COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(87) 542 final

Brussels, 9 November 1987

Report to the Council

on the situation of the herring market

COM(87) 542 final

com. 542

Report to the Council on the situation of the herring market

After several years of decline attributable to the ban imposed on fishing for biological reasons in a number of Community areas between 1977 and 1981/82, (1) herring fishing is again accounting for an appreciable proportion of fishing in the Community and is playing a not inconsiderable role in the socio-economic balance of many regions.

The aim of this report is to take stock of the market situation and to present to the Council a document for reflection and discussion based in particular on possible solutions proposed during discussions held to consider the market situation for herring by Commission and Council working parties.

(1) See Report on the situation on the herring market COM(84) 280 final of 17 May 1984 and COM(84) 629 final of 15 November 1984.

I. Situation report

According to the information available for 1986, overall production was lower than the total volume of catch quotas allocated to the Member States, prices were down, the external trade structure was expanding with exports rising sharply and visible Community consumption was stable.

1. Overall production lower than the total volume of catch quotas allocated to the Member States and relatively stable as compared with the previous year.

   In 1986 total Community production was only 417.372 t, (1) i.e. 6% up on 1985, while the prospective catches available under the quotas were 558.630 t (15% up on 1985). A number of Member States (Belgium, Germany, Denmark and France) used up only a part, small or large depending on the circumstances, of their potential catches.

   In the first two months of 1987 this trend seemed to be continuing, judging from production during that period by several Member States, but subject to uncertainty linked with the provisional nature of the figures and the fact that herring fishing is seasonal.
   This stabilization of Community production at around 400 000 T seems to be attributable largely to the prices situation.

---

(1) The 1986 figures are provisional (source : Catch report). See Table No 1.

2. Prices down on 1985

Average prices in 1986 in the Community as a whole were down by around 10% on 1985 (1). As against this general trend, the situation fluctuated appreciably from one Member State to another for reasons connected principally with the quality of the product offered for sale, its method of presentation and market outlets.

The general implication is that the fall in prices was attributable mainly to the rise in Community production. The previous report (2) demonstrated the close relationship that existed during the average period running from 1977 to 1982 between quantities placed on the market and price stability. Since production was up by 6% on 1985 and by 43% on 19894, it was inevitable that prices should drop for want of a significant increase in outlets.

It is not surprising in this general context that withdrawals, in spite of a fall of 3% in the guide price in 1986, remained sizeable (3), especially in Ireland, where production rose by almost 40% In 1986 as compared with 1985.

3. An expanding external trade structure with a significant increase in exports.

A point worth noting is that in 1986 Community exports of herring rose by a greater amount than imports.

---

(1) Estimated average price for herring. Basis of comparison at the representative ports, all categories included. (see Table No. 2)

(2) See COM(84) 280 final, pp. 2 and 3.

(3) See Table No. 2

a. Regarding exports, these consist mainly of fresh and frozen whole herring (1).

- In the case of fresh and chilled herring, exports rose by 40% (54 173 t in 1985; 75 825 t in 1986, almost entirely to East European countries (Klondijking) and from the United Kingdom only (94% of the volume of Community exports). (2)
- In the case of frozen herring, the rise in exports was even greater (49 544 t) in 1985, 84 341 t in 1986, i.e. a rise of 70%) with Nigeria, Poland, the Ivory Coast and Japan being the principal recipients. In volume terms, the Netherlands accounted for almost 90% of these total exports (3).

b. Imports of the same products and presentations rose by 18% for fresh herring (81 518 t imported in 1986, mainly from Norway and Sweden) and 28% for frozen herring (21 664 t, mainly from Norway). (4)

It should be pointed out also that intra-Community trade has been stable overall (down for fresh herring and up for frozen herring).

Nineteen eighty-six will therefore have witnessed a considerable expansion in Klondijking activities in United Kongdom waters, within its 12 mile limit (40% up in 1986 on 1985, accounting altogether in 1986 for 77% of the United Kingdom's overall herring production) and a very considerable rise in exports of frozen herring, principally from the Netherlands.

---

(1) See Tables Nos 3 and 4

(2) See Table No 5

(3) See Table No 6

(4) See Tables Nos 3, 4, 7 and 8.

