




VOTING LIST


Vote on 15 April 2026

**The impact of the implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive
2014/89/EU on fisheries in selected fishing areas and sea basins
2024/2126(INI)**

Rapporteur: Stéphanie Yon-Courtin


Concerned text	AM	Tabled by	Remarks	Rapp	Vote
	CA 3		→ if adopted go to CA 4		
Paragraph 3	76	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 3	77	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 3 or 76 adopted		
Paragraph 3 a (new)	78	Bartulica	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 4	79	Falcone	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 4 a (new)	80	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 4 a (new)	81	Zovko	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 4 a (new)	82	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 4 a (new)	83	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 5	84	Flanagan	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 6	85	Lövin	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 6 a (new)	86	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 6 a (new)	87	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 3 adopted		

Paragraph 10 a (new)	105	Falcone	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
Paragraph 11 a (new)	113	Zovko	Falls if CA 3 adopted		
	CA 4		 <i>if adopted go to 124</i>		
Paragraph 7	88	Flanagan	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 7	89	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 4 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 88, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 7	90	Arnaoutoglou	Falls if CA 4 or 88 adopted		
Paragraph 7	91	Lövin	Falls if CA 4, 88 or 90 adopted		
Paragraph 7 a (new)	93	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 7 a (new)	94	Adamowicz	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 8	96	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 8	97	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 4 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 96, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 8	98	Lövin	Falls if CA 4, 96 or 97 adopted		
Paragraph 8 a (new)	99	Bartulica	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 9	100	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 9	101	Flanagan	Falls if CA 4 or 100 adopted		
Paragraph 10	102	Flanagan	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 10	103	Lövin	Falls if CA 4 or 102 adopted		
Paragraph 10	104	Falcone	Falls if CA 4, 102 or 103 adopted		
Paragraph 10 a (new)	106	Ruissen	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 10 a (new)	107	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 4 adopted		

Paragraph 10 a (new)	108	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 11	111	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 11	109	Falcone	Falls if CA 4 or 111 adopted		
Paragraph 11	110	Flanagan	Falls if CA 4 or 111 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 109, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 12	115	Lövin	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 12	116	Droese, Schnurrbusch	Falls if CA 4 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 115, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 12 a (new)	118	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 13	120	Lövin	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 13	121	Ruissen	Falls if CA 4 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 120, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 13	122	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 4, 120 or 121 adopted		
Paragraph 14	125	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 14	126	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 4 or 125 adopted		
Paragraph 14 a (new)	128	Zovko	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 22 a (new)	162	Ruissen	Falls if CA 4 adopted		
Paragraph 13 a (new)	124	Ruissen			
	CA 5		 <i>If adopted go to Compromise 6</i>		
Paragraph 15	129	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
Paragraph 15	130	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 5 or 129 adopted		
Paragraph 16	132	Lövin	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
Paragraph 16	131	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 5 or 132 adopted		
Paragraph 17	133	Flanagan	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
Paragraph 17	134	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 5 or 133 adopted		





Paragraph 17 a (new)	135	Ruissen	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
Paragraph 17 a (new)	136	Smit, Le Callenec, Falcone, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
Paragraph 18	137	Flanagan	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
Paragraph 19	141	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 5 adopted		
	CA 6		 <i>if adopted go to 168</i>		
Paragraph 8	95	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 11 a (new)	112	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 11 a (new)	114	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 12 a (new)	117	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 12 a (new)	119	Smit, Le Callenec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 13 a (new)	123	Smit, Le Callenec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 14 – point 1 (new)	127	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 18 a (new)	138	Zovko	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 18 a (new)	139	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 18 a (new)	140	Smit, Le Callenec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 19 a (new)	142	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 19 a (new)	143	Bartulica	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 20	144	Lövin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		

Paragraph 20	145	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 144, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 20 a (new)	146	Ruissen	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 20 a (new)	147	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 20 a (new)	148	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 21	150	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 21	152	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 or 150 adopted		
Paragraph 21	151	Falcone	Falls if CA 6, 150 or 152 adopted		
Paragraph 21	153	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6, 150, 152 or 151 adopted		
Paragraph 21	149	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6, 150 or 152 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 153, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 21 a (new)	154	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 21 a (new)	155	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 21 a (new)	156	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 22	157	Droese, Schnurrbusch	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 22	158	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 or 157 adopted		
Paragraph 22	159	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6, 157 or 158 adopted		
Paragraph 22	160	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 6, 157, 158 or 159 adopted		
Paragraph 22	161	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6, 157, 158, 159 or 160 adopted		
Paragraph 22 a (new)	163	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		

Paragraph 22 a (new)	164	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 22 a (new)	165	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 23	166	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 23	170	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 or 166 adopted		
Paragraph 23	172	Lövin	Falls if CA 6, 166 or 170 adopted		
Paragraph 23	174	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6, 166, 170 or 172 adopted		
Paragraph 23	176	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6, 166, 170, 172 or 174 adopted		
Paragraph 23	169	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6, 166, 170, 172, 174 or 176 adopted		
Paragraph 23	171	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6, 166, 170, 172, 174, 176 or 169 adopted		
Paragraph 23	173	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6, 166, 170, 172, 174, 176, 169 or 171 adopted		
Paragraph 23	175	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6, 166, 170, 172, 174, 176, 169, 171 or 173 adopted		
Paragraph 23	167	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 23 a (new)	177	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 23 a (new)	179	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 24	182	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 24	181	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 or 182 adopted		
Paragraph 24	183	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 or 182 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 181, voted in addition</i>		



Paragraph 24	184	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6 or 182 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 183 and 181, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 24	185	Lövin	Falls if CA 6, 182 or 184 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 183, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 24 a (new)	186	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 24 a (new)	187	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 25	190	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 25	191	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6 or 190 adopted		
Paragraph 25	192	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6, 190 or 191 adopted		
Paragraph 25	188	Lövin	Falls if CA 6, 190, 191 or 192 adopted		
Paragraph 25	189	Junco García, Ruissen, Bartulica, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 190 and 188, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 25	193	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 25 a (new)	194	Adamowicz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 26	195	Junco García, Ruissen, Bartulica, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 26	196	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 195 voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 26	197	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 195 and 196, voted in addition</i>		

Paragraph 26 a (new)	198	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 26 a (new)	199	Zovko	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 26 a (new)	200	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 27	201	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 27	202	Sargiacomo, Mendiá	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 201, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 27	203	Flanagan	No vote Linguistic Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 28	204	Junco García, Ruissen, Bartulica, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 28	205	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 204 voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 28	206	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 204 and 205 voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 28	207	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 204, 205, 206 voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 29	209	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29	211	Droese, Schnurrbusch	Falls if CA 6 or 209 adopted		
Paragraph 29	212	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6, 209 or 211 adopted		
Paragraph 29	213	Arnaoutoglou	Falls if CA 6, 209, 211 or 212 adopted		
Paragraph 29	214	Sargiacomo, Mendiá	Falls if CA 6, 209, 211, 212 or 213 adopted		
Paragraph 29	208	Junco García, Ruissen, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, voted in addition</i>		


