
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1978 - 1979

30 November 1978

DOCUMENT 442/78

Report

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture

on the equipment manufactured in the Community which can be used for the inspection of fishing activities in Community waters and the surveillance of other activities affecting the common system for the conservation and management of fishing resources

Rapporteur: Mr H.-J. KLINKER

1.2.1

At its sitting of 15 June 1978 the European Parliament adopted an amendment (PE 52.999) to the report by the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 39/78) on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 460/77) for a decision on financial participation by the Community in respect of the inspection and surveillance operations in the maritime waters of Denmark and Ireland.

Subparagraph (b) of this amendment instructs the Committee on Agriculture to study the equipment manufactured in the Community which can be used for the inspection of fishing activities in Community waters and the surveillance of other activities affecting the common system for the conservation and management of fishing resources.

At its meeting of 18 July 1978 the Committee on Agriculture appointed Mr Klinker rapporteur.

It considered this report at its meetings of 19-20 September and 19-20 October 1978 and, at the latter meeting, adopted the motion for a resolution and explanatory statement by 7 votes to 1 with 4 abstentions.

Present: Mr Caillavet, chairman; Mr Liogier and Mr Hughes, vice-chairmen; Mr Klinker, rapporteur; Mr Albertini, Mr Brégégère, Mr Brugger, Mr Cunningham, Mr Durand, Mr Früh, Mr L'Estrange and Mr Vernaschi (deputizing for Mr Tolman).

C O N T E N T S

Page

A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION.....	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	8
 Annex: Types of aircraft and helicopters manufactured in the Community which can be used to patrol Community waters.....	 17

The Committee on Agriculture hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution, together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the equipment manufactured in the Community which can be used for the inspection of fishing activities in Community waters and the surveillance of other activities affecting the common system for the conservation and management of fishing resources

The European Parliament,

- having regard to its resolution of 14 October 1976 on the extension of the Community Member States' fishing zones to 200 miles on 1 June 1977; fishing agreements with non-Community nations; and a revised common fishing policy¹,
- having regard to its resolution of 16 February 1978 on some aspects of the final version of the common fisheries policy², and in particular paragraph 5(d) thereof,
- having regard to its resolution of 14 April 1978 on the Amoco-Cadiz disaster³, and in particular paragraphs 1 and 2 thereof,
- having regard to its opinion of 15 June 1978 on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 460/77) for a decision on financial participation by the Community in respect of the inspection and surveillance operations in the maritime waters of Denmark and Ireland⁴, and in particular paragraph 10(b) thereof based on an amendment to the motion for a resolution contained in the report of the Committee on Agriculture⁵, and paragraph 11(c) thereof,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 442/78),
- whereas all coastal Member States must procure special equipment in order to monitor the application of the common system for the conservation and management of fishing resources,

¹ OJ No.C259, 4.11.1976, p. 26. Cf Doc. 354/76 (motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Prescott on behalf of the Socialist Group)

² OJ No.C 63, 13.3.1978 - Klinker report (Doc. 466/77)

³ OJ No. C 108, 8.5.1978, p.59 - Kofoed report (Doc. 37/78/rev.)

⁴ OJ No. C 163, 10.7.1978, p. 43

⁵ Doc. 39/78 - Corrie report

- whereas the purchase price of such special equipment (aircraft, helicopters, ships) could be reduced if this equipment were standardized,
 - whereas, in view of the life of such equipment, if Member States purchase it independently, there will be no further opportunity for standardization before 1990-1995,
1. Invites the Member States, where they do not already have such equipment at their disposal, to decide without further delay on the joint procurement of the aircraft, helicopters and ships required for carrying out inspection and surveillance of Community waters;
 2. For this purpose, recommends the establishment of a committee of experts from the inspection services of the coastal Member States which will be responsible, with the participation of the Commission, for determining the specifically Community missions and, in consequence, requirements; on the basis of these facts, advises that a competition should be organized with the following aims:
 - (a) during the first stage, to select on the basis of purely technical criteria the most appropriate equipment for carrying out the specific missions of the European Community, and
 - (b) during the second stage, to determine the type of aircraft, helicopter or ship which involves the lowest operating cost, bearing in mind the purchase price of this equipment;
 3. Asks to be kept informed of each stage of this competition so that it can supervise both the technical and financial aspects of this selection procedure;
 4. Also considers that this committee of experts should determine, with the participation of the Commission, which formula offers the best cost-efficiency ratio for maritime surveillance operations - aircraft, helicopters or ships only or the most appropriate combination of these three types of equipment;
 5. Considers that the Member States should further coordinate their inspection and surveillance activities in Community waters by setting up a coordinating centre for their inspection and surveillance bodies, made up of experts from the coastal Member States inspection services and of Commission representatives;

