?*

- 7.4. Gaps have been found in collection of the basic data needed to operate the common fisheries policy.

*How should the ways in which data is collected and transmitted to the relevant authorities be improved?*

- 7.5. Aquaculture is held to be a way of promoting diversification of incomes and of the food supply. Care is needed to ensure that it is carried out in a responsible way and that any harmful impact on the environment and local communities is reduced to a minimum.

*What could the Union do to promote responsible expansion of aquaculture?*

- 7.6. Transparency of the Community decision-taking process and input to this from the fisheries sector are two matters of great importance to the sector.

*How should transparency of decision-taking be improved and safeguarded? How can the sector be more closely involved in the process?*

- 7.7. *Are there any other aspects of the CFP not mentioned in this questionnaire that should be included in the debate on the CFP after 2002?*

## ANNEX III

### ANALYSIS OF THE REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE COMMON FISHERIES POLICY AFTER 2002

#### ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED AT THE EUROPEAN LEVEL

1. **IUCN:** World Conservation Union  
**ESUSG:** European Sustainable Use Specialist Group  
**Fisheries Working Group**
2. **EBCD:** European Bureau for Conservation and Development: identical replies to those of the “fisheries working group” of the IUCN/ESUSG.
3. **AIPCEE:** EU Fish Processors Association
4. **EUROCOOP:** European Community of Consumer Co-operatives
5. **CRPM:** Conference of the Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe
6. **GREENPEACE International**
7. **WWF** European policy office
8. **ICSF:** International Collective in Support of Fish-workers
9. **HIS:** Humane Society International - European office : Its contribution was limited to the driftnet issue.
10. **The Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society**

#### 1. General assessment of the common fisheries policy

##### *1.1 Have the aims of the CFP been attained?*

Most of the organisations which replied to the questionnaire are of the opinion that the CFP has not attained its aims. The difficulties involved in applying the regulations and the lack of monitoring are the complaints which appear in most of the replies.

The processors denounce the quantitative restrictions on imports and the customs duties on raw materials as being economic obstacles to trade.

Greenpeace condemns the inconsistency of the CFP, in particular the lack of political will to apply the precautionary principle. The ICSF regrets the lack of hierarchical structure to the aims of the CFP.

Only the CRPM is more varied in its assessment stating that most of the regions are of the opinion that the aims of the CFP have, generally speaking, been attained. Some regions bordering on the Atlantic believe that the weak points of the CFP are the lack of sufficient control and the lack of effectiveness of the socio-economic measures applied in favour of communities dependent on fisheries.

### *1.2 The priority aims of the CFP after 2002:*

- to ensure the sustainability and variety of the fish resources and of the maritime ecosystems in Community waters (WWF, AIP, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society)
- to obtain an adequate supply for the market and the fish industries at reasonable prices (AIP)
- to promote the trend favouring the regionalisation of the CFP (CRPM)
- to put in place a sustainable activity based on the precautionary principle (Greenpeace, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society)
- to increase the co-ordination of the various Community policies likely to have an impact on fishing, in particular those of the structural funds and research (CRPM)
- to emphasise the social aspects of the CFP (ICSF)

## **2. Access to waters and internal resources**

### *2.1 Access to the 6/12 mile limits*

All the organisations are in favour of the status quo.

According to the CRPM, all the regions are even of the opinion that, if possible, the measure should be extended and made permanent. Moreover, fisheries protection zones should be established with common management rules for coastal countries/regions.

The ISCF is also in favour of extending the measure in order to protect the local economies and asks for the local committees to have more power in the administration of the 6/12 mile limits.

Environmental NGOs underlined the benefits of the regime for the stocks spawning in coastal areas and for the local communities.

### *2.2 Access to the North Sea*

The following comments were made:

- maintaining the transitional arrangements for access by the countries acceding after 2002 should only be justified by reasons of resource management or serious socio-economic imperatives (IUCN/ESUSG).

- the principle of non-discrimination should be applied . This principle should, however, be modified for those new Member States which have no history of fishing in certain zones (CRPM).
- access to certain Community waters by new Member States should be decided by the local and regional fishery committees (ICSF).

### *2.3 The Shetland box*

The vast majority of the organisations are of the opinion that the Shetland Box should be maintained and the concept of box could even be extended to other regions (WWF, CRPM, ICSF).

The CRPM feels that the pressure on fishing is nevertheless too great and should be reduced by reducing the number of licenses granted or by the number of fishing days authorised. However one region opposes the Box.

The IUCN/ESUSG is asking for a scientific evaluation in order to determine whether the measure should be maintained, extended or suppressed.

