



Executive Director



ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

12 July February 2012, Vigo

CONCLUSIONS

Participants

Advisory Board Representatives: Mr N. Wichmann (NSRAC), Mr J. F. Beltrán (PelagicRAC) Ms R. Caggiano (MEDRAC), Mr V. Badiola (SWWRAC) and Mr H. González (NWWRAC).

EFCA: Mr P. Savouret (ED), Mr P. Galache (HoU C), Ms B. Comby (HoU B) and Ms C. E. Fernández (PO).

OBS: Mr H. Villa (Spanish Administrative Board representative).

The ED of the Agency welcomed the Advisory Board participants.

Approval of the Agenda.

The agenda was approved without any amendment.

1. Introductory remarks: RACs state of play and EFCA latest developments

The ED gave the floor to the Advisory Board representatives to present the RACs state of play.

The representative of the NSRAC gave an overview of the NSRAC structure and the work done by the different working groups and underlined the following items:

- The work done by the NSRAC on the different components of the CFP reform (eg. the extension of the 12 miles limit);
- Discards: avoiding discards instead of discarding;
- Regionalisation: to be strengthened, namely regarding the role of the RACs and their financial support;
- LTMP (Long Term Management Plan): delay in the LTMPs adoption (e.g. cod, flatfish, nephrops). In the case of cod it was stressed that the current reduction has reduced the fishing opportunities;
- Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council introducing a discard ban in the Skagerrak.

The MEDRAC representative gave an overview of the MEDRAC structure and the work done by the different working groups and thanked the Agency for attending the meetings where the Agency input was required. The MEDRAC representative highlighted the following items:

European Fisheries Control Agency

Email: efca@efca.europa.eu – Tel: +34 986 12 06 10 – Fax: +34 886 12 52 37

Address: Edificio Odriozola, Avenida García Barbón 4, E-36201 Vigo – Spain

Postal Address: EFCA - Apartado de Correos 771 - E-36200 Vigo – Spain

- The MEDRAC is in contact with the GFCM (General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean) to join efforts and be more operational, namely regarding the LTMP vis-à-vis third countries and recreational fisheries. A MoU was signed in May 2012;
- Regionalisation: the MEDRAC supported the comment made by the NSRAC representative and underlined the need to clarify the role of the RACs.

The ED asked the MEDRAC for feedback on the BFT campaign.

The MEDRAC representative mentioned that, for the time being, they have not received much feedback from the members. In May the associations were quite satisfied. They feel the resource is in good shape and the TAC should be increased.

The ED informed that the Agency, at the request of the Commission, within the Bluefin tuna JDP framework, organised a meeting and invited Mediterranean third countries that are ICCAT CPCs. During the meeting the need to set up a permanent working group with the above mentioned countries was highlighted.

The NWWRAC representative gave an overview on the NWWRAC structure and the work done by the different working groups and underlined the following items:

- The need to clarify the role of the RACs in the next CFP, namely taking into account the regionalisation approach;
- The reduction in the cod effort every year;
- The state of play of the hake fishery;
- The closure to recovery the nephrops fishery;
- The movement of fisheries effort from one fishery to another;
- The data regulation;
- Technical measures, mesh size, etc.

The NWWRAC representative also summarised the results of the *Workshop on Fisheries Control and Compliance in Western Waters (ICES VI and VII)* that took place in Dublin on 3 July 2012, where an official of the Agency presented the work of the Agency in the Western Waters area. The discard ban was one of the main topics discussed during the meeting in Dublin, where the difficulty for the demersal fleet to keep the discards on board was underlined.

The SWWRAC representative gave an overview of the SWWRAC structure and the work done by the different working groups and highlighted the following items:

- The need to clarify the regionalization approach and the future role of the RACs;
- Technical measures, namely the discard and its feasibility taking into account that each fishery is different;
- The lack of progress towards the adoption of the LTMP for the anchovy;
- GEPETO project.

The Pelagic RAC representative gave an overview of the Pelagic RAC structure and the work done by the different working groups and underlined the following items:

- The work of the Pelagic RAC hand in hand with ICES in different management plans, e.g. herring, mackerel, horse mackerel, blue whiting;
- The need of financial support to cover scientific issues and not only RAC administrative issues;
- The need to collaborate in the NEAFC Coastal states framework, e.g. Iceland, Faeroe Islands, Norway.

