

WG1 – October 14, 2025
Ljubljana - Slovenia



MEDAC PERFORMANCE Review

A first look of «Performance of Structures and Leadership»

WG1 Coordinator: Gian Ludovico Ceccaroni

Contents of the PR

Contents	
Mediterranean Advisory Council Performance Review 2025	4
Key Findings	4
Executive Summary	5
Acknowledgements	5
1. Introduction	6
Reading guide	7
2. Key features of MEDAC	8
3. Internal Functioning and Decision-Making	11
3.1 Decision-making process	12
3.2 Representation of different interests	17
3.3 Transparency	22
4. Performance of Structures and Leadership	24
4.1 Functioning of the Executive Committee, Working Groups, General Assembly and Focus Groups	25
4.2 Performance of MEDAC Chair, Vice-Chairs, Working Group and Focus Groups coordinators and Secretariat	29
4.3 Observed practices contributing to effectiveness	34
5. Institutional Influence and External	36
5.1 Relationship with the institutions (European Commission and Member States)	37
5.2 Contribution to the objectives of the Common Fisheries Policy	41
6. Shortcomings	43
7. Recommendations	46
8. Conclusions	49
9. Methods	50
9.1 Performance assessment framework	50
9.2 Desk research	63
9.3 Observing meetings	63
9.4 Survey	67
9.5 Interviews	74
9.6 Focus Group	76
9.7 Background and positionality of reviewers	77
10. References	77
11. Glossary and acronyms	79

Key Findings

- **MEDAC is a functional and recognised actor in EU fisheries governance**
- **Structural tensions persist within the organisation**
- **Misalignment between MEDAC's role and institutional expectations constrains effectiveness**
- **Reliance on the very effective Secretariat is both an asset and a vulnerability**

Best practices identified

- ❖ *High-Performance Secretariat and Operational Backbone*
- ❖ *Effective Management of Multilingualism:.*
- ❖ *Strengthening of Consensus and Procedural Clarity:*
- ❖ *Strong Procedural Compliance and Adaptability:*
- ❖ *Integration of Scientific Knowledge:*
- ❖ *Financial Resilience and Contingency Planning*

Performance of Structures and Leadership Working Groups

❖ Structural and Leadership Performance

- ✓ MEDAC operates effectively with a strong Secretariat but faces strain due to uneven leadership and reliance on a few key individuals.
- ✓ Meetings are well-organized and inclusive, yet deliberative equity is challenged by dominant voices.
- ✓ Leadership varies in style and effectiveness; training and role clarification are needed.
- ✓ The Secretariat is praised for strategic coordination and procedural coherence but is vulnerable due to staff concentration.
- ✓ Organic best practices include rotating venues, structured scientific input, and streamlined data collection.

❖ Topic Relevance and Coverage

- ✓ MEDAC addresses timely and relevant topics using diverse knowledge sources.
- ✓ Combines scientific input, stakeholder debate, and policy updates (e.g., MSP, tuna bycatch).
- ✓ Capable of detailed evidence compilation (e.g., EFCA tuna carcass case).
- ✓ Annual workplans are tactical, not strategic; future foresight and socio-economic analysis need strengthening.
- ✓ Not involved in co-design of management measures due to CFP structure.

❖ Organisation

- ✓ Meetings are well-planned, multilingual, and accessible.
- ✓ Preference for in-person meetings; online debates are challenging.
- ✓ Back-to-back scheduling maximizes participation but can cause fatigue.
- ✓ Language management is effective but translation may affect consensus clarity.
- ✓ Conventional agendas work well; alternative formats could enhance engagement.

❖ Meeting Dynamics

- ✓ Rich integration of knowledge types: experiential, anecdotal, scientific, and official.
- ✓ Participation imbalance: a small group dominates discussions.
- ✓ 44% of survey respondents noted dominance by individuals, sometimes perceived as strategic delay.
- ✓ Alternative formats could improve equity and decision-making.

Functioning of the Executive Committee, Working Groups, General Assembly and Focus Groups

Table 6. MEDAC efficiency and effectiveness. Meetings during the performance review period (2020-2024)

	MEDAC MEETINGS										EXTERNAL MEETINGS						
	WORKING GROUPS					FOCUS GROUPS											
Year	WG1	WG2	WG3	WG4	WG5	FGEO	WESTMED	EASTMED	SoS	ADRIATIC	ICCAT	EFCA	STECF	GFCM	Joint & other AC events	Others	Projects
2020	5	1		2	2	1	2		1	4	3	2	4	1		3	1
2021	5	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	3	2		9	13	5	20	6
2022	6	2	2		2	1	3	1	1	2	3		5	25	2	14	7
2023	5	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	2			7	20	5	7	1
2024	8	2	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	8	11	3	24	2

Source: MEDAC Annual reports. MEDAC often organises joint WG meetings (e.g. WG1-WG3 or WG1-WG5). In those cases, the meetings are recorded twice, one if each of them.

Performance of Structures and Leadership Working Groups

Table 2. Enabling and constraining practices of coordinators observed during meetings

Enabling practices observed	Constraining practices observed
<p>Supports respectful and inclusive dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emphasises MEDAC mandate - Tempers forceful expression of opinions - Provides space for “venting” with empathy - Calls for respect, especially in response to dissent <p>Facilitates structured and efficient participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourages brevity and sets time limits (e.g., 3 minutes per intervention) - Offers the floor to online participants and allows follow-up replies 	<p>Dominating the discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Takes the floor regularly as coordinator and intervenes first after each presentation - Consumes a disproportionate share of the available time - Steps back from coordination role without noting that they are speaking as a member <p>Weak Facilitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fails to foster interaction or guide dialogue

Performance of Structures and Leadership Working Groups

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Asks for clarifying questions before comments or responses- Seeks confirmation of shared understanding <p>Promotes continuity and action-oriented discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Synthesises presentations and builds on previous MEDAC work- Summarises and lists action points- Invites additional contributions under Any Other Business (AOB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Does not link the debate to actionable outcomes- Omits synthesis of key session findings
---	---