



**REPORT OF DISCUSSION IN THE COUNCIL WORKING PARTY REGARDING THE PROPOSAL FOR
FISHING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CERTAIN FISH STOCKS AND GROUPS OF FISH STOCKS
(ATLANTIC) FOR 2018**

Meeting on 9th November 2017

1. General comments

All Member States supported reaching MSY 2020, however, some of them pointed out that for some stocks the MSY should not be reached in 2018 yet. **FR** referred to mixed fisheries in the Celtic Sea and that solutions should be found avoiding single species advice. **UK** requested flexibility where mixed fisheries occur, while **IE** advocates for a single-species advice. **UK**, **IE** supported the case-by-case approach for data limited stocks. **NL**, **BE** expressed concerns about choke species.

ES and **PT** underlined that they had made a lot of sacrifices and it would be difficult to explain to fishermen why TACs need to be modify. They preferred social and economic stability.

A number MS referred to eels and asked if the Commission made an impact assessment, why were there no proposed measures for the Mediterranean, why measures were only about silver eel, while fishing mortality of glass eel is very high and what would be done about fresh waters. COM referred to the scientific advice and a bad status of the stock. It also explained that in December it would aim at achieving real measures capable of improving the status of the stock.

In general MS were negative about the COM proposing TACs below MSY advice. They pointed out to the inconsistencies in the approach. COM pointed out that for a number of stocks, Member States argued that there was no need to follow the scientific advice (-and to make cuts-).

Article examination

Article 12 Prohibitions

a) Prohibition to fish for silver eels

FR considered "unacceptable, put in doubt the "eel ban". **DK** claimed it will affect directly to Danish fishery community (historic tradition). **NL** demanded more information to be collected on the stock. Besides, **NL** stated eel prohibition will have deep impact on small scale fisheries. For this reason, **NL** proposed "work together" to come up with viable solutions. **DE** pointed out ban does not consider efforts made in accordance with the eel management plan. **SE** asked whether COM made some calculation based on impact in F

(prohibition species). **PT** stated the high effort to protect fish stocks (limit fleet capacity, protection measures; in general).

Annex IA examination

Common name	TAC Unit	TAC 2017 (t)	TAC 2018 proposal (t)	TAC change proposal (2017-proposal 2018) (%)	MS comments
Herring	7g(1), 7h(1), 7j(1) and 7k(1) (HER/7G-K.)	14467	5445	-62%	IE: wondered why the proposal was not in accordance with the management plan
Anchovy	9 and 10; Union waters of CECAF 34.1.1	12500	pm		ES: Surprise for the "pm". COM explained that the advice was being studied.
Cod	Kattegat	525	525	0%	DK: The TAC should take into account incidental by-catches. DK stated ICES advice proposed a 20% increase in quota.
Cod	7a	146	292	100%	IE: ICES advice gave basis of a higher increase than the COM proposal, and IE did not understand why full ICES advice was not reflected in the proposal. UK: pointed out the COM proposal need to consider the Irish Sea mixed fishery. Moreover, UK agreed on IE view concerning ICES advice.

Common name	TAC Unit	TAC 2017 (t)	TAC 2018 proposal (t)	TAC change proposal (2017-proposal 2018) (%)	MS comments
Megrim	Union and international waters of 5b; 6; International waters of 12 and 14.	5682	4691	-17%	ES: could not understand the COM decision to decrease this TAC. ES argued biomass is above the reference points. FR: claimed this TAC has gone through "too many reductions". For this manner, FR proposed a 5% decrease instead of 10%.
Megrim	7	13691	12310	-10%	IE: in line with ES and FR as mentioned above.
Megrim	8c, 9 and 10; Union waters of CECAF 34.1.1	1159	1387	-20%	ES: Agreed with increase. On the other hand, ES argued cannot have full quota uptake for Megrim due to the decrease on hake's proposal (both stocks caught together). In addition, ES proposed to delete CECAF area from this TAC.
Anglerfish	7	33516	29534	-12%	FR: asked for a roll-over as stock remains the same as last year. ES: asked COM for reasons (no accept reduction on this TAC). ES, FR asked for a roll-over (data limited basis)
Anglerfish	8abde	8980	7914	-12%	FR: Same as above
Anglerfish	8c,9,10,CECAF 34.1.1	3955	3879	-2%	PT: pointed out the decrease in this TAC
Whiting	6; Union and international waters of 5b; international waters of 12 and 14	213	0	-100%	UK: A 0 TAC does not help (UK assumed there will be discards then)