Paragraph 29	210	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 29	215	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 29 a (new)	216	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29 a (new)	217	Droese, Schnurrbusch	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29 a (new)	218	Arnautoglou	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29 a (new)	219	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29 a (new)	220	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29 a (new)	221	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 29 b (new)	222	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 30	225	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 30	223	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 225, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 30	224	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 225 and 223, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 30 a (new)	226	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 31	227	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 31	229	Droese, Schnurrbusch	Falls if CA 6 or 227 adopted		
Paragraph 31	232	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6, 227 or 229 adopted		

Paragraph 31	231	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6, 227, 229 or 232 adopted		
Paragraph 31	230	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6, 227 or 229 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 232, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 31	228	Junco García, Ruissen, Bartulica, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6 or 227 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 229, 232 voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 31 a (new)	233	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 31 a (new)	234	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 31 a (new)	235	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 32	236	Junco García, Ruissen, Bartulica, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 32	237	Zovko	Falls if CA 6 or 236 adopted		
Paragraph 32	238	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6, 236 or 237 adopted		
Paragraph 32	239	Falcone	Falls if CA 6, 236, 237 or 238 adopted		
Paragraph 32	240	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 6, 236, 237, 238 or 239 adopted		
Paragraph 32	241	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6, 236, 237, 238, 239 or 240 adopted		
Paragraph 32	242	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240 or 241 adopted		
Paragraph 32 a (new)	243	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 32 a (new)	244	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 33	246	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 33	247	Lövin	Falls if CA 6 or 246 adopted		
Paragraph 33 a (new)	248	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		

Paragraph 33 a (new)	249	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 33 a (new)	250	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 33 a (new)	251	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 33 b (new)	252	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 34	253	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 34	254	Lövin	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 253</i>		
Paragraph 34	255	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 253 and 254, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 35	256	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 35	257	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 256, voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 36	258	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 36	260	Flanagan	Falls if CA 6 or 258 adopted		
Paragraph 36	262	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 6, 258 or 260 adopted		
Paragraph 36	264	Ruissen	Falls if CA 6, 258, 260 or 262 adopted		
Paragraph 36	265	Lövin	Falls if CA 6, 258, 260, 262 or 264 adopted		
Paragraph 36	259	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 258, 260, 262, 264, 265</i>		
Paragraph 36	261	Falcone	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 258, 259, 260, 262, 264, 265</i>		
Paragraph 36	263	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 6 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, 265</i>		
Paragraph 36 a (new)	266	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 36 a (new)	267	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo	Falls if CA 6 adopted		

		Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral			
Paragraph 37	268	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
Paragraph 37	269	Ruissen	Falls if CA 6 or 268 adopted		
Paragraph 37	270	Junco García, Bartulica, Milazzo, Fragkos, Solier	Falls if CA 6, 268 or 269 adopted		
Paragraph 37	272	Arnaoutoglou	Falls if CA 6, 268, 269 or 270 adopted		
Paragraph 37	273	Lövin	Falls if CA 6, 268, 269, 270 or 272 adopted		
Paragraph 37	271	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 6, 268 or 269 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 270, 272, 273</i>		
Paragraph 38	274	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 6 adopted		
 Paragraph 23	168	Flanagan	<i>Compatible with AMs 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176 and CA 6. Voted in addition</i>		
Paragraph 23 a (new)	178	Smit, Le Callennec, Falcone, Crespo Díaz, Do Nascimento Cabral			
Paragraph 32 a (new)	245	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen			
Citations	CA 1		 <i>If adopted go to AM 3</i>		
Citation 6 a (new)	1	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 6 a (new)	2	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 6 b (new)	4	Flanagan	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 6 b (new)	5	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 8 a (new)	6	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		



Citation 11 a (new)	7	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 11 a (new)	8	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 11 b (new)	9	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 11 c (new)	10	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 13 a (new)	11	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 13 b (new)	12	Lövin	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 15 a (new)	13	Flanagan	Falls if CA 1 adopted		
Citation 6 a (new)	3	Flanagan			
Recitals	CA 2		 <i>If adopted go to 53</i>		
Recital A	14	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital A	15	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 2 or 14 adopted		
Recital A	16	Lövin	Falls if CA 2, 14 or 15 adopted		
Recital A	17	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 2 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 14, 15, 16, voted in addition</i>		
Recital A	18	Flanagan	Falls if CA 2, 14, 15 or 16 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 17, voted in addition</i>		
Recital A	19	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 2 or 14 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 15, 16, 17, 18, voted in addition</i>		
Recital A a (new)	20	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital A a (new)	21	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital A a (new)	22	Falcone	Falls if CA 2 adopted		

Recital A a (new)	23	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital A a (new)	24	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital A b (new)	25	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital B	26	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital B	27	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 2 or 26 adopted		
Recital B	28	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 2, 26 or 27 adopted		
Recital B a (new)	29	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital B a (new)	30	Ruissen	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital B a (new)	31	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital B a (new)	32	Jamet, Tânger Corrêa, Diepeveen	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital C	33	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital C	34	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 or 33 adopted		
Recital D	35	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital E	36	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital G	37	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital G	38	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 2 or 37 adopted		
Recital G	39	Falcone	Falls if CA 2, 37 or 38 adopted		
Recital G a (new)	40	Ruissen	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital G a (new)	41	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital H a (new)	42	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital H a (new)	43	Miranda Paz	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital I	44	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		

Recital I	45	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 2 or 44 adopted		
Recital J	46	Falcone	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital I a (new)	47	Arnaoutoglou	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital J a (new)	48	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital K	49	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital K	50	Falcone	Falls if CA 2 or 49 adopted		
Recital K a (new)	51	Droese, Schnurrbusch	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital K a (new)	52	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital L	55	Falcone	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital L	56	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 2 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 55, voted in addition</i>		
Recital L	57	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 2 adopted <i>Compatible with AMs 55 and 56, voted in addition</i>		
Recital L a (new)	58	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital L a (new)	59	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital M	61	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital M	62	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 61, voted in addition</i>		
Recital M a (new)	63	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital N	64	Yon-Courtin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital N a (new)	65	Sargiacomo, Mendia	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital N a (new)	66	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital N a (new)	67	Crespo Díaz	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital O	68	Le Callennec	Falls if CA 2 adopted		