4. Apparently stable supply and consumption (1)

A comparison of the situation in 1986 with that in 1985 shows that the very steep rise in exports of fresh and frozen herring more than made up for the rise in imports and catches. From this it would appear that the quantities available fell slightly in 1986, subject to a certain degree of uncertainty as to the figures, the various presentations of herring not having been converted into whole equivalent (2).

Visible consumption in 1986 was approximately 320 000 t which was virtually the same volume as in the previous year.

In 1987, it is possible that this level of consumption will change slightly in response to consumer reaction, during the summer, to the unfortunate occurence of parasitosis affecting herring in particular.

The impact of this, which is partly psychological, should be possible to resolve.

To sum up this analysis, it would appear that the balance on the Community market in herring in 1986 was somewhat fragile, overall production being of the order of 420 000 t, a rise of 6% on 1985 but below the total volume of catch quotas allocated to the Member States of around 550 000 t. This relative stabilization of production was the result mainly of price movements which were down appreciably in 1986 on 1985, a factor which made herring fishing less attractive to several Member States and encouraged them to limit production.

---

(1) see Table n° 9

(2) (Example: the description "whole" can cover herring flaps which are equivalent to 2,32 whole herring).

If this voluntary limitation had not taken place and if exports of both fresh (Klondijking) and frozen herring had not increased appreciably, the situation would undoubtedly have been more difficult. But what of the future ? Can the market adapt itself in an orderly manner to a changing situation where among other things increased catches will be a possibily as will increasingly intense competition on the Commmunity and international market, both from non-member countries and among the Member States themselves ?

There are a number of worrying signs. For example, intra-Community trade is relatively stagnant while imports from non-member countries are on the increase. A further example, sales to the Klondijkers rose steeply in 1986. The origins of and justification for this phenomenon of "Klondijking" are set out in the situation report above and in the urgent need for outlets. The reasons for its recent development are open to question however. At present, almost 80% of the United Kingdom's herring production is sold to the Klondijkers, on terms over which the producers concerned do not appear to have total control. Recent competition from Norway has only worsened the situation while highlighting the lack of guarantees offered in the long term by this outlet. Is it not the case that abundant supplies make the buying non-member countries to a large extent masters of the situation ?

In these very difficult circumstances, suggestions have been made on various occasions within the Commission and Council working groups to restore, even if only partially, balance to the market in herring. An examination of these in the context of this report is all the more worthwhile in that it will underline the difficulty of reaching a solution which can satisfy the very wide diversity of situations.

II. Solutions suggested within the Commission and Council working groups

These can be divided into two main groups, one aimed at the control of imports and the other at improving intra-Community trade and developing domestic consumption, to which may be added some possibly more specific solutions.

1. Control of imports

Since Community production has been rising steeply as a result of the expansion of catch opportunities available to the Member States, would it not be appropriate to limit Community imports ? The question is relevant, especially where there is evidence, as has been noted above, of an appreciable rise in such imports (up 19% in 1986 on 1985 (1). Are the proposed solutions at all likely to remedy this situation ?

(a) Alteration of the import arrangements for whole herring

- It will be recalled that for the period 15 February to 15 June, the consolidated duty on fresh, chilled or frozen herring whole, headless or in pieces, was zero. For the period 16 June to 14 February, for the same presentations, it was consolidated at 15%, without prejudice to an annual zero-duty quota entered in the GATT of 34 000 t subject to observance of the reference price (2) and an agreed quota with Sweden of 20 000 t of fresh or chilled whole herring, subject also to observance of the reference price.

---

(1) See above p. 4 and Tables Nos 3 and 4.

(2) In the event of failure to observe the reference price, provision is made for a compensatory charge.

- Should these import arrangements not be altered? Could herring flaps, at least, not be excluded from the 34 000 t quota consolidated in GATT?

As matters stand, since the consolidated tariff heading (03.01 B Ia) 2) includes herring flaps, such alteration would entail a renegotiation of the concession granted within GATT with the non-member countries concerned, in particular Norway, Sweden and perhaps Canada.

This would be a delicate operation, demanding reciprocal concessions from the Community to secure uncertain results.

The present structure of Community imports is determined to a large extent by the specific requirements of the Community's processing industry, especially the German one, and it is not at all certain that amending the existing tariff heading would have any significant impact on the current situation.

