



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 6 April 2017
(OR. en)

Interinstitutional File:
2016/0238 (COD)

8004/17
ADD 1

PECHE 139
CODEC 556

'A' ITEM NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Council
No. Cion doc.:	11636/16 PECHE 293 CODEC 1142 IA 62 + ADD 1 - 3 - COM(2016) 493 final
Subject:	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on establishing a multi-annual plan for demersal stocks in the North Sea and the fisheries exploiting those stocks and repealing Council Regulation (EC) 676/2007 and Council Regulation (EC) 1342/2008 - <i>Statement</i>

Statement by the Danish delegation

Denmark takes note of the Presidency compromise proposal for a multi-annual plan for the demersal stocks in the North Sea. Denmark has very considerable interests in these fisheries. The Presidency compromise proposal has taken a big step forward in focussing on the relevant species. However, some issues of the utmost importance remain unsolved.

It is crucial to allow for the necessary flexibility in the regulation in setting TAC's:

- It should be possible to take into account an increase in a stock and the fishery of this stock for data limited stocks. This is to allow for the continued flexibility agreed by the European Parliament and the Council in the current long-term plan for cod stocks in the North Sea, Skagerrak and Kattegat among others in regulation (EU) 1342/2008, which has been used for the specific circumstances in the case of cod in Kattegat. Denmark has proposed a provision in line with the current long-term plan for cod stocks to be included in the new North Sea multi-annual plan.
- Socio-economic concerns should be clearly mentioned in the future plan. This could be done by referring to the provisions in the Basic Regulation on the Common Fisheries Policy (EU) 1380/2013, Article 2, paragraph 5, litra c and f.

Thus, on both these flexibility issues, Denmark has proposed to include already existing and agreed texts.

Since these issues have not been solved, Denmark for these reasons votes against the Presidency compromise, as set out in document 7339/17 to be adopted by the Council as a General Approach.