



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 7 February 2020
(OR. en)

Interinstitutional File:
2018/0210(COD)

5866/20
ADD 4

LIMITE

PECHE 40
CODEC 84
CADREFIN 16

NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
No. prev. doc.:	ST 5350/1/20 REV 1 PECHE 22 CODEC 33 CADREFIN 7
Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Regulation (EU) N° 508/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council (EMFF)

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

Lithuanian written comments on the 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)

References: doc 5350/1/20

Lithuanian authorities wish to submit the written comments on the draft revised mandate set out in document 5350/1/20.

Concerning block I Lithuania supports the approach proposed by the Presidency, but would ask the Presidency to ensure that the compromise reached on the line 128b would be consistent with the Common Provisions Regulation and do not increase the administrative burden for the administration. On line 138a Lithuania would ask the Presidency more flexibility addressing the proposal from European Parliament.

Lithuania fully supports advancing negotiation with the co-legislators on this important dossier, although the rest of the text in our view has not been scrutinized to the full extend.

In this regard, please find below the table with essential comments for the lines where Lithuania's position diverges from that of the Presidency.

Line	Lithuania's position	Pres. comments
74	No support to inclusion of 'inspection' to the definition of 'coastguard'	Flexible
85	Lithuania maintains position that inclusion of 'inland fisheries' into the definition of 'small-scale coastal fishing' is necessary. Usage of this definition should be consistent throughout the text.	Flexibility to explore EP's concerns

176	Strong support to EP amendment (extension of derogation to direct restocking). Support for direct restocking foreseen also by national legal acts is necessary considering current endangered state of several specific fish species, which are not subject to EU conservation measures. Proper specific conservation objectives would be set in the national programs and such activities could effectively contribute to achieving environmental goal of restoring and increasing fish stocks.	Some flexibility can be shown.
179	Strong support to EP amendment as it corresponds to Lithuania's position that investments in question should be eligible under the fund as a rule, not as an exception. Support is needed for investments to comply with EU law and implement it. <u>Serious approach needed since the ongoing Control Regulation revision implicates further obligations to MS and operators.</u>	Some flexibility to explore EP's concerns (ask for
180	Strong support to EP amendment (deletion of the point on the minimum number of days of fishing activities at sea) Regional approach also could be an option.	Defend PGA
180d-180e	Further clarifications from the EP on the proposed Article 13a needed.	No support to EP text
186	Lithuania's position is that support for both permanent and temporary cessation of fishing activities <i>mutatis mutandis</i> should apply to inland fishing. The application of Article 18 under the PGA text is not clear.	Defend PGA

203b	Support to EP amendment as it corresponds to general Lithuania's position that adequate support opportunities for fleet renewal (with strict respect to the capacity ceilings of Annex II of CFP Regulation) to already operating and remaining active fishing companies is vitally important for achieving the CFP objectives when the existing fleet is technically obsolete and environmentally not-friendly.	No support to EP text
217 and 235	<u>Lithuania would urge the Presidency to address in the negotiation the provisions on active days at sea and the referential years for the calculation in terms of critical Baltic Sea situation.</u> <u>Regional approach could be an appropriate option.</u>	
219a	Support to EP amendment	Clarifications about EP position needed
229	Support to EP amendment	Clarifications from the EP are needed
230	Support to EP amendment	Some flexibility to explore EP's concerns
238	Support to EP amendment (deletion of the paragraph) taking into account the indeterminacy and volatility in respect of the listed circumstances. 6 months of the whole period from 2021 to 2027 is inadequate.	Flexible