



▶ Pelagic AC

Executive Committee meeting
12 April 2018
16.30-18:00 hrs
Parkhotel Den Haag, Molenstraat 53
The Netherlands

Louis Braillelaan 80
2719 EK Zoetermeer
The Netherlands
Phone: +31 (0)63 375 6324
E-mail: info@pelagic-ac.org
Website: www.pelagic-ac.org

Participants

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|
| 1 | Jesper Raakjær, chair | Aalborg University |
| 2 | Alexander Wiseman | Scottish Pelagic Fishermen's Association |
| 3 | Ana Matias | Sciaena |
| 4 | Claus Reedtz-Sparrevohn | Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation |
| 5 | Delphine Roncin | From Nord |
| 6 | Esben Sverdrup-Jensen | Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation |
| 7 | Gerard van Balsfoort | Pelagic Freezer-Trawler Association |
| 8 | Goncalo Carvalho | Sciaena |
| 9 | Guillaume Carruel | Pelagic AC |
| 10 | Jerome Jourdain | Union des armateurs a la pêche de France |
| 11 | Jessica Demblon | EBCD |
| 12 | John Ward | Irish Fish PO |
| 13 | José Beltran | Organizacion de Productores de Pesqueros de Lugo |
| 14 | Justyna Zajchowska | The Pew Charitable Trusts |
| 15 | Linda Planthof | Dutch Elasmobranch Society |
| 16 | Lotte Huisman | Seas at Risk |
| 17 | Ludmilla van der Meer | Pelagic AC |
| 18 | Mads Larsson | AIPCE |
| 19 | Matthew Cox | National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation |
| 20 | Miren Garmendia | OPEGUI |
| 21 | Patrick Murphy | Irish South and West PO |
| 22 | Piebe Hotsma | Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy |
| 23 | Rob Banning | Parlevliet & van der Plas |
| 24 | Romain Soisson | Compagnie des Pêches St-Malo |
| 25 | Sean O'Donoghue | Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation |
| 26 | Stella Nemecky | WWF |
| 27 | Steven Mackinson | Scottish Pelagic Fishermen's Association |
| 28 | Søren Anker Pedersen | EU Fishmeal |
| 29 | Uwe Richter | Deutscher Hochseefischerei-Verband / Seefrostvertrieb |
| 30 | Wietze Kampen | European Transport Workers Federation |
| 31 | Verena Ohms | Pelagic AC |



1. Opening of the meeting by the chairman, Jesper Raakjær

The chairman opened the meeting at 17:00.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Follow-up on action items (information)

All action items from the previous meeting had been taken care of.

4. BREXIT meeting on 13 April (discussion)

The chairman explained that the PELAC has arranged a follow-up meeting on BREXIT with representatives of the other relevant ACs and the Commission on the next day. The idea was to discuss the future structure and functioning of the ACs under a reformed CFP, but also in light of BREXIT. At the first joint AC meeting in September 2017 it had been decided to follow a rotation scheme in regards to chairing the meetings and the PELAC had volunteered to chair this one. Director General Machado will attend the meeting as well and give an introduction to the topic. The chairman also asked support from the Executive Committee to take the initiative further in case no other AC will agree to arrange the next meeting. Subsequently he presented the outcomes of the recent BREXIT questionnaire.

The chairman explained that the survey had been designed in such a way that it was not too long in order to increase the likelihood of people filling it in all the way. In total 46 responses had been received from 10 different countries which he considered decent enough. Most responses were from the catching sector, but also a number of NGO representatives have filled in the survey as well as a few Member States representatives, scientists and people from the processing industry. Overall, the survey was driven by the PELAC which was not surprising, but many people represented more than one AC.

One of the questions in the survey asked people to rank the different functions of the ACs. Providing long-term advice, e.g. on management plans, was ranked as most important, followed by the exchange of ideas and trust-building, whereas providing annual TAC advice was ranked relatively low.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen pointed out that several ACs do not give TAC advice and it was not clear which AC people were representing when filling in the survey considering that many people are members on several ACs.

Verena Ohms agreed, but also said that the results are good enough to provide a general idea of what people are thinking.

Another question concerned the future structure of the ACs. While 37% of respondents indicated that there should be no change in structure, the remaining respondents felt that a new structure was needed, but there was no agreement on what that should look like.