(b) Complaints have also been made on several occasions concerning partial failure to observe the reference price. It would seem that when deliveries of herring are made in the Community, the reference price is not inveriably observed. If this should prove to be true and evidence were supplied that it was, by the customs authorities in particular, the Commission would not hesitate to apply the rules laid down for the purpose.

So far, no such evidence has been produced.

It should be pointed out in this connection in passing that some Member States frequently fail to forward all the information required under the Regulation which is essential moreover for its application. The Commission has been obliged to initiate an infringement procedure against those States.

c. Fixing of a reference price for frozen herring and fresh herring flaps and pieces.

With a view also to the improved control of imports, would it not be desirable to fix a reference price for frozen herring and fresh herring flaps and pieces?

From a strictly technical point of view, this would be possible.

However, the fixing of a reference price would not resolve the problem.

A reference price is not a minimum import price and protective measures, if any, could be adopted only under very strict conditions (Article 21 of the basic Regulation lays down inter alia that substantial quantities must be imported during three successive market days). The remark made above about Member States' notifications to the Commission is of the utmost importance here.

In any case, a decision of this nature should be considered in the more general context of the Community's fishing relations with certain non-member countries, in particular Norway and Canada.

But is the problem not of a different nature? In 1986 imports of whole herring (fresh, chilled and frozen) greatly exceeded the quotas allocated.

A substantial volume was imported on which the customs duties (1) were paid and, for the most part, in the case of fresh and chilled herring, at prices equivalent to or exceeding the reference price. The Community processing industry has not only continued to import on the basis of its specific requirements, but has increased its imports from

(1) According to official statistics, approximately 20% of the total quantity whole herring imported.

non-member countries. Why has it not made more of an effort to obtain its supplies in the Community ? The question is serious enough for consideration to be given now to the possibilities raised in the working groups for improving the situation.

3. Improvement of intra-Community trade and development of domestic consumption.

A previous Commission report (1) emphasised that some specific requirements of the Community's processing industry could not be met within the Community. The report revealed, however, that such requirements were limited in volume and that it should be possible for most of that industry's supplies to be met out of Community's raw materials, subject to compliance with a number of fundamental requirements, in particular quality. In other words, leaving aside a certain volume of imports which is difficult to reduce in that it meets certain very specific requirements (size and fat content notably) and does not, it would appear, exceed the quotas allocated by the Community (GATT and Sweden), available Community production could, in theory at least, better cover the requirements of the Member States industry. Not only is this not happening, but klondijking is continuing to grow, as we have seen with the resulting drawbacks of a lack of value added and a reliance on buying non-member countries.

---

(1) see report COM 629 final

A reason frequently put forward to explain this situation is the remoteness of some Member States from the Community's main consumption centres (particularly in the case of the German market). Such remoteness could be at the root of the difficulties encountered in intra-Community trade.
As a way of remedying it, two suggestions have been made : the introduction of a regional coefficient in favour of some Community geographical areas and, the application to herring of the carry over premium.

a) Introduction of a regional withdrawal price.

- It is generally asserted, in favour of such a measure, that it should help compensate, partially at least, for geographical handicaps (notably regarding supplies for the processing industries). There would be no cost to the budget. The size of the coefficient and its duration could be adapted to the objective market situation. Such a provision would be likely in the future, moreover, to prevent certain producer organizations from deciding to cease applying the Community withdrawal price as happened in 1986.

- Agita[illegible] against such a measure is the risk of distortions of competition between the Community's processing industries. This is a sensitive problem. It is not the case that a provision of this nature, adopted at a time when active steps are being taken to establish, for 1 January 1993, the major internal market would pose a partial threat to the unity of prices and of the market ? Admittedly provision is made in the Regulation for this type of measure to respond to specific, very special, situations, in order to offset certain handicaps, in particular geographical ones (outlying regions remote from the major consumer centres).

In practice, however, these provisions have always applied to species affected by successive accessions and to help align over time prices that deviated too much at the outset. This is not the case here and the fixing of a regional coefficient could be regarded, from certain points of view, as a step backwards, unified prices having until now been characteristic feature of the Community market in herring.