6. Considers that once established such a coordinating centre could become an embryonic Community coastguard service; therefore considers that the Member States must as a Community adopt this minimum measure which does not involve any transfer of sovereignty and which would allow for more efficient inspection and surveillance of Community waters;
7. Draws attention to the proliferation of surveillance equipment in the Community; invites the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to examine the industrial aspects of this multiplicity of equipment in the context of concerted action by the European aeronautical industries and of the reorganization of the Community's shipyards;
8. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission of the European Communities and to the European Council.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTINTRODUCTION

1. Following the debate on Mr Corrie's report (Doc. 39/78) on a proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision on financial participation by the Community in respect of the inspection and surveillance operations in the maritime waters of Denmark and Ireland, Parliament adopted amendment No. 1¹ tabled by Mr Hughes (cf paragraph 10 of the resolution²). The author of this amendment was of the opinion that the Committee on Agriculture should 'give particular consideration to:

- (a) inspection procedures, whether by means of:
 - (i) a generalized system of fishing licences in the short term;
 - (ii) the progressive establishment of a body to patrol the fishing zones on behalf of the Community;
- (b) the specialized facilities available within the Community which might be used for such inspection work.'

2. In the interests of convenience and clarity, this report will deal only with paragraph (b) of that amendment, in spite of its obvious links with the second subparagraph of paragraph (a). Your rapporteur believes that the opinion of the European Parliament will have more force if the two questions are kept distinct.

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE QUESTION

3. There is a striking amount of surveillance equipment in the Community (see annex). No less than 14 types of aircraft and 6 types of helicopter are suitable for surveillance missions, not to mention the various types of ships built in the Community which are difficult to determine exactly.

4. These models are not all in direct competition with each other, however, since their levels of performance differ. That is why if a user wants to select a model he must first define his requirements and then select the equipment most likely to satisfy them.

5. Some equipment is, however, directly competitive and if each Member State purchases its national equipment, this will often make such equipment bought on a small scale very expensive and it will become difficult to find outlets for it on the world market where the competition between manufacturers is very lively.

¹ PE 52.999

² OJ C 163, 10.7.1978, p. 44

6. The large variety of surveillance equipment available in the Community makes it plain that Europe is divided as regards both its aeronautics industry and its shipyards.

So it would be advisable for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to consider the industrial aspect which is emphasized in this report. The European Community will not be able to compete with the American aeronautics industry unless it rationalizes its programmes. The Airbus was certainly a big step forward, but much remains to be done if the European aeronautics industry, which has the necessary know-how, is to manage to compete on an equal footing with the American industry.

7. Standardization of surveillance equipment therefore seems advisable as of now for the reasons given in the preceding paragraph. If this does not prove possible in the next two years, in spite of the fact that all the coastal Member States have to buy the appropriate surveillance equipment under satisfactory economic conditions in order to patrol the waters off the coasts of the European Community, the European aeronautics industry will have missed a good opportunity, as will the Member States which will have to purchase this equipment at a considerably higher price than if they had purchased it as a pool.

8. If the Member States do not take this unique opportunity in the course of the next two years, no such opportunity will arise again - given the average life of such equipment - until 1990-1995. Common sense and a Community spirit both require the Member States to undertake the necessary studies without delay with a view to standardizing the surveillance equipment they will need for mid-1980.

III. METHOD OF STANDARDIZATION

(A) GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. In 1971 the US Coast Guard decided to replace its Grumman HU 16 E 'Albatross' aircraft, some of which were more than twenty years old. For this purpose, and after much time spent on attempts to evaluate the minimum technical specifications for suitable aircraft, the US Coast Guard decided in 1974, at the urging of the United States Congress, to organize a competition for the purchase of medium-range surveillance aircraft¹.

