



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 31 October 2023
(OR. en, it, pt)

Interinstitutional File:
2018/0193(COD)

14669/23
ADD 1

CODEC 1973
PECHE 474

'I/A' ITEM NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Permanent Representatives Committee/Council
Subject:	Draft REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009, and amending Council Regulations (EC) No 1967/2006 and (EC) No 1005/2008 and Regulations (EU) 2016/1139, (EU) 2017/2403 and (EU) 2019/473 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards fisheries control (first reading) - Adoption of the legislative act = Statements

Statement by Austria

Austria considers the amended control regulation as an important instrument for the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy. Strict traceability requirements are an essential tool in the fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated fisheries. Therefore, Austria regrets that traceability requirements for processed products will only be implemented after a long transition period via a delegated act.

Statement by Denmark

Denmark supports the objective of an effective control that contributes to sustainable fishing and aquaculture activities that create economic, social and employment benefits.

At the same time, Denmark stresses that the use of modern technology in fisheries control should support sustainable management and ensure better regulation, including more flexibility for fishers, for example in their choice and development of gears.

Denmark stresses the necessity of only adopting rules with which fishers may reasonably be capable of complying. Denmark regrets that this objective was not achieved with respect to the rules on margin of tolerance (MOT) for estimates to be recorded in the logbook of catches of small pelagic species and industrial species kept on board fresh and unsorted in bulk. In our opinion, it is the efficient weighing procedures upon landing that ensure a solid quota management, not the estimates in the logbook. Parts of the Danish pelagic fleet has initiated a project with CCTV and fishers' participating in this project and other initiatives such as the CCTV project in Kattegat to promote the use of modern technology. Denmark finds that they should be able to benefit from more flexibility in the MOT, and regrets that this is not part of the final compromise text.

Furthermore, Denmark finds it unfortunate that our input into the process revising the EU fisheries control system has not been taken sufficiently into account.

Statement by Estonia

Estonia finds that the overall aim to collect fishing data electronically is the right direction and improves operational control. Nevertheless, Estonia remains hesitant about some of the aspects of the agreement, questioning specifically on the proportionality of some of the measures.

We find that several provisions that affect control on small-scale fleet will have a disproportionately high resource demand compared to the effect that fleet have on the fish stocks. Estonia firmly believes that even though there are advances in e-governance, technology and AI, administrations will still work with limited resources. Thus, prioritising is clearly necessary in order to be able to tackle the most pressing issues and with that, to safeguard the health of fish stocks. One of such provisions that we find disproportionate is the obligation to start tracking all the vessels, regardless of their size. Our internal experience so far shows that implementing such a measure is not without problems. Solving them is of course possible, but requires resources that could be put to better use in tightening control on segments that have a bigger impact on fish stocks.

In addition to the burden to the administration, some of the new provisions will be difficult for the fishers to implement in their daily practice. We are very worried about the new obligation for the small-scale fleet to submit logbook data before landing. Taken together with the rules on margins of tolerance, it will likely prove highly problematic for the fishers of small vessels (e.g. less than 8 m) to remove the catch from gear, sort it by species and assess the amounts accurately enough, all while still in a small boat.

Statement by Finland

Finland considers that effective and cost-effective fisheries control is a necessary and important part of the Common Fisheries Policy, which aims to ensure the sustainability of fish stocks. However, the costs of control must be proportional to the verifiable benefits of control, and the costs must be considered from the perspective of the different types of fishing and groups of fishermen so that control requirements do not become unreasonable for fishermen and the authorities.

Finland welcomes the positive changes made to the Commission's original proposal during the negotiations. However, the result achieved does not correspond to Finland's negotiating objectives and Finland cannot support it. In particular, monitoring obligations for small vessels are unreasonable and unnecessary.

Finland is concerned about the obligations related to the permitted margin of tolerance between the estimated and weighed amounts of catches. It is good that, in the case of unsorted pelagic fisheries, the 10% tolerance can be calculated on a species-by-species basis in proportion to the total catch. However, the use of this derogation should not be jeopardised by excessive control obligations limiting landings to a limited number of ports.

In addition, Finland considers that the control of recreational fishing and the sanctions for infringements go too far. It is particularly difficult to accept that the sale of catch from recreational fishing is considered a serious infringement at a very low threshold.

The outcome of the negotiations does not take sufficient account of the fact that fishing and associated conditions are very different in different sea areas, both commercial and recreational. Finland is very disappointed that an article on regionalisation is not included in the regulation as it is an accepted basic principle of the CFP.

Statement by Italy

La modifica delle norme europee sul sistema dei controlli sulla pesca è nata dalla necessità di semplificazione richiamata nelle conclusioni di un'indagine della Corte dei Conti europea sul Regolamento CE 1224/2009 (c.d. Regolamento Controlli). Secondo l'indagine il Regolamento Controlli era difficile da capire da parte degli operatori e difficile da attuare da parte delle Autorità nazionali di controllo. Nel 2018, la Commissione europea ha presentato la propria proposta di modifica (Documento COM(2018) 368 final) che è sembrata andare nella direzione esattamente contraria.

Sin dalla sua pubblicazione l'Italia ha attivamente partecipato al negoziato facendosi portavoce di numerose proposte di modifica per migliorare il testo e renderlo più comprensibile ed attuabile.

Alcune proposte sono state accolte tuttavia la maggior parte sono state scartate.