Recital O a (new)	69	Adamowicz	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital P a (new)	70	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital Q	72	Do Nascimento Cabral	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Recital Q	73	Falcone	Falls if CA 2 adopted <i>Compatible with AM 72</i>		
Paragraph 1 a (new)	74	Lövin	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Paragraph 1 a (new)	75	Flanagan	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
Paragraph 7 a (new)	92	Millán Mon, Mato	Falls if CA 2 adopted		
→ Recital K a (new)	53	Ruissen			
Recital K b (new)	54	Ruissen			
Recital L a (new)	60	Flanagan			
Recital P a (new)	71	Flanagan			
Paragraph 23 a (new)	180	Lövin			
Final vote – Draft text as amended (Roll-call vote)					

European Parliament

2024-2029



Committee on Fisheries

2024/2126(INI)

COMPROMISES

on the impact of the implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning
Directive 2014/89/EU on fisheries in selected fishing areas and sea basins
(2024/2126(INI))

Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

COMP 1 – Citations

AM falls: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

Groups supporting: EPP, S&D, ECR, Renew, Greens, The Left

- having regard to Directive 2014/89/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning¹ (Maritime Spatial Planning Directive or MSP Directive),
- having regard to Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive)²,
- having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on the Common Fisheries Policy, amending Council Regulations (EC) No 1954/2003 and (EC) No 1224/2009 and repealing Council Regulations (EC) No 2371/2002 and (EC) No 639/2004 and Council Decision 2004/585/EC³ (Common Fisheries Policy Regulation),
- having regard to Regulation (EU) 2021/1139 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2021 establishing the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and amending Regulation (EU) 2017/1004⁴,
- having regard to Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora⁵ (Habitats Directive),
- having regard to Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds⁶ (Birds Directive),
- ***having regard to the report of 3 May 2022 from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council outlining the progress made in implementing Directive 2014/89/EU establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning,***
- ***having regard to the directives on water quality and pollution control (Directive 2000/60/EC, Directive 2008/105/EC, Directive (EU) 2024/3019, Directive 91/676/EEC, Directive 2005/35/EC, Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006),***
- ***having regard to the Commission communication of 20 May 2020 entitled ‘EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 - Bringing nature back into our lives’ (COM(2020)0380), and to its resolution of 9 June 2021 thereon;***
- ***having regard to the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries of 2011, in particular Article 10 thereof,***
- ***having regard to the Food and Agriculture Organization’s (FAO) Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines);***
- having regard to the Commission communication of 5 June 2025 entitled ‘The European Ocean Pact’ (COM(2025)0281),

- having regard to its resolution of 7 July 2021 on the impact on the fishing sector of offshore wind farms and other renewable energy systems⁷,
- ***having regard to its resolution of 6 October 2022 entitled 'Momentum for the Ocean: strengthening Ocean Governance and Biodiversity'***,
- having regard to its resolution of 9 May 2023 on co-management of fisheries in the EU and the contribution of the fisheries sector for the implementation of management measures⁸,
- having regard to its resolution of 18 January 2024 on the state of play in the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy and future perspectives⁹,
- having regard to the Commission communication of 12 May 2021 entitled 'Strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture for the period 2021 to 2030' (COM(2021)0236),
- ***having regard to the Commission staff working document entitled Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the Commission's assessment of the Member States' programmes of measures, as updated under Article 17 of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC)***,
- ***having regard to the 2023 Special Report by the European Court of Auditors entitled 'EU aquaculture policy - Stagnating production and unclear results despite increased EU funding'***,
- having regard to the briefing entitled 'Fisheries in maritime spatial planning' published by its Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services in October 2025,
- having regard to the study entitled 'Implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive: Impact on fisheries in selected fishing areas and sea basins' published by its Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services in December 2025,
- ***having regard to the 2022 Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF)***,
- ***having regard to the report of September 2019 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change entitled 'Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate'***,
- having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure, as well as Article 1(1)(e) of, and Annex 3 to, the decision of the Conference of Presidents of 12 December 2002 on the procedure for granting authorisation to draw up own-initiative reports,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries (A100000/2025),

COMP 2 – Recitals

AM falls: 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 92

Groups supporting: EPP, S&D, ECR, Renew

- A. *whereas increased competition for access to maritime space from various activities and sectors, such as fisheries, aquaculture, maritime transport, shipping, offshore renewable energy, nature conservation, the conservation of marine cultural heritage, coastal tourism, recreational activities, extraction and disposal operations of sea floor sediments through dredging, underwater cables and pipelines, or defence, among others, is resulting in increased cumulative pressure on marine ecosystems as well as increased conflict over the use of maritime space and amplified by institutional and administrative fragmentation;*
- Aa. *whereas fisheries and aquaculture are strategic sectors for the security and sovereignty of the European Union, particularly in terms of food security and maritime sovereignty, and contributes to competitiveness and the resilience of coastal communities; whereas European fishery products are both healthy and often locally sourced, offering one of the best profiles in terms of low greenhouse gas emissions per unit of edible animal protein; whereas these sectors strategic value should therefore be duly recognised in maritime spatial planning;*
- Ab. *Whereas, in 2022, EU seafood self-sufficiency declined to 37,5% and around 80 % of seafood consumed in the Union was imported, which creates a structural dependence on outside sources and weakens the Union’s food sovereignty; whereas, at the same time, the European fishing fleet has experienced a significant reduction over the last decade, decreasing more than 13 % compared to 2014; whereas this contraction, coupled with increasing competition for the use of maritime space, threatens the economic viability of the sector, generational renewal and the ability of the fleet to contribute to the Unions food security; whereas ensuring sufficient, balanced and predictable access to maritime space is therefore essential for developing competitive European fisheries, as recognised by the European Ocean Pact;*
- Ac. *whereas a changing geopolitical context and growing tensions could lead to an increased military use of maritime space; whereas maritime spatial planning must take into account defence and security-related activities and operations, such as surveillance of exclusive economic zones, protection of maritime trade, joint military exercises, combating illicit trafficking, mine clearance, combating piracy, as well as aerial and satellite surveillance, and their interactions with economic activities related to the sea and the marine environment;*
- Ad. *whereas the European Court of Auditors has, in its Special Report 22/2023: Offshore renewable energy in the EU, pointed to the risk that jobs may be lost in the fisheries sector; whereas the Special Report pointed to a lack of quantification of the key economic effects on fisheries resulting from offshore renewable energy development and stated that potential negative consequences of offshore renewable energy*

development on the fisheries sector should be better identified and addressed; whereas it also highlights that an improved fish population on a larger scale is uncertain, some fish density increases in offshore renewable energy areas have been observed, indicating potential benefits for fishers and fisheries;

Ae. whereas the Union has set a legally binding target to put in place effective and area-based restoration measures on at least 20 per cent of EU sea areas by 2030;

Af. whereas the Union has committed to have at least 30 per cent of the sea that should be protected in the EU by 2030;