Common name	TAC Unit	TAC 2017 (t)	TAC 2018 proposal (t)	TAC change proposal (2017-proposal 2018) (%)	MS comments
Whiting	7a	80	pm		IE: did not understand "pm"
Hake (overall N. TAC)	Overall northern TACs (3a / 2a and 4 / 5b, 6, 7, 12 and 14 / 8abde)	119765	97580	-19%	UK: claimed COM did not follow ICES advice. DK: asked to follow MSY advice and avoid introducing other parameters FR: proposed a lower reduction ES: considered COM proposal not realistic compared to scientist reported in terms of biomass. Moreover, ES underlined its efforts to reach MSY. BE: Assumed the proposal lower than the ICES advice was a mistake
Hake	8c, 9 and 10; Union waters of CECAF 34.1.1	10520	7366	-30%	ES: asked for more flexibility (cannot reach MSY next year). As a consequence, there will be "huge" socio-economic impacts on Spanish fishery communities. Furthermore, ES suggested CECAF 34.1.1 should be considered separate as ICES did not include it in the advice. PT: supported Spanish viewpoint as well as declared there is no justification for a decrease on this TAC.
Blue ling	Int. waters of 12	357	286	-20%	ES: asked for a roll over.
Norway lobster	7	25356	pm		IE: Expected to see an increase UK: supported IE viewpoint and requested to see a proposal soon
Norway lobster	8c	0	0		ES: Asked for 10t for a commercial sentinel fishery in order to get more information about the stock.
Norway lobster	9 and 10; Union waters of CECAF 34.1.1	336	pm		ES: Considered split functional units (differentiate Portuguese waters and Spanish waters). As a consequence, asked for an independent TAC. PT: showed interest on Sentinel fishery and requested a role for commercial fisheries to get involve.
Northern prawn	3a	7000	pm		DK: Reported interest in this stock

Common name	TAC Unit	TAC 2017 (t)	TAC 2018 proposal (t)	TAC change proposal (2017-proposal 2018) (%)	MS comments
Plaice	7a	1098	1793	63%	
Plaice	7h, 7j and 7k	128	0	-100%	IE and UK: disagreed with the proposal, given this is taken in a mixed fishery and proposed a small TAC
Pollack	7	12146	12141	+0.04%	FR: asked for a degree of flexibility and considered the reduction unjustified. Suggested a rollover.
Pollack	8abde	1482	1482	0%	FR: asked for a degree of flexibility and considered the reduction unjustified. Suggested a rollover.
Common sole	3a; Union waters of subdivisions 22-32	551	336	-39%	DK and SE: expressed this TAC has the same situation as northern hake, not following scientific advice. Besides DK and SE were concerned about the different principles COM follows to set TAC compared with ICES advice.
Common sole	7d	2724	2933	+8%	UK: at first asked for a 40% increase, but clarified that were not aware of the plan. FR: asked for a figure above the cap of 15%. BE: was discussing all sole stocks with the stakeholders
Common sole	8ab	3420	3621	+6%	FR: wanted to see the top-up level
Sole	8cde, 9 and 10: Union waters of CECAF 34.1.1	1072	1072	0%	PT: stated this is a combined TAC (involve many different species). Considered that it should be established only for common sole.

Common name	TAC Unit	TAC 2017 (t)	TAC 2018 proposal (t)	TAC change proposal (2017-proposal 2018) (%)	MS comments
Horse Mackerel	9	73349	55555	-24%	ES and PT: pointed out the no understanding of TAC decrease proposed by COM , (in line with the figure proposed by ICES) considering the positive state of the stock. As a result, ES and PT proposed a rollover and asked for delays reaching MSY for those "healthy" stocks.

