



Executive Director



## ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

28 February 2014, Brussels

### CONCLUSIONS

#### Participants

**Advisory Board Representatives:** Mr Niels Wichman (NSAC), Mr J. F. Beltrán (PAC), Mr Reine Johansson (BSAC), Mr Luc Corbisier (NWWAC), Ms Susana Sainz Trapaga (MEDAC), Mr Manuel Liria (LDAC) and Mr Carlos Aldereguía (LDAC).

**EC:** Ms Pascale Colson, Ms Isabelle Perret and Ms Silvia Scalco.

**EFCA:** Mr Pascal Savouret (ED), Mr Pedro Galache (HoU C), Ms Karin Hermansson (HoU B) and Ms Clara E. Fernández (PO).

#### **Approval of the Agenda:**

The ED welcomed the participants. The agenda was approved without any amendment.

#### **1. Introductory remarks:**

- ACs: state of play
- EFCA: latest developments

The ED gave the floor to the Advisory Board representatives.

The representative of the NSAC thanked the Agency for inviting the ACs to the meeting in Dubrovnik, (15-16 January 2014). With regard to the meeting organisation, the NSAC pointed out that the ACs should have been invited to share the first day meeting with the Member States. The representative of the NSAC acknowledged the role of the Agency in looking for equality in control and pointed out that the introduction of control methodologies should lead to a simplification on the daily business. The NSAC underlined that the fisherman will be the ones implementing the measures on the spot.

The NSAC mentioned that they are participating in the different meetings on landing obligation, e.g. STECF, Scheveningen group, and that there are many open questions.

On the omnibus proposal the NSAC commented that the ACs requested to be consulted before the proposal was launched. It seems the proposal has to go to the EP before Eastern.

With reference to the meeting in Dubrovnik, the ED explained that, in order to be consistent and to get a full picture, it was necessary to be aware of Member States opinions before having an exchange of views with the stakeholders. On EFCA's contribution to control methodologies and the

discard ban, the ED mentioned that the Agency paper on landing obligation was a very comprehensive document and that any feedback was welcomed. EFCA has also been working with some regional groups e.g. BALTFISH and Scheveningen. The ED explained that a project to try to implement the obligation to register the discards is to be launched in 2014. Risk analysis will be one of the main control tools to explore looking for compliance with landing obligation.

The ED informed that there will be a communication campaign in the Baltic Sea to raise awareness within the sector.

The ED pointed out the interest in receiving feedback from the ACs on the reverse burden of proof.

The LDAC representative shared the NSAC opinion. The LDAC mentioned that the discussions are limited to the control and flexibility rules, however other countries are developing different policies not only focused on discards, e.g. introducing ITQs. The need to make an impact assessment on the implementation of the discard policy was underlined. It was pointed out that Norway has been working for 25 years and they still have a significant amount of discards.

The BSAC representative shared the previous ACs points of views. The BSAC stated that they have supported the regionalisation from the first day; however, regionalisation does not mean having different level playing field or controls. If the way goes through control measures close contact with the fishermen and proper communication are needed to raise awareness.

The BSAC has discussed the draft of the Baltic Sea discard plan with BALTFISH; the reply from the BSAC will come soon. With regard to the omnibus regulation, the BSAC mentioned that it was a temporary solution and that all fisheries should be covered. The BSAC drew the attention to the issue on the mix fisheries, where minimum sizes for different fishes apply and the survival rate is high for some species.

The NWWAC representative commented that the landing policy should be pragmatic, functional, and adaptable. In this regard the NWWAC shared previous opinions on learning from what other countries have done. The NWWAC pointed out that the fishermen have worked during the last few years to improve selectivity. Larger selectivity measures would lose fish, e.g. sole is caught together with plaice. With larger selectivity measures the fishermen would need to target single species.

The representative of the PAC showed his concern on the discard ban; the PAC mentioned that there are uncertainties on the practical implementation, e.g. the lack of quotas could be an issue. It is not known how the TAC would be increased and the regulation about CCTV cameras on board is not clear.

The MEDAC representative indicated that a working group will be held in Barcelona. The MEDAC is concerned about the landing size, as undersized fish could become the target for the market. The MEDAC have worked on a strong policy against the consumption of juveniles. The MEDAC commented that the engagement of the stakeholders at an early stage was essential to avoid demotivation.

The ED mentioned that the Agency was trying to develop a methodology; it would be a first approach but certainly it will not be perfect. With regard to the CCTVs, the ED mentioned that they should be considered one tool, among others. With reference to data availability, the ED stated that it is not feasible to have all the data today; inspectors could collect information during the inspection to improve the knowledge. The ED clarified that the Agency has no mandate for all the pelagic species but was open to work with the different regional groups.

On the Mediterranean the ED commented that there is a new SCIP for the Mediterranean, including some pelagic fisheries in the Adriatic.

The EC representative pointed out that the legislation is in force and has to be implemented. With regard to the omnibus regulation, the EC mentioned that the time schedule was very tight and it should be in force by 2015.