In a similar vein, the prospect has occasionally been raised of increasing the negative tolerence margin to minus 20%. Such a provision would be too permanent and general however not to risk undermining, if it were introduced, the balance of the market. It would also constitute a serious threat, in view of the extent of the difference adopted, to the principle of price unity. On the other hand, a modest increase of 5% in the positive tolerence margin (i.e. 10% instead of the existing 5%) could be more readily contemplated. Such a measure, which has already been adopted for the aid arrangements for Norway lobsters and crab, would be more acceptable than the solution of the regional coefficient vis-à-vis the large internal market. It would be more in keeping with the philosophy of the tolerence margin than increasing the latter to minus 20%.

b) The inclusion of herring in the list of species to which the carry-over premium can be applied (Article 14 of the basic Regulation).

The arguments put forward in support of this measure are as follows :
the application of the carry-over premium to herring would not only help reduce the quantity of withdrawn products destroyed but would allow them to be stabilized,

stored and disposed of subsequently when the market was able to absorb them. The results would be satisfactory for everyone since by enabling major production problems to be overcome (supplies varying appreciably depending on the season, fishing grounds, herring qualities), the market could be supplied throughout the year with the different varieties of product required by the industry. Given the limited volume of production liable to be taken into consideration (twofold limitation of 20% and 15% provided for in Articles 13 and 14 of the basic Regulation), this measure could not seriously affect the interests of the Community processing industry. On the contrary, it would be likely to favour the Community's preference sought after. It would be no charge on the Community budget since it would involve withdrawn products which, in any case, would have to be granted financial compensation that would cost more. In addition, the benefit of the carry-over premium has been extended to all new species added, on the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community, to Annex I to the basic Regulation and, from 1 January 1987, it applies also the anchovy and sardines.

In opposition to this line of arguments, the risk can be pointed to above all of possible discrimination against the processing industries to the benefit of the producer's organizations. This is an old grievance that has already been aired during the preparatory discussions on the implementation of the carry-over premium. It has never been shown to be justified.

Quite the contrary, the operation of the premium has not yet brought to light discrimination such as might pose a serious threat to the interests of the processing industries in question. This risk is all the more theoretical now that the market is increasingly demanding products with a high added value for the manufacture of which the producer's organizations, in the present circumstances, are playing a subsidiary role only.

c) <u>Introduction of a promotional measure for products with a view to increasing domestic consumption</u>.

This eventuality has also been raised. It should be possible to put it into effect under the structural rules in force. (1)

To conclude this second point on the desired improvement of intra-Community trade and the development of domestic consumption, the Commission would like to recall out, for the record, the ressources available to the Member States under the structural policy both the restructuring of the fleet by renewal or modernization (Regulation (EEC) N° 4028/86) or for the processing of marketing of fishery products (Regulation (EEC) N° 355/77).
These structural instruments, by helping to stabilize production and thereby adapt it better to the very diversified demands of the industry and by enabling the industry to update itself according to consumer needs,

---

(1) Regulation (EEC) N° 4028/86, 18.12.1986, OJ N° L 376.

these structural instruments should also be able to make a not inconsiderable contribution to the improvement of intra-Community trade.

3. Other points for consideration

Leaving aside certain suggestions that export refunds be granted, a not very realistic approach in the current situation, given the present growth of exports (up 48% in 1986 on 1985, 70% of which was for frozen whole herring alone), the very steep budgetary cost of a measure of this nature and the related income which could not fail to arise from it, mention must be made in this report of the likelihood of the re-opening of direct fishing for herring for industrial purposes.

Since part of the problem for the herring market is one of over-supply vis-à-vis the possibilities of the various markets and since catch quotas are in all cases under-utilized, should the Community not be considering the advisibility of amending its existing rules that effect, in the same way as the Norwegian rules have been amended ?

In support of this measure it can be asserted that it should, not for the reasons outlined above, have a negative impact on fishing for human consumption. On the contrary, the price of herring for this type of consumption can be expected to rise. Two factors militate against it, however :

- firstly, the crisis on the world market in by-products (meal, and oil), aggravated in the Community by the fall in the value of the dollar compared with the ECU which has been responsible, for some years now for the sharp drop in prices in the Community;

- secondly, the control problems which, without being decisive, are nevertheless real and should be given close attention.

Similarly, should a study not be made of the possibility of developing herring roe production for export ? For some years now a trade has been developing in the export of herring roe from the Community to Japan. Several Member States are involved. There would appear also to be certain prospects in the pharmacological industry of using male herring gonads for therapeutic purposes (1).