B. whereas the EU's Maritime Spatial Planning Directive establishes a common framework for the Member States to organise the use of their marine waters and aims to promote the sustainable development *and sustainable growth* of the blue economy and to reduce conflict between sectors, *while not in itself introducing new sectorial obligations; whereas there are tendencies showing that it has favoured the expansion of capital-intensive and spatially exclusive economic activities, which could marginalise traditional, mobile and collective uses of the sea, in particular fishing;*

B a. whereas the Union has provided a framework for maritime spatial planning, including mechanism for cross-border cooperation; whereas coastal Member States are responsible for adopting plans under the framework including designing and determining the format and content of such plans, in line with their administrative tradition, as well as the distribution of maritime space to different activities and uses respectively;

C. whereas the MSP Directive contributes to environmental protection by promoting the sustainable use of maritime space and marine resources and provides that Member States must apply an ecosystem-based approach; *whereas it seeks to ensure an effective balance between environmental, social and economic objectives, without systematically subordinating traditional activities in relation to others;*

D. whereas the MSP Directive is closely linked to the implementation of other EU legislation, such as the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation, the Habitats and Birds Directives, the Water Framework Directive¹⁰; *whereas it is also linked with legally and non-legally binding policy commitments, such as the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;*

E. whereas following the adoption of the MSP Directive, the 22 Member States with a coastline were required to appoint competent authorities by 2016 and to adopt national maritime spatial plans for their marine waters by 31 March 2021; *whereas 8 Member States did not comply with that deadline;*

F. whereas 20 out of the 22 Member States with a coastline have adopted maritime spatial plans so far, and many are now in the process of revising them;

G. whereas when developing maritime spatial plans, Member States must consider environmental, economic, social and safety aspects, land-sea interactions, cross-border cooperation, and ensure *early, continuous and effective* involvement, *through a bottom-up approach*, of all relevant stakeholders, *including fishers and shellfish*

gatherers and their representative organisations as well as the outermost regions, throughout the decision-making process, and ensuring that this involvement is appropriate, meaningful and not limited to a merely consultative role;

- H. whereas the level of implementation of the MSP Directive varies considerably from one Member State to another, due to differences in administrative and governance structures ranging from localised to more centralised systems; *whereas the effects of maritime spatial planning vary greatly depending on the sea basins and territories concerned, with some coastal regions facing a higher concentration of spatial restrictions and competing uses, thereby exacerbating territorial imbalances within the Union;*
- Ha. whereas Member States shall coordinate their plans with other relevant Member States and cooperate with third-country authorities in the marine region concerned; whereas, given the differences between various marine regions or sub-regions and coastal zones, a one size-fits all approach is not seen as appropriate for such cooperations;*
- I. whereas the maritime spatial plans vary greatly in nature and content, as the MSP Directive *does not have binding detailed criteria for the plans* and leaves Member States with considerable flexibility over its implementation and detailed design of the plans;
- J. whereas there is a strong need for maritime spatial planning (MSP) in areas with a high concentration of activity and limited maritime space, such as the Channel, the Baltic Sea *and the Mediterranean Sea;*
- Ja. whereas maritime spatial planning should contribute to the territorial cohesion of the Union, in accordance with Article 174 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and whereas fishing and aquaculture are not only economic activities, but play a fundamental social role in providing livelihoods, maintaining employment and preserving the social and cultural fabric of coastal and island communities, particularly in peripheral and outermost regions;*
- K. whereas the fisheries and aquaculture sectors are facing several challenges such as pressure from *declining state of marine ecosystems* and the uneven deployment of marine conservation measures *as well as pressure from* emerging blue economy sectors, such as offshore renewable energy;
- Ka. whereas well-managed and effectively protected networks of ecologically connected marine protected areas are an essential tool for conserving marine biodiversity which can contribute to long-term gains through stock recovery, spillover to adjacent areas, and resilience for coastal economies, but their effectiveness and social acceptability depend on their design, management and coordination with sustainable fishing activities, in particular through differentiated approaches based on scientific data and the participation of all stakeholders, including fishers and coastal communities;*
- L. whereas the increasing loss of fishing grounds is leading to the displacement of fishing activities, increased fishing pressure and competition between fleets, and the disappearance of certain segments *that cannot relocate their activities*, particularly in

small-scale fisheries, *including fishers on foot, such as shellfish gatherers; whereas this also affects social cohesion, employment and the handing down of maritime traditions;*

- La.** *whereas in accordance with the Common Fisheries Policy, Member States are authorised within the 12 nautical miles zone and for outermost regions the 100 nautical miles zone to restrict fishing to fishing vessels that traditionally fish in those waters from ports on the adjacent coast;*
- M.** *whereas maritime and coastal areas are suffering the consequences of climate change, pollution, particularly from chemical pollutants and marine or land-based litter, which also affect activities related to the sea, marine biodiversity and fishery and aquaculture resources;*
- Ma.** *whereas the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union and its consequences have profoundly altered the spatial, economic and fisheries balance in several sea basins, in particular the Channel, the North Sea and western waters, leading to an increased concentration of Union fishing activities in more restricted sea areas;*
- N.** *whereas maritime professionals, such as fishers, may face certain risks or dangers related to vessel safety or exposure to certain types of trafficking via maritime routes, such as drug trafficking;*
- Na.** *whereas workers in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors should enjoy safe, fair and decent working conditions and adequate social protection, and whereas decisions on maritime spatial planning can have a direct impact on the safety, income and working conditions of these professionals;*
- O.** *whereas many of the maritime spatial plans only cover marine spaces and do not include land-sea interactions and in particular the effects of land-based pollution on marine ecosystems;*
- P.** *whereas the implementation of an ecosystem-based approach is insufficient or lacking, as many Member States are struggling to apply it in practice and to align the requirements of the MSP Directive with those of other legislation such as the CFP or the Marine Strategy Framework Directive;*
- Q.** *whereas data collection, transparency, accessibility, harmonisation and reasonably expeditious processing are key to determining how fisheries and aquaculture are included in maritime spatial planning; whereas there is a lack of comprehensive data on exclusive economic zones and difficulties integrating data across different sectors and obtaining data from national authorities; whereas allocation of funding to these kind of data collection activities could be improved;*