The HoU C made a presentation on the landing obligation and an example of a table on risk analyses for the Mediterranean. EFCA is working on a project for the whole EU area on improving risk analysis.

The LDAC representative asked if, in line with the omnibus regulation, it would be compulsory to record any quantity of discards of any species.

The HoU C explained that EFCA does neither have the power to interpret the legislation nor to legislate, just to implement it.

The BSAC representative mentioned that without any ITQ system it would be extremely difficult to handle different types of fisheries. The BSAC pointed out that a shared system is needed and the fishermen are the key players in the process.

The ED underlined the importance of the mitigation measures, e.g. implementation of mitigation measures by the fishermen, which could lead to a reduction of the risk of certain vessels: the more standard the better.

The ED asked the ACs feedback on the reverse burden of proof.

The NSAC representative insisted on the need to involve the industry at a first stage. On the ITQs the NSAC mentioned that it should be possible to get an agreement from the Producers Organisation so each fishing vessel has a quota.

In regard to the reference fleet, the NSAC highlighted the lack of updated data, which could lead to discussion. The discard ban introduction will change behaviour in a drastic way, which will affect the different fishing areas. Therefore, current data could lead to wrong assumptions. On the frequency of control, and the possibility to turn it upside down, the question is the added value the industry would get if setting up CCTV, etc.

The ED indicated that CCTV is an option; however it is not clear if it could fit all fisheries. The ED pointed out that two premises could be taken into account:

- For some fisheries there is a certain steady behaviour of the biomass in the time,
- If the fishermen have dynamic mitigation measures, this would be reflected in the ERS report and next year the Agency would be getting accurate data that will improve the data of the matrix.

The MEDAC representative indicated that exploring mechanisms of voluntary compliance is the way. Co-management has shown good results.

The NWWAC representative mentioned that to make a difference between good and bad behaviour more incentives are needed.

The BSAC stated that the objective is very clear in the Baltic and that it would be interesting to set a reference control. The BSAC underlined that it is possible to build up trust and recalled the need of an ITQ system and training to support a behaviour change.

The ED pointed out the necessity of being pragmatic, to discuss the main issues on some fisheries, the burden of proof and what could be the mitigation measures to help them comply with the landing obligations. EFCA could provide coordination.

The ED asked the ACs view and roadmap, and suggested to include the item in the agenda of the next ACs' meetings.

## **2. Exchange of views: implementation of the EFCA Annual work programme 2013**

**&**

## **3. Exchange of views: activities within the frame of the next Multiannual work programme 2015-2019 and Annual work programme 2015**

The ED and the Heads of Unit presented a PowerPoint on the implementation of the Annual work programme of EFCA in 2013 and the Agency's priorities for the coming years.

With reference to capacity building support in third countries, the LDAC representative asked about the conditions a third country should fulfil to be part of the Agency work programme.

The HoU B explained that the cooperation with third countries was upon request of the EC.

The LDAC representative highlighted that the international versant is very important for them, e.g. in NAFO some contracting parties tried to advance on discard and it was rejected.

The ED mentioned that the legal service of the EC is analysing the case.

## **4. Rotation of the Advisory Board representative in the EFCA Administrative Board**

The PO presented the next rotation shifts:

From 2 March 2014 to 1 March 2015

- Representative: LDAC
- Alternate: NSAC

From 2 March 2015 to 1 March 2016

- Representative: NSAC
- Alternate: MEDAC

From 2 March 2016 to 1 March 2017

- Representative: MEDAC
- Alternate: NWWAC

The LDAC representative mentioned that the LDAC Deputy Chair, Mr Raúl García, will be attending the meeting of the Administrative Board of EFCA on 13 March 2014.

The PO asked the ACs if they have any news on the establishment of the new AC's.

The NSAC mentioned that there have been some meetings to set up the Market AC.

## **5. Cooperation with the ACs: discussion**

The ED pointed out that if the reverse burden of proof is included in the agenda of the ACs meetings, the Agency could attend as an observer.

The BSAC representative mentioned that there was a meeting in the BSAC only to discuss the landing obligation. The BSAC will contact EFCA.

The MEDAC representative indicated that it would be interesting that the Agency attends one of its meetings to discuss the topic above with the stakeholders.

The LDAC representative brought the attention to cooperation, LDAC is working with third countries, namely in two cooperation projects in West Africa, on capacity building, governance, empowerment of civil society and improving fisheries control system. The LDAC pointed out that, on the capacity building domain, it would be important to count with EFCA experience.

The ED thanked the LDAC for the initiative and pointed out that any activity proposal of a new activity should be presented to the Board for discussion.

## **6. AOB**

The NWWAC representative invited EFCA to participate in the next meetings of the NWWAC on 25 March.

The ED pointed out that an important ICCAT seminar will be held in Vigo during those dates but the Agency will try to send a representative.

Closure of the meeting at 12h35.