In this situation, where the market is expanding, could provisions not be adopted for the management of certain stocks to facilitate and increase production of the product ? These could include, for example, the opening of the North Sea spawning grounds during the reproduction periods. This would give rise to the need, however, given the heavy concentration of herring banks in those areas, for very effective control measures to prevent the TAC, being exceeded; any such decision would have to be adopted in the light of scientific opinion, currently being applied by Article 6(2) of Regulation (EEC) N°4034/86, and furthermore, since it is a joint stock, by observing the Community's obligations towards Norway. Should this possibility not be explored ?

---

(1) Notably to control AIDS

This study of the current situation of the herring market and of the solutions recommended for improving its operation highlights the complexity of the problem facing the Community. There is no simple answer to the many and varied situations whose common origin is plentiful supplies vis-à-vis disposal prospects on the various domestic and external markets.

Prices could not fail to be affected by this trend of production and reference has already been made (1) to the close relationship existing in the past over an average period between the stability of prices and the quantities placed on the Community market. The "institutional" guide and withdrawal prices now applied are the result mainly of an earlier situation of shortages, even though substantial price adjustments have been made in the last few years. Have these adjustments been adequate ? Or has the fact that they are very limited not played a part in de-stabilizing the market ? Is this not one of the underlying reasons for the present situation ? In any case it is a debatable point that will be increasingly difficult to avoid.

This query does not preclude the adoption in a Community context of subsidiary measures to facilitate transition and to help secure better balance. Such measures cannot however take the place of the overriding responsibility of the economic agents. In view of the differing nature of the situations in the various States and regions - something that the solutions outlined above will have sufficed to demonstrate - a choice must be made. The aim of this report is to help, by adding depth to the debate, to make that choice clear.

---

(1) See above p.3

Trend of quotas and Community herring production

(in tonnes, fresh round weight)

Year	1984	1985	1986
Quota	300.600	485.340	558.630
Production	292.743	392.748	417.372
Rate of use of quota	97 %	81 %	75 %

Source: Catch Report

Rate of use of herring quota by fishing zone

(in %)

Fishing zone / Year	1985	1986
1. West of Scotland VI to [illegible] VI to Sc[illegible], VII b,c	100	95
2. North Sea IV and VII d	76	72
3. Skagerak and Kattegat III a	83	67
4. Baltic Sea III b, c, d	99	85

Trend of herring withdrawals

(in tonnes)

Member State / Year	1984	1985	1986
Germany	281	525	360
Belgium	1.050	437	-
Denmark	9.785	12.315	10.817
France	1.473	1.351	460
Ireland	6.832	4.916	4.599
Netherlands	3.386	4.241	2.066
United Kingdom	12.997	20.499	6.463 (*)
TOTAL EEC	35.804	44.284	24.765

(*) Including 366 t at the Community withdrawal price

Source: Communications from Member States

EVOLUTION OF HERRING PRICES

	Guide price Ecu/t	Average price CEE and MS(Ecu/t)						Production (t)
		CEE	DK	UK	NL	IRL	RFA	
1973	[illegible]	181		129	200	154	183	769,085
1974	206	228	229	209	195	222	205	521,072
1975	206	214	258	183	241	227	162	526,054
1976	227	266	289	218	275	273	205	331,150
1977	247	411	375	479	416	396	199	200,860
1978	259	447	409	581	362	414	-	116,017
1979	313	499	502	763	571	423	-	109,723
1980	313	464	482	595	309	400	-	123,557
1981	329	366	425	233	269	238	367	194,372
1982	336	346	405	253	288	281	283	223,004
1983	336	302	353	235	269	275	251	242,537
1984	336	278	360	216	237	234	-	292,743
1985	336	261	302	214	242	209	273	392,748
1986	326	236	288	165	238	225	273	417,372
1987	303	249 6months	-	-	-	-	-	-

Intra-and extra-Community imports of fresh or chilled herring, whole, headless or in pieces 1984-1986 (CCT 03.01 B Ia) 1aa) and 2aa))