COMP 3 – Implementation of MSPD

AM falls: 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 105, 113

Groups supporting: EPP, S&D, ECR, Renew

Implementation of the MSP Directive and its impact on fisheries and aquaculture

1. Highlights that, while the MSP Directive provides a relevant cross-sectoral framework for cooperation, it has been implemented unevenly by the Member States;
2. Welcomes the fact that some Member States are well advanced in implementing the MSP Directive, with integrated national strategies, dedicated bodies and sea-basin action plans;
3. Notes that maritime spatial plans are legally binding in some Member States and ***non-binding and more*** advisory in others; emphasises that implementation in Member States is often hindered by institutional segmentation, fragmented governance and inadequate legal mechanisms ***or insufficient dedicated financial and human resources and access to them, particularly through the EMFAF for Fisheries and Aquaculture Local Action Groups***;
- 3a. ***Highlights the fact that spatial planning of marine areas should include identification of problems and opportunities, collection of planning data, decision-making, implementation, and that, as part of such planning, special attention should be paid to fisheries and aquaculture***;
4. Emphasises that the implementation and effectiveness of MSP varies greatly between EU maritime regions, with some regions, such as the Baltic Sea or the North Sea, being largely covered by maritime spatial plans, while others, such as the Mediterranean Sea, have significantly less planning coverage;
5. Welcomes the Greater North Sea Basin Initiative (GNSBI), which brings together Member States and non-EU countries with the aim of achieving greater alignment and coordination on maritime spatial plans;
6. Highlights that cross-border initiatives remain limited and effective coordination is lacking, hampering efforts to address shared challenges across interconnected marine regions ; deplors the difficulties in MSP cooperation between Member States and non-EU countries, in particular neighbouring coastal states;
- 6a. ***Emphasises the effects of Brexit on maritime planning, in particular the development of marine protected areas and offshore renewable energy, but also other activities such as dense maritime transport and coastal tourism; highlights that those changes have led to the exclusion of the European fishing fleet from many fishing areas in British waters, and to a shift in fishing effort and high fishing pressure in the North Sea and Channel areas, to the detriment of European fisheries; calls for MSP in these areas to systematically incorporate these elements***;

- 6aa. *Stresses the need for coordination between Member States and with the United Kingdom in order to achieve effective and equitable management of the maritime basin and thus reduce the numerous conflicts of use, taking into account the economic, social and environmental dimensions of each activity; recalls in this regard the obligation under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) to cooperate across borders, in particular under Articles 7 and 8; calls in particular for genuine consultation with the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands on management measures in marine protected areas that take into account the socio-economic consequences borne by European fishers;*
- 6b. *Stresses that the Mediterranean basin is particularly affected by the proliferation of offshore energy platforms and other such infrastructure, which is significantly reducing the amount of space available for fisheries, limiting access to traditional fishing grounds and contributing to the fragmentation of maritime space; notes that while the Member States are responsible for designating the use of infrastructure in these areas, their decisions have a direct impact on the use of traditional fishing grounds and therefore need to be integrated within MSP processes in a coherent way; notes that the development of maritime tourism also has an effect on fisheries operations in the sea basin;*
- 6c. *Highlights the specific characteristics of the Adriatic Sea as a semi-enclosed and highly sensitive marine basin, subject to cumulative pressures from fisheries, aquaculture, maritime transport, tourism and coastal development; stresses that these pressures require a reinforced sea-basin and cross-border approach to maritime spatial planning; calls on the Commission and the Member States concerned, in cooperation with neighbouring non-EU coastal countries, to strengthen coordination, data sharing and joint governance mechanisms in the Adriatic Sea; underlines the importance of small-scale and coastal fisheries for the sea basin and the importance of its integration into maritime spatial planning, in order to safeguard their economic viability and cultural heritage;*
- 6d. *Highlights that the Baltic Sea is characterised by a number of unique features, including its status as a semi-enclosed sea basin, its high concentration of different types of economic activity, including fisheries, maritime transport and the expansion of marine renewable energy, and its ecosystem vulnerability; calls in this regard for an approach to maritime spatial planning that is sustainable and adjusted to this regional conditions; commends the ongoing work of the joint HELCOM-VASAB Working Group on MSP providing a firm foundation for sea-basin level coordination in the Baltic Sea;*
- 6e. *Stresses that the maritime basins of the outermost regions must also be included in the implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive, taking full account of their specific characteristics, including in interactions with third countries;*

COMP 4 – Benefit of MSP

AM falls: 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126, 128, 162

Groups supporting: EPP, S&D, ECR, Renew

Benefits of maritime spatial planning for fisheries and aquaculture

7. Regrets that the current MSP legal framework has not adequately delivered the expected benefits for fisheries; notes that MSP has not substantially contributed to improving predictability and stability for fisheries activities; emphasises the lack of minimum targets and measurable *environmental, social and economic* indicators for fisheries in MSP, *especially for small-scale operators*; *stresses the need for a coherent and effective implementation of EU maritime policy*;
- 7a. *Highlights, for the purpose of implementation of the MSP framework, the importance of having a comprehensive socio-economic analysis, including incorporating the viewpoints of small businesses and coastal communities; recalls the importance of fisheries and aquaculture in food sovereignty and in preserving related know-how for the Union, justifying its better recognition as being of major public interest in MSP*;
- 7b. *Stresses that maritime spatial planning must better integrate fisheries and aquaculture and actively address the spatial challenges affecting fisheries, including the cumulative effects of offshore energy, marine protected areas, shipping and defence zones, and avoid the progressive marginalisation of fishing activities; stresses that offshore windfarms should, whenever possible, be placed in zones that are less suitable for fishing, in order to minimise negative impacts on fisheries operations*;
- 7c. *Emphasises the essential role of small-scale fishing, such as in local employment, social cohesion and preservation of traditional skills; calls for MSP to take full account of this segment, particularly in terms of access to space, proximity to fishing grounds and safety of activities*;
- 7d. *Notes that offshore windfarms can have an impact on fisheries by changing the spatial distribution and abundance of commercially fished marine species as well as access restrictions for safety reasons or restrictions on fishing methods, while some potential benefits for fishers have been observed these are only relevant if fishers are practically and feasibly able to operate in these areas* ;
8. Highlights that while the MSP legal framework brings marginal benefits to aquaculture, improvements are needed in the designation of maritime space, further recognition of the role of aquaculture within the framework, cross-border coherence, legal certainty and the timeline and impact of licensing *procedures*; *emphasises in particular the need for better incorporation of aquaculture in MSP as well as considering other actions such as the development of a possible common aquaculture policy, in order to take better account of this key sector for European food security*;