¹ For further details see:
the working document drawn up by the Subcommittee on Fisheries of the Committee on Agriculture on 'the replacement of the US Coast Guard's fleet of medium-range surveillance aircraft' (PE 53.036),
the working document drawn up by the Subcommittee on Fisheries of the Committee on Agriculture on 'the technical specifications adopted by the US Coast Guard for the replacement of its fleet of medium-range surveillance aircraft' (PE 53.141)

10. At the request of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, the General Accounting Office reviewed and adopted a two-phase procurement method:

- (a) in the first phase the US Coast Guard selected aircraft purely on technical criteria: the characteristics and performance of these aircraft were the only factors examined, these being checked against certain essential technical requirements.

This method made it possible to open the competition to as wide a range of manufacturers as possible and to ensure that each had an even chance of being awarded the contract.

- (b) during the second stage, the US Coast Guard, having established that the aircraft chosen conformed to its minimum requirements, made a final choice on the basis of the lowest offer, which included not only the purchase price of the aircraft, but also its operational costs calculated over 41 months.

On 5 January 1977, the US Secretary of Transportation, Mr Coleman, authorized the US Coast Guard to purchase 41 models of the aircraft which had come out best in the competition.

11. The case of the US Coast Guard is very instructive for the European Community.

- (a) Firstly, it is clear that the US Congress played an essential role in the organization of the competition. The competition was held on its initiative and supervised at its request by the General Accounting Office.

It should be pointed out that in its resolution of 16 February 1978¹, the European Parliament recommended that 'Member States standardize the equipment used for patrolling the Community fishing zone, in order to reduce procurement costs' and that for this purpose the Commission should 'invite submissions before 1 January 1979, for the joint procurement by the Member States of the most appropriate equipment manufactured in the Community for patrolling the Community fishing zone'. The European Parliament also asked to be involved in the decisions taken.

Even if this deadline cannot be kept, the political approach defined by the European Parliament remains valid, which is why it suggests a method for the Community to organize a competition (see p. 14).

¹ OJ C 63, 13.3.1978, p.28. Cf paragraph 5(d) of the EP resolution on some aspects of the final version of the common fisheries policy. Klinker report (Doc. 466/77)

- (b) It is interesting to observe the degree of detail in the US Coast Guard's definition of the technical specifications with which the medium-range surveillance aircraft must conform¹ and to examine its analysis of the percentage flight time on each of the various types of medium-range surveillance missions. This flight time was broken down as follows:

<u>Missions</u>	<u>Flight hours (%)</u>
Search and rescue	28.5
Marine environmental protection	30.3
Enforcement of laws and treaties	18.9
Marine science activities	10.6
Logistics support	5.4
Engineering support	3.8
Domestic icebreaking	1.7
Short-range aids to navigation	0.8

This example shows that the Community should analyse, in the light of Member States' experience, the flight time of each of the missions it might either carry out directly itself, or carry out via its Member States. These missions would involve inspection and surveillance of fishing activities in Community waters, preventing and combatting pollution, study of the marine environment and search and rescue at sea, as advised by the Committee on Agriculture in its previous reports².

Once it had completed this analysis, the Community, still acting in the light of Member States' experience, could define a set of minimum technical specifications with which manufacturers wishing to take part in the competition would have to conform.

12. This example indicates that the Community should take steps immediately, prior to organizing such a competition, to determine its requirements and examine what is the most appropriate equipment for satisfying these requirements most efficiently and economically.

(B) DETERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS AND EQUIPMENT

13. The first problem facing the Community is to determine its requirements. These can be evaluated in two stages:

- (a) As we said in paragraph 11(b), the Community must establish which maritime surveillance missions it can carry out on its own account

¹ Working document PE 53.141

² Doc. 466/77 (rapporteur Mr Klinker) and Doc. 39/78 (rapporteur Mr Corrie)

and which should be carried out by the Member States, and evaluate the flight time of each mission in the light of the experience of Member States' coastguard services. This information will enable it to choose the appropriate equipment for these missions.