Tra queste in particolare, l'Italia aveva chiesto di prevedere possibili misure alternative all'installazione delle telecamere a bordo dei pescherecci per il controllo dell'obbligo di sbarco, quale ad esempio l'impiego degli osservatori del controllo. Oppure l'opposizione alle ispezioni sul territorio nazionale da parte di ispettori di altri Stati Membri che va a minare la sovranità dello Stato. Senza dimenticare l'opposizione alle nuove norme sulla pesca ricreativa che creano un carico amministrativo elevatissimo per le Amministrazioni nazionali e alle continue modifiche delle misure relative al margine di tolleranza.

Il testo attuale è sicuramente migliore di quello iniziale ma, per le considerazioni sopra riportate, l'Italia conferma il suo **voto contrario**.

Statement by Portugal

Portugal reconhece a importância e necessidade da Revisão do Regime de Controlo das Pescas, que é um instrumento essencial para garantir atividades de pesca e aquicultura sustentáveis a longo prazo.

Portugal entende que, no geral, o compromisso é adequado aos desafios que o setor da pesca atualmente enfrenta e constitui uma melhoria significativa face às medidas existentes.

Porém, Portugal lamenta que as novas regras quanto à margem de tolerância (MOT) para capturas de espécies de pequenos pelágicos não sejam adequadas à realidade das atividades da pesca.

Portugal referiu, de forma consistente e durante todo o processo negocial, que estas medidas não são exequíveis para o setor devido às características da pescaria dos pequenos pelágicos.

Neste contexto, atendendo à dificuldade que as novas regras sobre margem de tolerância irão criar para a atividade diária das frotas nacionais, Portugal abstém-se.

Statement by Slovenia

The revision of the Regulation on the control system of the Common Fisheries Policy is important and necessary in order to achieve a uniform approach to ensuring the control of the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy, thereby preserving the marine environment and the sustainable management of fisheries stocks, particularly taking into account the global changes affecting European fisheries.

Republic of Slovenia welcomes, that the Regulation amending various Regulations regarding fisheries control takes into account the specific characteristics of smaller fishing sectors, small-scale coastal fishing as well as Slovenian fisheries. This is reflected in the proposal as last adopted in the trilogue, which is why Slovenia supports the final compromise text.

However, we remain concerned about the shorter transitional period of only two years for the introduction of electronic systems (electronic logbooks and landing declarations) for vessels between 12 and 15 meters of length, as this might lead to difficulties in implementation and reduced cost efficiency.

We also remain concerned about the additional costs and administrative burdens that the obligatory introduction of digital traceability for fisheries products could bring for operators that are micro and small enterprises.

Statement by the Commission

on Article 6 and Article 7 (Entry into force/date of application)

The Commission is empowered to adopt the delegated and implementing acts provided for in this Regulation which will apply at the dates of application set out in the Regulation.

The Commission will endeavour to adopt those acts sufficiently in advance of the dates on which they are supposed to become applicable.

When preparing such acts, the Commission will review Implementing Regulation (EU) 404/2011 in the light of this Regulation and of any implementing or delegated acts adopted and will repeal those provisions of Regulation (EU) 404/2011 which are superseded by this Regulation or by any implementing or delegated act.

Statement by the Commission

on the implementing powers granted to the Commission as regards the derogations from rules on the margin of tolerance

The Commission is empowered to adopt an implementing act providing further detail in relation to the content of the legislative act in order to ensure that it is implemented under uniform conditions in all Member States in particular to the designation of ports and facilities for landing and weighing of catches of unsorted small pelagic, industrial and tropical tuna purse seine fisheries, that allow benefiting from derogations from rules on the margin of tolerance in order to ensure uniform, implementation of the applicable provisions.

The Commission will start working on the draft implementing regulation on the basis of the objectives and requirements of the relevant provisions immediately after the political agreement on the Control Regulation is reached by the European Parliament and the Council.

The Commission will endeavour to submit the draft implementing act without delay after the entry into force of the Control Regulation for the opinion of the Committee for fisheries and aquaculture with a view to facilitate the adoption before the date of application of the provisions relating to the margin of tolerance, i.e. within 6 months from the date of entry into force of the Regulation on the revision of the EU fisheries control system.

Statement by the Commission

on the new control rules and level playing field with third countries

In accordance with Article 28 of the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation, the Commission will promote a level-playing field for Union operators vis-à-vis third country operators, both at bilateral and multilateral level, as regards the new control rules that will be implemented under the revised fisheries control system, such as remote electronic monitoring and control of small scale and recreational fisheries. The Commission will also continue to promote and support, in all international spheres, action necessary to eradicate IUU-fishing.

Statement by the Commission

on the resource implications of the outcome of the inter-institutional negotiations on the revision of the EU fisheries control system

The Commission recalls that the final agreement reached on the revision of the EU fisheries control system, in particular on the electronic reporting of catches and on the tracking for small scale vessels, on the recording and reporting of catches from recreational fishers, on the traceability of fishery and aquaculture products, but also on annual reports and on the need to adopt implementing and delegated acts, including on the margin of tolerance, has evolved significantly compared to the initial Commission proposal (COM(2018)368 final of 30.05.2018).

The agreement substantially increases the number of tasks and obligations for the Commission and the workload associated, both in the short and in the long-term i.e. beyond the current programming period. These include the adoption of implementing and delegated acts, which the Commission had instead proposed to be included in the basic act, the performance of a feasibility study on the traceability of prepared and preserved products, the development, deployment and future maintenance and upgrades of uniform IT tools for small scale fisheries and recreational fisheries, along with various compilations of annual reports to be published on the Commission's website. This has a direct impact on the estimated resources required for the Commission services, which was not anticipated when the Commission submitted its proposal.