Sean O'Donoghue pointed out that under question 9, i.e. concerning the future structure of the ACs, people should have been allowed to choose more than one option.

Wietze Kampen said that it is very important for ETF to put the social factor on the agenda in the future. A lot of times people discuss what the TACs should be, but nobody ever mentions the fishermen and issues like e.g. safety. Employed Dutch fishermen represented by the ETF and their employers united under Europêche consider it important to bring this discussion into the ACs.



The chairman pointed out that this is an issue to be considered in the next CFP since at the moment it is not really part of the remit of the PELAC.

Wietze Kampen agreed that the issue should be included under the next CFP.

The chairman also presented additional comments received through the questionnaire. One of them related to the question who classifies as a UK stakeholder, i.e. all people with a UK passport or only people working for UK organizations.

Gerard van Balsfoort said that it would be strange to exclude someone from the discussions who has a UK passport, but works for an EU organization.

The chairman furthermore mentioned that all ACs have a different focus and different ACs might therefore move into different directions. Another comment received was in relation to different speeds within the EU. However, this was something that cannot really be picked up within the ACs, but for transparency reasons all comments received were included in the presentation. The chairman invited the audience to comment on the outcomes of the questionnaire.

Sean O'Donoghue was surprised that 39% of the people wanted to continue business as usual and he wanted to know whether it would be possible to find out which ACs want to follow business as usual.

The chairman said that he would look into that with the secretariat.

Sean O'Donoghue also thought that there was a good representation at tomorrow's BREXIT meeting to get people to think about how their ACs could operate under a post BREXIT scenario. He wanted to know whether people have already considered that.

The chairman said that he will try to sharpen the discussion points for tomorrow's meeting and to start the process of thinking about how the ACs could be organized in the future.

Goncalo Carvalho could unfortunately not participate in the BREXIT meeting, but thought that there will be good representation from the NGO community. He was also very pleased that DG Machado will attend the meeting. He considered the meeting a good opportunity to put some ideas on the table of the Commission. He thought that business as usual could work under a very soft BREXIT, but of course it was not clear how exactly BREXIT will pan out.

Gerard van Balsfoort considered two things relevant in the longer term. On the one hand it was not clear how the UK will develop its policies in the future and whether there might be a difference between Scotland and England. On the other hand, he was quite certain that the UK will develop its own stakeholder consultation process in the future and he suggested thinking about how EU stakeholders could be involved in that process too.

Sean O'Donoghue pointed out that tomorrow's meeting was meant to be a brainstorming session. It was not the intention to come up with definite decisions. He further said that a one size fits all approach does not make sense and that people should explore different models depending on the ACs concerned. One option could be to combine some ACs into one and he wanted to get peoples' views on this.

The chairman promised to convey the issues raised today at tomorrow's meeting.

5. Recommendations from Working Group I (decision)

There were no recommendations from Working Group I.



6. Recommendations from Working Group II (decision)

Sean O'Donoghue asked the Executive Committee for approval to reply to the Commission's letter on the choke mitigation tool and the three questions raised. In relation to question 1 he wanted to list the stocks identified as category 3 stocks and to add herring in 6a and a question mark about blue fin tuna, subject to analysis. In relation to question 2 he wanted to say that the AC is considering measures outside article 15 and is working on additional solutions, but also refer to the original de minimis recommendation issued in 2014. In regards to question 3 he suggested taking all the measures identified in 2014 and updating them with the excel sheets from October. He proposed to send the letter as soon as possible and also to arrange a WebEx soon to further discuss other options. He asked Goncalo Carvalho to produce a draft document for discussion.

Goncalo Carvalho said that it has been a while since the PELAC produced its recommendation in 2014. Therefore, he wanted to see the letter before approving it. Regarding a draft document he wanted to briefly discuss whether it makes sense to pursue certain issues, because if some of them are non-starters, then there is not much use in including them.

It was agreed to send the draft letter to Goncalo Carvalho before submitting it to the Commission. It was also agreed that the secretariat will ask members whether they are interested in joining the WebEx meeting.

7. AOB

There was no other business.

8. End of meeting

The chairman closed the meeting at 18:00 hrs.

Action items

- Send draft letter to Commission regarding category 3 choke species to Goncalo Carvalho before submitting it to the Commission (secretariat)
- Arrange a WebEx meeting with interested members to discuss other solutions to choke issues (Sean O'Donoghue, secretariat)