### *2.4 The TAC system*

Most of the organisations doubt the effectiveness of the TACs as a means to reduce exploitation rates. The reservations they have about this are as follows:

- the division into national quotas (CRPM)
- the excessively wide gap between the scientific recommendations and the permitted quotas (CRPM)
- the species by species approach (CRPM)
- the lack and difficulties of monitoring (IUCN/ESUSG, WWF)
- the fact that the fishing fleet is not really adapted to the resource available (IUCN/ESUSG, WWF)
- the system encourages waste and discards (Greenpeace, ICSF)
- The uncertainty of scientific basis and the political compromises of the system (AIP).

WWF strongly recommends the designation of no-take zones in addition to existing technical measures and to the reduction of fleets.

According to Greenpeace the system must be complemented by effective conservation and control measures.

### *2.5 The system of individual transferable quotas (ITQ)*

Opinions are divided about but the majority are against the introduction of the ITQs because they encourage the concentration of access rights to fish stock in the hands of a small number of large enterprises (Greenpeace, ICSF).

In the opinion of the AIP, the adoption of the ITQs would lead to the fishermen having a more professional attitude. The IUCN/ESUSG suggests that ITQs are advisable for multi-species fisheries. The CRPM feels that the only "advantage" of the ITQs would be to make the producer organisations shoulder the responsibility instead of the authorities.

According to WWF the benefits would be purely theoretical because an ITQ system would be difficult to enforce.

### *2.6 The principle of relative stability*

Most of the organisations support the principle of relative stability. The CRPM feels that the principle of equal access would not enable the interests of the fishermen's communities to be safeguarded and would not take account of "historical rights". Changes in keys need to reflect the current patterns of stocks and fishing activities.

Greenpeace regrets that the political negotiations favoured the major fishing companies and they have not taken sufficient account of the interests of the fishermen's communities. The ICSF is asking for the local committees to be involved in quota management.

### *2.7 The quota allocation formulae*

The CRPM states that the vast majority of the regions believe that the quota allocation formulae should be revised basing them on the one hand on the "historical rights" and on the other hand to adapt them to the variability of the resource in time and space. It recommends a periodic review of the quotas and increasing the importance of the biological pre-requisites in allocating the quotas.

Greenpeace stresses that the allocation of the resources should be based on ecological and social and not only economic criteria.

## **3. Resource management and conservation**

### *3.1 Discards*

For certain organisations, the total ban on discards does not always appear to be the solution to adopt, particularly in view of the multi-species fisheries. Some organisations nevertheless encourage the use of improved technical measures and the introduction of zones where fishing is temporarily and/or permanently banned for certain species in order to limit discards.

Greenpeace stresses that the aim should be to reduce by-catches in order to eliminate discards. The WWF regrets the lack of data from the Member States on the level of discards and finds merits in the Norwegian system.

In the ICSF's opinion, everything fished should be returned to port as in Norway. The Whale and Dolphin Conservation society believes however that the Norwegian system encourages over-fishing for fishmeal. The problem of cetacean by-catch need also be addressed urgently.

### *3.2 The precautionary approach*

The application of the precautionary principle is not contested by the CRPM, which recommends establishing an objective approach based on the improvement of research on the inter-relationships between the resources and the environment, and between the fishing methods and the environment in the various zones.

For some organisations (AIP, ICSF), the precautionary approach should be applied in cases of scientific uncertainty.

Finally, the full and urgent application of the precautionary principle is demanded by Greenpeace, the WWF and the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society.

### *3.3 Management of the fishing effort*

For most of the organisations, the existing instruments do not really make an effective contribution to limiting exploitation rates. They have the following criticisms:

- the choice of uniform criteria does not allow flexible and sufficiently sensitive management of the exploitation rates. Regional MAGPs should be used, in particular for the peripheral regions (CRPM).
- the restrictions have been overtaken by the development of new improved vessels (Greenpeace, ICSF)

### *3.4 The multi-annual guidance programmes (MAGPs)*

All the organisations are of the opinion that the MAGPs system has not been very effective, particularly because of the inadequacy of the controls, inconsistencies between conservation and structural policies and the practise of “diverting” fishing capacities between Member States (CRPM, IUCN/ESUSG, ICSF, WWF).

According to Greenpeace, MAGPs do not take into account the technological creep phenomenon and encourage exporting of over-capacity to third countries. Subsidies need to be reduced.

The IUCN/ESUSG recommends that the basis and methods of calculation of fleet capacity used should be harmonised so that the reductions to be attained are comparable from one Member State to another.