(b) After this first stage, the Community must determine the criteria for selecting the appropriate equipment. Briefly, the following criteria would apply:

1. aircraft have the advantage of speed and can patrol a large expanse of sea in a short time; they can rapidly give aid to shipwrecked persons by dropping rubber dinghies; on the other hand, they cannot 'fish out' shipwrecked persons nor can they stop and board a vessel;
2. helicopters have the advantage of a certain speed, but their range is limited; helicopters are more expensive to operate than aircraft; on the otherhand, they can easily rescue a shipwrecked person provided he is not outside their range; they can be used for boarding and inspecting vessels; like aircraft, they can patrol a fairly wide expanse of sea quite rapidly;
3. patrol ships have great autonomy and can therefore patrol a large expanse of sea, but they can only do so rather slowly; the operating cost of ships is higher than that of aircraft; on the other hand, ships can rescue shipwrecked persons within a maximum range of 200 miles (or further) and can board and inspect a fishing vessel infringing Community rules and conduct it to a port;
4. a combination of patrol ship/carrier helicopter, although expensive because of the necessary dimensions of the ship, would combine the advantages of inspection by ship and inspection by helicopter since the helicopter's range would be increased by the fact that its base, in this case the ship, was situated far from the coast; this system would involve distinctly higher operating costs than the use of aircraft only;
5. the sea-plane, proposed by one manufacturer, combines the advantages of the aircraft and the helicopter; on the other hand, it would be difficult for a sea-plane, after stopping and inspecting a fishing vessel that was infringing the rules, to conduct it to the nearest port;
6. a combination of the above methods, although rather expensive, offers maximum efficiency since it would make it possible to carry out all the missions and functions of maritime surveillance.

14. Once the Community has evaluated the profile of its missions and decided on the best combination of equipment for carrying them out, it will have to define the minimum specifications with which this equipment must conform:

- (a) in the case of aircraft, it will have to determine whether a sea-plane or a land-based plane is needed and, if the latter, to choose between a propellor or a jet aircraft, and determine the necessary weight, volume and minimum performance of such an aircraft;
- (b) in the case of helicopters, it must decide between a light, medium-weight and heavy helicopter, since the weight determines performance and the feasibility of landing on a reasonable-size ship;
- (c) in the case of ships, it must define the size (whether a helicopter can land on it), speed, manning, etc.

15. Clearly it is very difficult to determine the requirements and equipment needed for the Community to carry out maritime surveillance missions.

That is why the European Parliament recommends that the coastal Member States should set up a committee of experts made up of representatives of their respective inspection and/or coastguard services and responsible for helping the Commission to define the tasks described in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the explanatory statement.

16. Once these tasks have been carried out, a competition could be organized in order to select the aircraft, helicopter or ship (or any combination of these three types of equipment) which would become the Community's standard equipment.

C. METHOD OF ORGANIZING A COMPETITION

17. If a competition is organized it should comprise two stages:

- (a) during the first stage all the Community manufacturers offering equipment which conforms to the required minimum technical specifications would be invited to compete.

The committee on experts referred to above would then have to check whether the equipment offered actually satisfied the conditions of the competition. Operational tests could then be organized;

- (b) the second stage should lead to the selection of a single type of aircraft, a single type of helicopter and a single type of ship on the basis of the lowest operational cost. The US Coast Guard, when calculating the operational costs of the aircraft admitted to the competition over a period of 41 months, also took into account the

fuel requirements for performing these missions and the cost of spare parts, which is an important component of the operational cost. So the Community should determine the duration of the period over which it will calculate the operational cost of the chosen equipment.

18. Naturally the European Parliament cannot leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Commission assisted by a committee of experts. If such a competition is organized, the Commission must inform the Parliament at regular intervals of the progress of each stage of the competition from the moment of determining the Community's requirements to the conclusion of the competition. The Committee on Agriculture should have an important part to play here, as regards the technical aspects, and the Committee on Budgets as regards the financial aspects.

