Council of the European Union

Brussels, 14 October 2020
(OR. en)

11686/20
ADD 1

LIMITE

PECHE 302
CODEC 973
CADREFIN 319

Interinstitutional File:
2018/0210(COD)

NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
No. prev. doc.:	ST 11416/20 PECHE 284 CODEC 933 CADREFIN 302
Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council (EMFF) - Czech comments

Delegations will find attached written comments by the Czech delegation on the above-mentioned document.

Czech comments on Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council (EMFF) - Draft Revised Mandate (11416/20)

1) Rows 248 and 249

The Presidency proposes to align article 20 to the scope of data collection framework. It is not clear what is meant by this draft mandate. In our view, the data collection framework is already included in this provision as both COM and Council texts contain the reference to Article 25 and 27 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 and related DCF Regulation.

2) Rows 247k – 274n

Presidency asks for flexibility to address EP´s concerns in the recitals in rows 274m and 274n (article 22a proposed by EP). It seems that this mandate should also apply to rows 274k and 274l. Otherwise, we do not understand, what is behind the PRES proposal.

3) Rows 274o, 274p and 274q

EP proposes an article on innovations; PRES proposes to tackle the issue in the recitals. In general, CZ can agree with revised mandate, but we believe that innovations are already addressed under Priority 2.

4) Row 275ca

The Czech Republic cannot support adding a new specific objective covering different types of crisis. It was very difficult to reach the balance on priorities and specific objectives in the Council and the structure was already agreed in trialogues during HR PRES. So we believe this discussion should not be opened again.

CZ understands the EP´s intention to address impact of the crisis by allowing financing the private storage. But we have to take into account that crisis as such is an unforeseeable event. Therefore, it is impossible for Member States to set allocation in advance when preparing their operational programmes.

In our opinion, crisis support can be covered under existing specific objectives within Priority 2. So, to address the EP´s concern, in the spirit of compromise, CZ could agree to amend the scope of both existing objectives. However, not only support to private storage should be allowed in the Regulation.

Based on existing experience, CZ therefore proposes following wording of the scope:

New row 275fa

Support under paragraph 1 (a) and (b) may also contribute to address unforeseeable crisis caused by natural disasters, environmental incidents or health crisis. The EMFAF may support inter alia:

a) working capital,

b) compensations for reduced sales or additional storage costs or

c) *compensations to recognised producer organisations and associations of producers organisations which store fishery products listed in Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013, provided that those products are stored in accordance with Articles 30 and 31.*