Community of Twelve

Origin	1984	1985	1986
France	1709	749	338
Belg./Lux.	3417	2681	409
Netherlands	7291	6947	8391
FRG	1009	785	589
Italy	18		18
U. Kingdom	[illegible]	11658	13878
Ireland	4511	3481	4609
Denmark	[illegible]	[illegible]	57209
Greece			20
Portugal			
Spain			
Intra-Community	[illegible]	[illegible]	67462
Iceland	[illegible]	[illegible]	40
Faeroes ~~Isles~~	[illegible]	[illegible]	2774
Norway	[illegible]	[illegible]	40754
Sweden	57104	44199	32234
GDR	1707	2700	2452
Other	40	64	14
Extra-Community	83409	65096	21518

Intra-and extra-Community exports of fresh or chilled herring, whole, headless or in pieces, 1984-1986 (CCT 03.01 B Ia) 1aa) and 2aa))

Destination	1984	1985	1986
France	2350	3734	4684
Belg./Lux.	1410	2310	2008
Netherlands	13611	12044	11154
FRG	55684	52599	50838
Italy		23	26
U. Kingdom	4644	[illegible]	4309
Ireland	4372	[illegible]	3903
Denmark	820	175	307
Greece			2
Portugal			
Spain	3	37	
Intra-Community	80597	87339	77415
Norway	5	303	81
Sweden	[illegible]	129	362
Austria	2108	1587	1366
USSR	19749	41076	53734
GDR	2366	7511	12297
Poland	3387	1453	5165
Bulgaria		606	555
Other	[illegible]	[illegible]	2263
Extra-Community	[illegible]	[illegible]	75525

Intra-and extra-Community imports of frozen herring, whole, headless or in pieces 1984-1986 (CCT 03.01 B 1 a) 1 bb) and 2 bb)

Origin	1984	1985	1986
France	115	187	43
Bel./Lux.	134	96	118
Netherlands	8978	14755	15959
FRG	659	785	3541
Italy	13	19	3
U. Kingdom	1648	3756	4992
Ireland	4530	4340	5288
Denmark	8030	6769	5601
Greece			
Portugal			
Spain			
Intra-Community	24210	30907	35549
Iceland	5395	2643	5155
Norway	3675	7925	10665
Sweden	1282	738	190
Canada	5099	5216	5105
Finland	740	279	
Other	38	711	529
Extra-Community	19279	16780	21664

Intra-and extra-Community exports of frozen herring, whole, headless or in pieces 1984-1986 (CCT 03.01 B 1 a) 1 aa) and 2 aa)

Destination	1984	1985	1986
France	[illegible]	800	1266
Bel./Lux.	3316	7703	3771
Netherlands	4272	[illegible]	3291
FRG	[illegible]	14515	17773
Italy	62	95	62
U. Kingdom	455	604	437
Ireland	77	47	33
Denmark	318	469	579
Greece	27	71	63
Portugal	307		9
Spain	30	37	37
Intra-Community	23437	23965	27324
USSR	3990	976	2306
GDR	2750	851	2119
Poland	22410	12076	16356
Czech.	2199	2300	2081
Bulgaria	0	1043	0
Ivory Coast	3559	12012	11203
Nigeria	0	6273	36565
Japan	7124	11084	9627
Other	1306	2924	4084
Extra-Community	42341	47544	54341

Source: EUROSTAT - Comext

22

Extra-Community exports of fresh or chilled herring, whole, headless or in pieces

Country of origin	1984 Q (t)	1984 %	1985 Q (t)	1985 %	1986 Q (t)	1986 %
Extra-Community	32469	100	54173	100	75825	100
Origin: United Kingdom	25718	79	46976	87	71161	94
France	3608	11	3707	7	2832	4
Denmark	2322	7	2285	4	1690	2
USSR	19749	100	41076	100	53734	100
Origin: United Kingdom	15967	81	36688	89	50904	95
France	3607	18	3704	9	2830	5
FRG	6388	100	7511	100	12297	100
Origin: United Kingdom	6356	99	7461	99	12250	99
Poland	3887	100	1458	100	5165	100
Origin: United Kingdom	3375	87	1226	84	5165	100
Austria	2108	100	1587	100	1368	100
Origin: Denmark	2107	99	1569	99	1358	99
Bulgaria	-	-	808	100	555	100
Origin: United Kingdom	-	-	808	100	555	100
Sweden	131	100	129	100	362	100
Origin: United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	195	54
Denmark	131	100	129	100	160	44
Norway	9	100	303	100	81	100
Origin: Denmark	9	100	303	100	73	90

