



**EAPO / AEOP**  
**H. Baelskaai 25 – 8400 OOSTENDE (Belgium)**  
☎ +32 59 32 18 76      Fax: +32 59 32 28 40  
e-mail: [info@eapo.com](mailto:info@eapo.com)

---

**Conclusions of the EAPO-Europêche-COGECA Meeting with the European Commission in Rome, 10 March 2009, on the Reform of the Control System.**

***Chairman of this session: Sean O Donoghue***

***The conclusions highlighted below are not in any particular order of importance.***

**1. Weighing**

Review of the apparent requirement to weigh on board, at the time of landing and at first sale. Can this be restricted to at first sale only? Commission prepared to examine this issue however it may cause additional problems.

**2. Margin of Tolerance**

It was suggested that the best way to address the difference of opinion between industry and Commission representatives on the margin of tolerance of 5% in the proposed regulation, was to set up a small working group.

**3. Fleet Capacity**

The Commission indicated that reform of the CFP and of the Control should go together with tackling the overcapacity. Self-regulation should be the aim. Today this is not possible, but the door should be kept open. A transition period in order to achieve the buy-in of the member states could be useful.

**4. Process**

The industry was not satisfied that the process undertaken by the Commission in developing the proposal was consistent with its approach in other areas of stakeholder's involvement and a bottom-up approach. The industry considered that most of the comments coming out of the 2008 consultations had not been taken into account. The Commission did not agree and stressed that urgent action needed to be taken in light of the Court of Auditors report. However the Commission said they are willing to meet the sector to discuss in detail their concerns on an article by article basis.

## **5. Recreational Fisheries**

The Commission is looking for the professional sector's support to counter lobbyists to keep recreational fisheries out of the regulation. The sector however, expresses the concern about the impact on quota when recreational fisheries will be included.

## **6. Article per Article Analysis**

The Commission said it was prepared to organize a meeting with a small group of industry stakeholders to discuss the proposed regulation on an article by article basis. It is hoped this will be arranged at an early date.

## **7. Overburden on Smaller Vessels**

This concerns the swamping with notifications (Art. 17) the operators and the Member States and the deletion of aids for Member States (Art. 95). The Commission points out that also under 10 m vessels have an impact on the resources, but remains flexible about this criteria (12 m?). There is an understanding of the problem for mixed fisheries in respect of the time required to fill in the logbook. The important factor is to focus on important fisheries. This was another issue highlighted for discussion by the small working group mentioned above.

## **8. A.I.S.**

Maritime Transport will make this obligatory for over 15 m vessels, not as a control system but as a safety system. The Commission accepted that this is not a control issue.

## **9. Culture of Compliance**

The Commission finds that it should be avoided that a part of the sector gets an opportunity to commit fraud. Reaching the targeted level playing field, also for sanctions, will help achieving a culture of compliance.

## **10. Scope for Self Regulation**

On several occasions the sector has expressed a great interest in self-regulation. There was no adequate answer from the Commission on the query why there is no mentioning whatsoever in the control regulation proposal.

## **11. Administrative Sanctions**

Reference was made to the complexity of the relevant article as opposed to the promise of simplicity. According to the Commission representatives the main debate is whether this can be done by the European Commission. The initial answer being 'no', it has ultimately been accepted, but the integration in national laws remains difficult.

## **12. Cost and Entrepreneur Flexibility**

It was commented that some articles in the regulation proposal will lead to increased operating costs and others to reduced entrepreneur flexibility. The Commission referred to the fact that momentarily the costs to follow up the fisheries are higher than the economic value. In respect of the prohibition to tranship, no alternatives have been found to address the many logbook irregularities coming out of the I.U.U. analysis.

### **13. Engine Power**

The Commission pointed out that a problem exists (referring to art. 30 of the proposed regulation) across Community fleets with regards to the current regulation and registered power. This is a complex and difficult issue and will require an innovative solution

EAPO  
18 March 2009