### *3.5 The environmental aspects of the CFP*

Opinions vary. For some organisations, the objectives of the CFP do indeed take into account of the main environmental aspects, but the way this is done needs improvement (IUCN/ESUSG, AIP, CRPM, ICSF).

In the opinion of Greenpeace, the WWF and the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, the CFP, by its approach in terms of management of the fishing effort and TAC, does not take into account the effects of targeted fishing on other species, and the impact of the regulations on the environment in general.

Closer co-operation between environmental and fisheries authorities is needed.(WWF, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society).

## **4. International cooperation and fishery agreements**

### *4.1 The present fishery agreement set-up*

The present fishery agreements satisfy, under certain conditions, some organisations (AIP, CRPM) and Greenpeace are pleased to see numerous improvements introduced into the most

recent agreements (biological rest period, increased monitoring, etc.) However, there is a need for greater transparency and priority must be given to the needs of local populations.

The CRPM is asking for a number of improvements:

- when direct costs are involved in exchange for fishing rights, they should be borne not by the EU but by the Member States benefiting.
- the agreements should take more account of commercial and industrial policy considerations.
- more stringent checks should be carried out on imported goods, in particular as regards quality and the health aspects.

Other organisations feel that the current system of fishery agreements is far from being satisfactory. The ICSF is of the opinion that the fishery agreements are no longer aiming to safeguard the traditional activities of the Community fleet . The ICSF is seeking the introduction of a code of conduct in the execution of the international fishery agreements to be applied by distant water fleets. Similarly the WWF and the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society denounce the economic and ecological damage caused by the fishery agreements, in particular in the waters of the less developed countries.

#### *4.2 Joint enterprises and temporary joint ventures between Community operators and those of the partner countries*

Opinions vary widely. Some organisations consider this type of agreement to be effective and worthy of development (AIP, CRPM).

For others, this is not a good system (Greenpeace, WWF). These organisations regret the fact that owing to these agreements, Community vessels can disappear from the Community registers and no longer be subject to Community regulations, particularly as regards controls.

#### *4.3 Partnership between enterprises in the Community and other countries embracing the entire fishery product chain*

The IUCN/ESUSG and the CRPM are in favour of extending the co-operation to the entire fishery product chain.

On the other hand, other organisations are not in favour of this being extended (AIP, Greenpeace, WWF). The processors believe that this type of co-operation should be conducted between commercial partners, whereas Greenpeace and the WWF have the same objections as they have to the current system of fishery agreements.

#### *4.4 The regional fishery organisations*

In general, the organisations support the presence of the EU in the regional fishery organisations. They are of the opinion that the EU should win acceptance for the aspects connected with sustainable development, protecting the resources and observing the terms of the agreements. In the view of the CRPM, the EU should also intensify its mediation and information role in its dealings with the organisations representing the profession.

The WWF complains of the EU being inconsistent in its approach, giving precedence to the economic interests of some Member States at the expense of a unified position.

Finally, Greenpeace, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society and the WWF are asking the EU to ratify the United Nations Agreement on highly migratory fish stocks and straddling fish stocks.

#### *4.5 General assessment of the EU's international fisheries policy*

This policy would appear to be generally satisfactory to several organisations. The processors are satisfied with the Community's efforts to enable the Community fleet to have access to distant waters and ensuring compliance with the rules managing and conserving the resources.

The CRPM nevertheless believes that there is a need to strengthen common positions and to play less of a role as the spokesman for all the national interests.

#### *4.6 The common fisheries policy in the Mediterranean*

The IUCN/ESUSG believe that the CFP in the Mediterranean should be continued along the lines developed over the past few years stimulating greater voluntary co-operation. Similarly the CRPM is seeking improvement for 3 aspects: the introduction of territorialised management of the fishery activities, the strengthening of the scientific research capacities and a more structured and more readily recognised interregional organisation.

There is also a need to strengthen co-operation between all the coastal countries, to take more account of small-scale coastal fishing, to strengthen the role of the local professional bodies and to increase research capacities.

Greenpeace acknowledges that the European Commission is trying to improve the work of the GFCM. Nevertheless, the organisation feels that the technical measures decided as part of the CFP for the Mediterranean, are in certain cases contradictory and impossible to implement. There is a need to adopt a regional management regime based on the principles of recent international agreements. There is also an urgency to address issues such as lack of data, over-capacity and catch of small fish.

According to the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society the drifnet fishing remains an important problem in the area.