9. Emphasises that the objective of minimising conflict between the various sectors and users of the sea has not been substantially fulfilled, particularly with regard to fisheries and aquaculture, ***including shellfish farming and emerging sectors such as seaweed farming, which have seen a reduction in the spaces available to them, affecting their competitiveness and possibilities for the development of their activities;***
10. Highlights that the nature of conflict over the use of maritime space varies according to the type of fisheries and aquaculture activities concerned, and such activities may also compete with each other for maritime space; emphasises that the main conflicts affecting fisheries are the loss of fishing grounds due to the exclusion of maritime zones, access restrictions, competition for access and spatial fragmentation, ***and declining state of several marine ecosystems***, while the main conflicts affecting aquaculture are zoning overlaps, environmental concerns ***such as pollution and eutrophication***, and capture competition;
- 10a. ***Recalls that fisheries and aquaculture are dependent on the geographical location of marine resources and the healthy state of marine ecosystems, and that they are strongly linked to the seafood value chain and employment in coastal regions and therefore not suited for relocation;***
11. Emphasises that fisheries do not benefit from priority or dedicated areas and often have to operate in unallocated maritime spaces ***that are increasingly being squeezed out by other activities***; notes that while aquaculture, ***including seaweed farming***, is in principle more suitable for reserved areas, approaches vary greatly between ***and even within*** Member States and licensing procedures are often burdensome;
12. Highlights that while some Member States have established multi-use zones, the approach is mainly implemented through a project-based approach; emphasises that a multi-use approach is proving very difficult to implement for certain activities, particularly between fisheries, biodiversity protection and marine renewable energy; notes that a multi-use approach also raises insurance and security concerns for fishers and aquaculture professionals; ***highlights that while multi-use could hold potential in addressing the cumulative impacts of human activities, more research is needed to assess its feasibility and impact; points out that the designation of such zones should be based on impact assessment of the different activities undertaken therein taking into account economic, social and environmental impact, which needs to be addressed with the proper involvement throughout the process of operators from all of the relevant sectors as well as other relevant stakeholders;***
13. Welcomes successful examples of co-location of activities, such as fixed or floating offshore wind infrastructure that can also be used to develop aquaculture, shellfish ***and algae*** farming, protection of habitats for marine fauna and flora or regenerative activities, ***as well as fisheries activities such as passive and low impact fisheries;*** ***highlights, in that regard, the need for increased exchange of good practices as well as more research, especially in relation to ecological impact and economic potential;***
14. Highlights that land-sea coordination remains a critical weakness in the implementation of MSP, ***in particular the failure to take into account the effects of land-based pollution on marine ecosystems when implementing measures to protect biodiversity;***

- 14. a** *Points out the importance of fisheries and port infrastructure and related facilities and the need to ensure that MSP is coherent in relation to such infrastructure investments, in line with the EU Port Strategy, while taking into account that all maritime activities hinges on effective land-sea coordination;*

COMP 5 – Stakeholder involvement and data collection

AM falls: 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 141.

Groups supporting: EPP, S&D, Renew, ECR, Greens, The Left

Stakeholder involvement and data collection

15. Highlights that stakeholder and coastal community involvement in the MSP process has increased but remains constrained; regrets that this involvement often lacks early and formal engagement and consultation, offering limited opportunity for genuine influence on planning decisions; **welcomes, in this regard, the Commission initiative "implementation dialogue" on MSP;**
16. Notes good examples of stakeholder participation in some Member States, such as national consultations and participatory processes; regrets, however, the lack of binding provisions for **Member States on stakeholder participation**; notes that this hinders the participation of **relevant stakeholders such as** fishers and aquaculture professionals **as well as interest groups and the public concerned** in consultation and decision-making processes **particularly regarding the location of offshore renewable energy projects;**
17. Emphasises that fisheries and aquaculture are often overshadowed by other, more powerful or economically important sectors, such as offshore energy; **notes reports of structural power imbalances between maritime sectors, ;** deplores the fact that certain sectors and operators often bypass consultation processes, at the expense of less organised actors, such as small-scale fishers, **including fishers on foot, such as shellfish gatherers; calls for comprehensive, accessible and inclusive consultation processes with all stakeholders, and the creation of corrective governance mechanisms, including transparent guidelines, aimed at ensuring balanced and transparent decision-making, alleviating the potential for conflict and creating a level playing field between fisheries and other sectors;**
18. Deplores the lack of harmonised and comparable data on the state of the ocean and seas, fishery resources and the impact of climate change, as well as the lack of proper **social and economic** data, including assessment of impacts of MSP on coastal communities; emphasises the lack of harmonisation between Member States' data collection systems;
19. Highlights that data misalignment, such as incompatible geospatial baselines, and temporal mismatch, such as distinct revision cycles for maritime spatial plans, hinder the implementation of coherent maritime spatial planning and an ecosystem-based approach; **recalls that modelling, mapping and spatial analysis tools are decision-making aids and cannot replace democratic debate or political compromise;**

COMP 6 – Recommendations

AM falls: 95, 112, 114, 117, 119, 123, 127, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274

Groups supporting: EPP, S&D, ECR, Renew

Recommendations

20. Stresses the need for a more holistic approach and better coordination between relevant EU legislation, in particular between the MSP Directive, ***the CFP***, and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, in order to ensure consistent and effective implementation of maritime spatial planning, ***including the ecosystem-based approach, with the aim of contributing to achieve Good Environmental Status; underlines as well that MSP must fully respect the CFP as the exclusive European Union legislative framework for fisheries management and should therefore not be used to indirectly introduce fisheries management measures, especially if incompatible with the ambition to strengthen the role for fisheries activities in MSP;***
21. Believes that maritime spatial plans should better reflect spatial, environmental and socio-economic needs, as well as the specific characteristics of each sea basin, including connected exclusive economic zones; stresses that the Member States should strengthen coordination between land-use and marine authorities when designing and implementing maritime spatial plans ***and incorporating assessments of the impact of land-based activities on coastal waters; believes that Member States should take into account regional specificities, including island regions and outermost regions, and respecting the administrative traditions in each Member State;***
- 21 a. ***Stresses the need for Member States to strengthen coordination both between Member States and within Member States, in particular between national and regional authorities, as well as horizontal coordination among authorities responsible for, among others, environmental, fisheries, energy and transport policies when designing and implementing maritime spatial plans in order to ensure a coherent, ecosystem-based and integrated approach;***
22. Calls for the implementation of a ***bottom-up***, balanced, multi-use approach to maritime spatial planning, ***by adopting an approach aimed at avoiding adverse effects on marine resources and biodiversity, and therefore*** on fisheries and aquaculture and to ensure that these activities are not excluded from the maritime space; considers that the development of certain activities related to the blue economy must not be at the expense of sustainable and resilient seafood production, food sovereignty and the preservation of marine biodiversity; ***believes in this regard that the strategic importance of food security should be better anchored in the forthcoming revision of the MSP***

Directive; calls therefore for fishing and aquaculture to be recognised as strategic sectors of major public interest which provides essential contributions to EU food sovereignty and food security as well as strategic autonomy and coastal employment and that priority consideration should be given to them in maritime spatial planning, particularly for segments that cannot be relocated;