The ED asked the participants if they have any comment on the control implementation.

The representatives from the NWWRAC and the SWWRAC mentioned that the main issue was the lack of uniformity when interpreting the rules. More consistency and uniformity is needed.

The ED explained that the interpretation of the rules was not under the remit of the Agency. The questions regarding interpretation should be addressed to the Commission.

The NSRAC representative commented that a revision of the Control regulation should be considered as some inconsistencies have been detected, and that the sector could bring a very useful input.

With reference to discards, the NSRAC representative drew the attention to the issue of the ownership of the footage of the CCTV cameras. In Denmark it has been agreed that the ownership should belong to the fishermen/skipper for a specific period. Another issue that was raised was the need to protect the recording from going to the public domain.

The MEDRAC representative mentioned that the MEDRAC has already adopted an opinion regarding discards and that one of the main problems was the storage on board in multispecies fisheries. On top of that the identification cameras would require a huge financial investment.

Following the Advisory Board representatives' feedback the ED took the floor.

The ED commented the positive result of the Five year external independent evaluation of the Agency. He pointed out that most of the conclusions from the Seminar on 14 March 2012 were included in the Administrative Board recommendations.

With reference to the Agency operational activities, among other topics, the following points were mentioned:

- The new SCIP framework to be provided by the Commission will be a more result oriented process;
- The Agency has been working on a data base tool for the JDPs called JADE;
- Salmon will be included in the Baltic JDP;
- The Agency is working on the ERS application within its remit and planning to develop two new systems, Fishnet and an EIR application;
- *Core curricula*, the idea is to provide Member States with a common guide.

2. Exchange of views: implementation of the EFCA Annual Work Programme 2012

The ED and the Heads of Unit presented a PowerPoint on the Activities implemented by the Agency in the first half of 2012.

Within the IUU field the representative of the MEDRAC asked whether it would be possible that the Agency organises an IUU meeting to support third countries in the Mediterranean area with the support of the GFCM.

The ED clarified that for activities with third countries the request should be sent to the Commission.

The Pelagic RAC representative asked the Agency whether it would be possible to give some additional details on the Western Waters JDP.

The HoU C explained that the JDP was adopted in September 2011. During the first half of 2012 one permanent campaign for all the area was carried out. For the second half there will be two campaigns running, one in the Northern area and another one in the Southern area. It was underlined that a risk analyses process is followed during the whole life cycle of the JDP.

The ED asked the view of the Advisory Board on the controllability of the discards and on the methods envisaged for enforcing the discard ban.

The NSRAC representative pointed out that for the demersal fleet it would be rather difficult as they would need to treat the discards (e.g. cleaning) before store them and that would be impossible to manage.

The MEDRAC representative informed that the RAC is asking for pilot projects to check what would be the most realistic way to avoid and handle discards.

3. Exchange of views: Provisional Multiannual Work Programme 2013-2017 and Annual Work Programme 2013

The ED presented a PowerPoint on the Provisional Multiannual Work Programme 2013-2017 and Annual Work Programme 2013.

The representative of the MEDRAC asked whether the swordfish would be included in the Bluefin tuna JDP.

The ED indicated that the inclusion could be possible once the corresponding SCIP is adopted by the Commission.

4. Cooperation with the RACs: discussion

The ED asked the Advisory Board representatives if they would consider interesting to have 1 or 2 observer/s, in addition to the representative of the Advisory Board, to attend the Administrative Board meetings (e.g. the Advisory Board alternate, expert) without any voting and reimbursement rights.

The Advisory Board members attending the meeting did not provide any feedback on the above mentioned issue.

Regarding the rotation of the Advisory Board representative in the Administrative Board the PO summarised what said in the last Advisory meeting on 21 February 2012. The rotation system to appoint the Advisory Board representative in the Administrative Board of the Agency was put in place in March 2010 and is based on a yearly rotation system. Some of the RACs have not joined the rotation system yet, namely the MEDRAC, the LDRAC and the NSRAC.

The representative of the MEDRAC mentioned that the MEDRAC was prepared to join the rotation system next year and mentioned that they would be circulating a proposal to the RACs.

5. AOB

Closure of the session 12:55 h.