### **5. The market in fishery products**

#### *5.1 The Common Market Organisation (CMO)*

The following comments were made:

- the producer organisations have very different functions in each country/region (AIP)
- intervention arrangements should be limited as much as possible (AIP)
- the mechanisms are too complex and rigid (CRPM)
- the CMO for fisheries creates the same ill-effects as the CAP, i.e. over-fishing(WWF).

Eurocoop is proposing to start a classification of fishery products by calibre and quality, to set up offices responsible for applying and monitoring these classifications and to oblige fish trade professionals to apply principles of product traceability on packaging and wrapping.

## *5.2 The CMO in the future*

The IUCN/ESUSG supports the Commission's suggestions relating to the catch forecasting plan, to the system of withdrawal avoiding the destruction of products and to the transparency of the market, providing a guarantee of the origin of the products and the methods used to catch them.

The processors are asking for imports not to be further restricted by protectionist barriers.

The CRPM stresses three main objectives: to continue the current missions, integrate the producer organisations more into a system of regional resource management and develop the approaches and measures making it possible to improve the quality and traceability of the products.

## *5.3 External commercial policy*

Most of the organisations believe that the commercial policy does not achieve a satisfactory balance between market supply needs and fair competition between Community operators and those of other countries (CRPM, WWF, ICSF).

According to Greenpeace, the international trade rules should not weaken environmental and social standards.

The processors complain of the fact that the customs tariffs applied to imported raw materials, harm the competitiveness of the Community's processing industry. On the other hand, the ICSF says that the price of imported fish is too low.

## *5.4 Other comments on the fishery product market in the EU*

The WWF works with the *Marine Stewardship Council* of London to ensure that fish resources endure owing to the products being certified by independent bodies. The WWF recommends the EU to support the efforts of the MSC in establishing a credible labelling system for fishery products.

Greenpeace proposes the reduction of subsidies for promotional campaigns for fish consumption.

## *5.5 Consumer information*

Only the processors consider that the information currently provided to the consumer is adequate.

The other organisations (Eurocoop, Greenpeace, the WWF, the ICSF, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society) are of the opinion that improvements are needed and generally favour the eco-labelling.

The CRPM stresses two aspects: increase the amount of information given to the producers on the needs and requirements of the consumers as well as the information given to the consumers on the origin of the products and fishing methods, and rationalise the marketing systems.

The WWF would like consumers to be advised of the current state of the stocks of fish they are buying.

## **6. Rationalisation and support measures**

### *6.1 Aid*

The CRPM believes that the aid to the fleet is a generally effective instrument for reducing the fishing effort.

The following recommendations were made:

- emphasise the restructuring of the fleet rather than grant public aid for shipbuilding (IUCN-ESUSG)
- grant aid for measures where structural changes are really necessary (AIP)
- set up tripartite programming EU/States/regions. The priorities should be small -scale fishing, employment in fisheries dependent areas, etc (CRPM)

Greenpeace, the WWF and the ICSF regret that subsidies are used to build new more modern vessels which further increase the fishing effort.

### *6.2 Accompanying measures*

In the view of the CRPM and ICSF, the accompanying measures are positive in principle and have to be developed. Nevertheless, the CRPM makes a general remark on the under-use of the possibilities, particularly in Spain and in the Baltic sea, due mainly to the lack of flexibility of the instrument in the different regional situations.

The WWF is asking for the accompanying measures to be totally re-evaluated.

### *6.3 Coastal zone planning and development*

Several organisations (IUCN/ESUSG, CRPM) support the role of the EU as a co-ordinator to achieve an integrated approach in the improvement, planning and use of the coastal zone. The CRPM favours the implementation of such an approach at regional and local level as well as stronger structuring of the organisations representing the fishing and aquaculture profession.

### *6.4 Small-scale fishing*

The processors do not share the opinion that small-scale fishing has any importance for the security of food supplies.

Greenpeace and the WWF suggest that structural measures should be allocated to this type of fishing, by reserving certain fish stocks for it, for example. Similarly, regions within the CRPM say that there is a need to reconsider priorities, i.e. less of a desire to produce and more of a desire to preserve jobs and incomes.

## **7. Horizontal matters**

### *7.1 Control and enforcement*

All the organisations agree that enforcement is certainly one of the weak points of the CFP. In general they find that the differences between the Member States are far too great.

The following proposals have been put forward:

- make the controls and sanctions uniform in all the Member States (AIP, Greenpeace)
- stress the fishermen's involvement in the controls giving them a degree of responsibility (IUCN-ESUSG)
- renationalise fishery management (CRPM)
- develop a sufficiently dissuasive set of repressive measures (CRPM)
- develop the satellite monitoring system (the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society)
- record discards (Greenpeace)
- cancel or refuse aid to Member States for non-compliance with their control obligations (Greenpeace)
- increase the powers of the EC inspectorate.