- 22 a. Calls for an evidence-based approach to multi-use, recognising that coexistence between fisheries and offshore energy remains limited in practice and should not be used to justify the exclusion of fisheries from maritime space; stresses that the multi-use approach should be pursued on the basis of technical and scientific criteria, reflecting the reality of how fishing and aquaculture actually operates; stresses that the designation of multi-use zones should be based on a cumulative impact assessment of the different activities undertaken therein and a rigorous analysis of navigability and safety; calls for all relevant sectors to be directly and properly involved throughout this process;*
- 22 b. Considers that maritime spatial planning must adopt a dynamic and adaptive approach, taking into account changes in the marine environment and marine resources, using regularly updated scientific and socio-economic data and indicators, particularly when establishing areas which could exclude fisheries activities such as offshore wind farms and the designation of certain marine protected areas; emphasises that the planning process should reflect the dynamic nature of fishing, with fleets often moving around depending on seasonal availability and stock movements, and certain types of fishing gear requiring considerable room in which to operate;*
- 22 c. Calls for inclusive governance mechanisms ensuring the direct and structured involvement of relevant stakeholders, such as fishers, including small-scale fishers as well as regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs), where relevant, in the decision-making, monitoring and review processes for plans;*
- 23. Emphasises the need for strengthened support for and systematic consideration of fisheries within MSP; supports the establishment of clear spatial zoning and priority zones for fisheries, taking into account the movement and development of fishery resources, the recognition of traditional fishing and aquaculture zones as well as the need for preservation and protection of the environment and improvement of the state of fish stocks, and that it should be tailored to different fleet segments, as well as sea basins, and based on robust scientific and socio-economic assessments and indicators, in order to bring greater visibility and predictability to the fisheries sector; calls for mandatory assessment of the cumulative socio-economic impacts of fishing displacement, including effects on the competitiveness of the European fleet, its profitability, safety at sea and generational renewal;*
- 23a. Stresses the need to strengthen research into mapping and modelling fishing areas and fishery resources; considers that the delimitation of priority zones for fisheries and the planning of fishing activities must adopt a dynamic approach in order to adapt to the phenomena of change and migration of fish stocks affecting historical distribution areas;*

- 23b. *Calls on the Commission to propose a mechanism of compensatory measures or insurance schemes for the fisheries sector when its activities are displaced by alternative uses of the sea, including financial compensation measures, priority for new compatible uses and support for the redesign of fishing routes, or technological investments;*
- 23c. *Highlights the potential negative consequences of far-reaching restrictions on marine activities such as fisheries for coastal communities, not least in the islands and outermost regions; calls for the development, implementation and review of maritime spatial plans to be accompanied in all cases by social and territorial impact assessments, focusing in particular on employment, working conditions, the safety of fishers and the sustainability of coastal communities as well as to assess the biological and socio-economic effectiveness of fisheries restrictions and measures;*
24. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to further integrate aquaculture and shellfish farming, *as well as fishing on foot, including shellfish gathering*, into MSP and to recognise the ecosystem services provided by low-trophic *and low-carbon* aquaculture; *calls on the Commission to consider further actions such as the development of a possible common aquaculture policy as a tool to facilitate this integration;* calls for the designation of dedicated maritime spaces for sustainable aquaculture development zones, such as for low-carbon and low-trophic *aquaculture*, in MSP; calls for the facilitation of licensing procedures and the reduction of regulatory barriers to the development of these activities; *highlights that licensing procedures need to be expedited and underpinned by clear environmental requirements with a view to maximising socio-economic benefits;* *calls for the provision of incentives to boost the sustainable development of aquaculture, especially low-trophic aquaculture, including diversification to non-feed species such as seaweed cultivation;*
25. Emphasises the need for transparent, multi-stakeholder governance in MSP; calls on Member States to ensure the early, systematic, meaningful and continuous participation of the relevant stakeholders, *including Advisory Councils and fishers, aquaculture farmers and shellfish farmers, at all stages of MSP design*, processes, *implementation*, final outcomes *and revision*, and for the inclusion of transparent feedback on how stakeholder input is used in decision-making; calls for fair treatment of all stakeholders and coastal *and island* communities, regardless of their financial, administrative or organisational means, *through transparent consultation formats;*
26. Believes that co-management should be the model for governance and decision-making in MSP; emphasises the benefits of this model, which allows for the direct involvement of stakeholders, better management of fishery resources, the sharing of best practices and an approach tailored to local realities, *particularly when it builds on existing and proven structures and on the practical knowledge of local fishing communities as well as other structures such as RFMOs;* *stresses that co-management can also help to promote generational renewal in the sector and strengthen the economic resilience of small-scale and coastal fleets;*
27. Stresses the benefits of bottom-up structures for local MSP implementation, such as Community-Led Local Development and Local Action Groups, *local and regional*

authorities, fishers' and gatherers' organisations, women's organisations in fisheries and other organisations at local and regional levels;

28. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to support the capacity building of stakeholders, particularly small-scale fishers, *including fishers on foot, such as shellfish gatherer* and their organisations, and coastal *and island* communities, *including the outermost regions*, so that they are better equipped to *actively and effectively* participate in public consultations and decision-making processes relating to MSP; *stresses the importance, in this regard, of supporting generational renewal and calls on Member States to ensure that spatial planning decisions do not create additional barriers for young people entering fisheries;*
29. Stresses that the designation of areas dedicated to offshore renewable energy or to the protection of marine ecosystems must take into account the impact on fisheries and aquaculture, *including historical and traditional fishing grounds*; insists on the need to systematically conduct cumulative environmental and *social and economic* impact assessments *prior to zone demarcation*, and to ensure that the professionals affected, particularly fishers in the case of offshore wind farm projects, are informed in advance and *involved* on a mandatory basis *in consultations* before decisions are taken; calls, in this regard, for assessments of the impact on the state of fishery resources *and for the quantification of the key social and economic effects on fisheries resulting from offshore wind farms to be carried out;*
- 29a. *Stresses that measures to protect marine ecosystems must be based on sound scientific and socio-economic assessments and must be tailored to the protection needs of each area; emphasises that the establishment and management of different categories of marine protected areas, where compatible with conservation objectives, and the best available scientific advice, should allow for coexistence with sustainable fishing activities, including through appropriate, differentiated management measures and avoiding automatic exclusion; highlights also the potential of 'Other Effective area-based Conservation Measures' (OECM);*
- 29b. *Calls on the Commission and the Member States to systematically and scientifically assess the potential for co-use between different maritime uses, including marine protected areas or in the case of offshore renewable energy, and to avoid treating different maritime zones as mutually exclusive; emphasises that the active involvement of all stakeholders and especially fishers in the design, management and evaluation of marine protected areas contributes to greater environmental effectiveness, greater acceptance of conservation measures and better integration of these areas into maritime spatial planning; stresses that better account must be taken for climate change and shifting fish stock distributions ensuring a flexible approach to zoning that reflects the dynamic nature of fisheries;*
30. Calls on the Commission to support a more cross-border and sea-basin-based approach to maritime spatial planning by promoting existing initiatives, such as the GNSBI; calls on the Commission and Member States, together with coastal neighbouring states, to engage in joint management regional platforms, drawing on the example of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (also known as the Helsinki Commission or HELCOM), *including with a view to identifying shared fisheries corridors;*