23

Extra-Community exports of frozen herring, whole, headless or in pieces

Country of origin	1984		1985		1986	
	Q (t)	%	Q (t)	%	Q (t)	%
Extra-Community	42341	100	49544	100	84341	100
Origin: Netherlands	32118	76	42641	86	75044	89
Ireland	6096	14	2586	5	3803	5
Denmark	3106	7	2878	6	3358	4
Poland	22413	100	12076	100	16356	100
Origin: Netherlands	21713	97	11303	94	16253	99
Japan	7124	100	11084	100	9627	100
Origin: Netherlands	6339	89	10218	92	8680	90
United Kingdom	423	6	464	4	739	8
Ivory Coast	3559	100	12012	100	11203	100
Origin: Netherlands	3559	100	12012	100	11203	100
USSR	2990	100	976	100	2306	100
Origin: Ireland	2990	100	976	100	1436	62
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	870	38
FRG	2750	100	851	100	2119	100
Origin: Ireland	1999	73	-	-	1079	51
Denmark	751	27	851	100	1040	49
Czechoslovakia	2199	100	2300	100	2081	100
Origin: Denmark	1701	77	1514	66	1806	87
Nigeria	-	-	6273	100	36565	100
Origin: Netherlands	-	-	6273	100	36565	100
Bulgaria	-	-	1048	100	-	-
Origin: Netherlands	-	-	1048	100	-	-

24

Extra-Community imports of fresh or chilled herring, whole, headless or in pieces

Country of origin	1984		1985		1986	
	Q (t)	%	Q (t)	%	Q (t)	%
Extra-Community	83469	100	69096	100	81518	100
Destination: Denmark	66334	79	56273	81	64921	80
FRG	12055	14	8162	12	11815	14
France	1168	1	1636	2	2120	3
United Kingdom	1405	2	1846	3	1669	2
Sweden	59134	100	44199	100	32284	100
Destination: Denmark	52179	88	41126	93	30207	94
FRG	4637	8	2177	5	1925	6
Norway	20352	100	21311	100	43954	100
Destination: FRG	7389	36	5985	29	9866	22
Denmark	10242	50	11650	55	29486	67
France	1138	6	1618	8	2114	5
United Kingdom	1404	7	1763	8	1658	4
Faeroes	2206	100	739	100	2774	100
Destination: Denmark	2206	100	739	100	2774	100
FRG	1707	100	2700	100	2452	100
Destination: Den[illegible]	1707	100	2700	100	2452	100
Iceland	30	100	83	100	40	100
Destination: FRG	29	97	-	-	23	58
United Kingdom	1	3	83	100	11	28

Extra-Community imports of frozen herring, whole, headless or in pieces

Country of origin	1984		1985		1986	
	Q (t)	%	Q (t)	%	Q (t)	%
Extra-Community	19279	100	16980	100	21664	100
Destination: FRG	12160	63	8625	51	11140	51
United Kingdom	2082	11	3419	20	5329	25
Netherlands	1388	7	1015	6	2027	9
France	1535	8	3222	19	1985	9
Norway	6695	100	7925	100	10685	100
Destination: FRG	3113	46	2771	35	5258	49
United Kingdom	599	9	2141	27	2657	25
France	575	9	2264	29	1085	10
Netherlands	1068	16	385	5	1224	11
Iceland	5395	100	2846	100	5155	100
Destination: United Kingdom	1250	23	937	33	2102	41
FRG	2564	48	605	21	1765	34
France	920	17	958	34	897	17
Canada	5099	100	5216	100	5105	100
Destination: FRG	4747	93	4456	85	4002	78
Netherlands	38	1	391	7	365	7
United Kingdom	221	4	341	7	374	7
Sweden	1262	100	738	100	190	100
Destination: FRG	967	77	564	76	113	59
Finland	740	100	239	100	-	-
Destination: FRG	693	94	228	95	-	-

Supply situation and visible Community consumption

(tonnes)

	1984	1985	1986
Imports	108461	91243	108743
Exports	89071	119945	177549
Balance	19390	-28702	-68806
Catches	292743	392748	417372
Total supplies	312133	364046	348566
Withdrawals	33804	44199	24765
visible consumption	[illegible]	319545	323801

Source: EUROSTAT-COMEXT