### *7.2 Fisheries research*

In general, the organisations are very critical of the quality of the research activities at Community level. The CRPM in particular lists the criticisms made by the regions: insufficient knowledge of the state of the fish stocks as well as of the inter-relations between the species on the one hand and between the resources and ecosystems on the other hand and inadequate means by which to monitor vessel movements.

A number of organisations have made the following suggestions:

- increase scientific knowledge, in particular on the impact of fishing on the maritime environment and on how selective the fishing equipment is to avoid by-catches, etc. (IUCN/ESUSG, WWF)
- send the results to the professional bodies (CRPM)
- improve the collection of scientific data by including black fishing and discard data on a confidential basis (AIP)
- focus research on gear selectivity, impact of fishing on non-targeted species etc (Greenpeace, IUCN).
- encourage scientists to make contact with the local stakeholders (ICSF)

### *7.3 Cooperation between scientists and fishermen*

Here are a few suggestions:

- organise meetings between the various categories of actors at all levels to increase active exchanges (CRPM)
- recognise the crucial role of scientists in fishery management and introduce open regional consultation fora (WWF)

- promote cooperation in areas where experience of fishery professionals can help scientists and provide for financial support for research in regions experiencing difficult socio-economic conditions (IUCN/ESUSG)

#### *7.4 Data collection*

The CRPM recommends a regionalised approach for the CFP in the area of data management, while the IUCN/ESUSG suggests that an organisation could be created with responsibility for data management, under the aegis of the Commission. In addition to this, the ICSF is asking for greater transparency in data collection in order to encourage participation by the fishermen.

#### *7.5 The development of aquaculture*

Some organisations are asking for the precautionary principle to be actually implemented in practising aquaculture.

The IUCN/ESUSG view is that aquaculture in the Community now has to continue its development under normal economic conditions, without using structural aids. The Community has to encourage action aiming to improve genetic research, food and resistance to diseases as well as the various drug treatments used in this sector, and adopt measures for the protection of the environment.

Finally, Greenpeace stresses that aquaculture should not replace fishing. The organisation would not like to see what has happened to the salmon happen to other species. Moreover it proposes along with WWF, among other things, research to be conducted on the impact of aquaculture on the eco-systems.

#### *7.6 The decision-taking process*

In the view of the IUCN/ESUSG, the current system of consultation and involvement of the sector in the decision-making process is certainly inadequate, whereas the processors say they are satisfied with the same system. The latter do, however, ask that the proposals for Community regulations should be discussed earlier in the process.

Some organisations stress the need to create a climate of confidence between the various parties involved, through greater association/involvement of all the actors in the decision-making process itself, i.e. the representatives of the industry, the scientists, the NGOs, etc. (CRPM, WWF, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society).

A co-management system is proposed by WWF.

Finally, the ICSF suggests increasing dissemination of the information through the media.

#### *7.7 Other aspects of the CFP*

Here are the subjects which a number of the organisations would liked to have seen discussed:

- the decentralisation and regionalised management of the CFP (CRPM, ICSF)
- the budget and the various administrative burdens and checks on imports (AIP)
- by-catches (WWF)

## ANNEX IV

**Table of dates and venues of the regional meetings on the CFP after 2002**

Date	Place/Lieu
<b>1998</b>	
22 September	Cork (Ireland)
24 September	Dublin (Ireland)
28 September	Donegal (Ireland)
07 October	Aberdeen (United Kingdom)
09 October	Glasgow (United Kingdom)
13 October	London (United Kingdom)
16 October	Belfast (United Kingdom)
27 October	København (Denmark)
29 October	Viborg (Denmark)
02 December	Hamburg (Germany)
<b>1999</b>	
12 January	Oostende (Belgium)
19 January	Vigo (Spain)
21 January	Barcelona (Spain)
25 January	Las Palmas (Spain)
27 January	Cadiz (Spain)
29 January	Madrid (Spain)
09 February	Lisboa (Portugal)
23 February	Ponta Delgada (Açores) (Portugal)
25 February	Funchal (Madeira) (Portugal)
04 March	San Sebastian (Spain)
11 March	Athens (Greece)
18 March	Waidhofen (Austria)
19 March	Wien (Austria)
20 April	Noordwijk (Netherlands)
04 May	Göteborg (Sweden)
07 May	Helsinki (Finland)
19 May	Paris (France)
01 June	Civitavecchia (Italy)
03 June	Ancona (Italy)
07 June	Palermo (Italy)