31. Calls on Member States to complement national plans with plans focused more on sea basins and to develop, where relevant, macro-regional planning strategies, including joint maritime spatial plans; urges Member States and non-EU countries, particularly neighbouring coastal states, to deepen their cooperation on maritime spatial planning *particularly in the basins adjacent to the United Kingdom, the Mediterranean and the Baltic Sea; supports a stronger sea-basin approach to MSP, ensuring that fisheries are fully integrated into cross-border planning frameworks and not disadvantaged by fragmented national decisions;*
- 31a. *Calls for enhanced cooperation on maritime spatial planning between the EU, Member States and third countries; stresses the need for better coordination between the coastal States in the Channel; highlights specifically the case of the Channel regions, where cooperation with the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands must be improved, particularly with regard to the designation of marine protected areas; believes that cooperation in this regard must include obligatory and transparent stakeholder consultation processes; calls on the EU, the UK as well as other relevant parties to establish a regional management plan for the Channel and the North Sea in order to ensure sustainable exploitation of resources and multi-annual management of fisheries;*
- 31b. *Emphasises that such cooperation with third countries must ensure a level playing field and avoid displacement of fishing effort to the detriment of EU fleets and fishing communities; calls on the Commission, therefore, to pursue a structured approach to dialogue and cooperation with neighbouring coastal countries in an effort to promote similar environmental, management and social standards and to be ready to take needed measures to protect Union interests as necessary;*
32. Calls for the integration of climate change mitigation *and adaptation* measures as well as other relevant environmental measures into MSP, in order to tackle issues affecting fisheries and aquaculture, such as coastal erosion, rising *water* temperatures, *invasive species*, ocean acidification and pollution *from both land-based and marine sources, as well as cumulative impacts; stresses that these solutions must be proportionate, adapted to local conditions and assessed in advance in terms of cost-effectiveness, avoiding one-size-fits-all approaches that do not take into account the realities of each sea basin; underlines that fishers can play a key role in monitoring, early detection and conservation efforts, provided that they are properly involved, trained and supported;*
- 32a. *Emphasises the effects of coastal erosion and shoreline retreat on coastlines, especially on areas where aquaculture activities are established and developed; calls, in this regard, for a European plan for coastal resilience, incorporating integrated coastal zone management, climate change mitigation and adaptation, land-sea interactions, marine and land pollution, coastal adaptation measures and targeted support for aquaculture; believes that Member States play an important role in this regard and that these effects must be taken into account in Member States' MSP plans;*
33. Stresses the need to allocate significant resources to data collection and scientific research, as well as to enhancing data sharing and coordination between Member States; believes that more standardised and harmonised data and methodologies will

help to secure the place of fisheries and aquaculture in MSP; emphasises, in this regard, the need to develop and update scientific data on the impact of climate change on *marine aquatic* resources, particularly in terms of changes in *the geographical distribution of fish stocks, spawning grounds* or displacement of fish stocks;

- 33a. *Calls for improved and harmonised data collection and systematic mapping of fishing activities as a precondition for fair and evidence-based MSP; calls on the Commission and Member States to use the best available and updated data and information;*
- 33b. *Considers that the future European Ocean Observation Initiative, ‘Ocean Eye’, should strengthen and harmonise marine data collection, thereby contributing to improved maritime spatial planning; calls as well for the potential of the European Digital Twin of the Ocean to be used to better understand and anticipate the effects of climate change on the state of the seas and marine resources, and to develop appropriate maritime planning strategies;*
- 33c. *Stresses the need to dovetail MSP with the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and Horizon Europe, as well as under the future MFF, in order to foster research and innovation, including in areas specifically designated for sustainable and innovative uses; believes that the Commission and Member States should encourage the use of digital technologies such as European artificial intelligence tools to support maritime spatial planning;*
34. Calls on the Commission to rigorously monitor the implementation of the MSP Directive; considers that the next MSP Directive evaluation report should focus on the spatial implications for fisheries and aquaculture, stakeholder involvement and cross-border cooperation, and provide recommendations on how the MSP Directive could deliver better results in terms of environmental, social and economic sustainability; *considers that maritime spatial planning should be assessed in terms of spatial equity, understood as the equitable distribution of benefits and constraints among stakeholders, territories and generations, and not solely in terms of its economic or administrative efficiency;*
35. Calls on the Commission to consolidate the European Maritime Spatial Planning Platform by providing examples of MSP projects, mapping tools and good practices; urges, in this regard, Member States to make greater use of this platform when developing their maritime spatial plans *in order to facilitate transparent policy decisions without ruling out genuine consultation in the resolution of conflicts of use and interests;*
36. Supports the revision of the MSP Directive as part of the ‘Ocean Act’ expected in late 2026; *notes that this revision is being done in parallel with the revision of the MSFD;* considers that this revision should establish a coherent framework to improve coordination between the existing legislation and regulatory framework, by streamlining overlapping regulations, aligning objectives, streamlining existing targets and introducing minimum targets to be reached in MSP plans, improving coherence between marine and terrestrial spatial planning, and establishing shared governance tools; *believes that this revision should, in particular, make the provisions on the participation of stakeholders, especially fishers and coastal communities, legally*

binding with more harmonised application by all Member States; believes that the proposed act should create synergies among the different regulations and sectors in a true holistic policy coordination, without imposing new sectorial obligations; believes as well that minimum standards for securing space for fisheries and aquaculture must be introduced in order to contribute to food sovereignty, sustainability and competitiveness of the blue economy and strategic autonomy;

- 36a. Considers that the MSP Directive revision should also deepen the cross-border, multi-use approach *to mitigate cumulative impacts and to strengthen* the involvement of stakeholders; *considers it also important to use the revision to reduce fragmentation and uncertainty for the fishing fleet ;*
- 36b. *Considers that the Ocean Act should involve all EU territories and take into account their specific characteristics, particularly in the case of the outermost regions and island regions; stresses the importance of the involvement of Parliament’s Committee on Fisheries in the elaboration of the upcoming proposal, especially in relation to food sovereignty, the strategic role of fisheries and aquaculture and the effective implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy;*
37. Considers that the forthcoming review of the MSP Directive should be *closely linked to the implementation of the Ocean Pact* and to sufficient financial resources, particularly within the next multiannual financial framework, as well as concrete actions, *in order to ensure its effective implementation and avoid negative impacts on Member States and stakeholders; stresses that such resources must be sufficient, predictable and easily accessible, and that their use must prioritise measures with a tangible impact;*
38. Calls on the Commission to fully integrate MSP into the development of its Vision 2040 for fisheries and aquaculture and to link these initiatives to the conclusion of the evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy and EMFAF;
39. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission, and to the governments and parliaments of the Member States.