IV. USE OF THE STANDARD EQUIPMENT

19. Once the standard equipment has been chosen, there are three possible ways in which it could be used:

- (a) The Community can simply recommend to the Member States that they should use this equipment. Here the risk is that the money and time spent on preparing and holding the competition will be entirely wasted for if there is no minimum financial constraint or encouragement Member States with a national production are most likely to choose national equipment;
- (b) In its proposal (Doc. 460/77) for a decision on financial participation by the Community in respect of the inspection and surveillance operations in the maritime waters of Denmark and Ireland, the Commission advises the Community to help these two Member States to acquire surveillance facilities. In paragraph 3 of its resolution on the subject¹, the European Parliament rejects any proposal to restrict the financial participation of the Community to two Member States. Provision could therefore be made for Community aid - which might have to be adapted to each Member State's requirements and wealth - to be given to any Member State which procures standard equipment, although limiting the amount to the number of aircraft, helicopters or ships needed to carry out the inspection and surveillance missions referred to above in Community waters.

For instance, it seems that the surveillance of Community waters would require 20 aircraft if this surveillance was carried out on a purely Community basis, while national patrols would require 25 aircraft (i.e., under-utilization of 5 aircraft), which means that Community

¹ OJ C 163, 10.7.1978, p. 43 - Doc. 39/78: rapporteur Mr Corrie

financing would have to cover 20 and not 25 aircraft.

So while urging the Member States to procure standardized equipment, one could also require them to place their inspection operations on a Community basis, so that a Member State will patrol not only the area of Community waters for which it is responsible but also the area which comes under another Member State to ensure that the surveillance equipment is used as profitably as possible.

It should be pointed out that this would to some extent alleviate the burden on the Member States' national budgets.

- (c) Lastly, the Community itself could procure these aircraft, helicopters or ships and make them available to a Community coastguard service under the Commission. The European Parliament has proposed this solution on several occasions in its resolutions of 16 February 1978¹, 14 April 1978² and 15 June 1978³.

The establishment of a Community coastguard service would not only have financial advantages for Member States' budgets but would also be of great political significance for the Community which could then carry out inspection and surveillance operations under its own flag and thus assert its identity vis à vis third countries.

The decision to establish this service could be taken, on a proposal from the Commission, by the European Council acting as Council of the Community in order to underline its importance.

V. CONCLUSIONS

20. For the political and economic reasons referred to in this report, the Community must standardize the equipment it will need to patrol Community waters.

If the Community organizes a competition in order to achieve this standardization, as requested by the European Parliament, the latter must be associated in the procedures of this competition so that it can exercise its supervisory power.

Lastly, the European Parliament hopes that in the long run the Community will take the decisive step of establishing a Community coastguard service and, pending this event, recommends that the Member States should coordinate as closely as possible the operational activities of the standardized equipment which, for reasons of common sense alone, they must procure jointly.

¹ OJ C 63, 13.3.1978, p. 28 - Doc. 466/77: rapporteur Mr Klinker

² OJ C 108, 8.5.1978, p. 59 - Doc. 37/78/rev.: resolution tabled by Mr Kofoed on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture

³ OJ C 163, 10.7.1978, p. 43 - Doc. 39/78: rapporteur Mr Corrie

TYPES OF AIRCRAFT AND HELICOPTERS MANUFACTURED
IN THE COMMUNITY WHICH CAN BE USED TO PATROL
COMMUNITY WATERS

Aircraft

AERITALIA	G-222
AEROSPATIALE	NORD 262 A II
BRITISH AEROSPACE	HS 748 'Coastguarder'
BRITTEN-NORMAN	'Maritime Defender'
DASSAULT-BREGUET	Falcon 20 G 'Guardian'
DORNIER	DO 28 D 2 'Sky servant'
DORNIER	DO P 501 'Commutility'
DORNIER	DO 24 A 'STOL Amphibium'
FOKKER-VW	F 27 'Maritime'
PARTENAVIA	P 78 R
PARTENAVIA/	
SPORTAVIA-PUTZER	P 68 B 'Observer'
PIAGGIO	P 166 - DL 3
SHORTS	'Skyvan'
SHORTS	SD 3-MR 'Seeker'

Helicopters

AEROSPATIALE	SA 365 C 'Dauphin 2'
AEROSPATIALE	SA 330 J 'Puma'
AGUSTA	Naval A 109
AGUSTA	Naval AB 212 ASW/ASV
MESSerschmitt-	
BÖLKOW-BLOHM	BO 105 CB
WESTLAND	'Naval Lynx'

