



▶ Pelagic AC

Executive Committee meeting
21 April 2016
10.00-12:00 hrs
Parkhotel Den Haag, 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	Ian Gatt, chairman	Scottish Pelagic Fishermen's Association
2	Alex Wiseman	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
3	Aukje Coers	Cornelis Vrolijk
4	Carl Jesper Hermansen	Danmarks Fiskeriforening
5	Christine Absil	Seas at Risk
6	Claus Reedtz Sparrevohn	Danish Pelagic Producer Organisation
7	Esben Sverdrup-Jensen	Danish Pelagic Producer Organisation
8	Eric Roeleveld	Jaczon
9	Fredrik Lindberg	Swedish Fishermen's Federation
10	Frederik Schutyser	European Commission: DG MARE
11	Gerard van Balsfoort	Pelagic Freezer Trawler Association
12	Goncalo Carvalho	Pew Charitable Trusts
13	Ignacio Fontaneda Lopez	Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente
14	Inge van der Knaap	Pelagic Freezer Trawler Association
15	Irene Kingma	Dutch Elasmobranch Society
16	Jerome Nouis	From Nord
17	Jesper Juul Larsen	Danmarks Fiskeriforening
18	Jesper Raakjær	AIPCE
19	John Anderson	Scottish Fishermen's Organisation
20	John Ward	Irish Fish PO
21	José Beltran	OPLUGO
22	Kees Taal	Van der Zwan
23	Lesley Duthie	North Sea Women's Network
24	Lotte Worsøe Clausen	DTU Aqua
25	Ludmilla van der Meer	Pelagic AC
26	Maria Aira Martin	Shetland Fishermen's Association
27	Martin Pastoors	Pelagic Freezer-Trawler Association
28	Matthew Cox	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation
29	Miren Garmendia	Federacion de Cofradias de Pescadores de Guipuzcoa
30	Norman Graham	European Commission: DG MARE
31	Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West PO
32	Reine Johansson	Swedish Fishermen's Federation
33	Rob Banning	Parlevliet & Van der Plas B.V.
34	Sean O'Donoghue	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation
35	Søren Anker Pedersen	Marine Ingredients Denmark

36	Stella Nemecky	WWF
37	Uwe Richter	Deutscher Hochseefischerei-Verband
38	Verena Ohms	Pelagic AC

1. Opening of the meeting by the chairman, Ian Gatt

The chairman opened the meeting at 10:00 hrs and welcomed the participants. A tour de table followed.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The chairman announced that there are three issues to be discussed under AOB. Other than that the agenda was adopted without amendments.

3. Follow-up on action items

The first action item was to contact the SWW regional group to establish a working relationship with that group. Goncalo Carvalho had been very helpful in finding out who to contact at the Portuguese ministry, currently chairing the SWW regional group, and forwarded that information to the secretariat. The secretariat subsequently contacted the Portuguese administration and was informed that the Pelagic AC might be invited to the next High Level Group meeting in May if control will be discussed.

The second action item asked members to submit suggestions on how to allocate the additional financial resources to be received from the Commission as of the next budget year. However, no suggestions have been received and the secretariat hence proposed an allocation scheme to be discussed later at the meeting.

Jerome Nouis had been charged with putting forward a draft recommendation on additional tonnage on vessels. This recommendation has been circulated to the Executive Committee two days ago and the chairman considered it too ambitious to discuss the issue during this meeting. Instead he suggested discussing the draft recommendation in the focus group on control and technical measures and coming up with a proposal for the Executive Committee.

Frederik Schutyser had promised to check with the Commission whether there are any rules on when discard plans can be amended throughout the year. Before the entry into force of the landing obligation for a fishery, the Commission told Member States that joint recommendations have to be received by the end of May, to ensure adoption in time for the act to enter into force by January of the following year. Now that pelagic discard plans are in place it does not matter as much anymore when a proposed amendment is being received. However, for practical reasons the Commission suggested to stick to the timeline. This will enable a scientific review of proposed amendments given that the STECF meeting dealing with these issues is scheduled for June. At the same time it takes several months to get new rules adopted and by submitting them by the end of May they can be aligned with the TAC and Quota Regulation.

Sean O'Donoghue remarked that the Pelagic AC has to fast-track its recommendations on control and enforcement to the Scheveningen and the NWW regional group to make sure that they will be included in an amendment of the discard plans.

The chairman pointed out that the recommendations on control and enforcement have been presented to both groups, but that the Pelagic AC has not received any reaction yet. He decided to contact the regional groups and ask for an update on how the groups intend to proceed.

The next action item was in relation to finalizing the recommendation on damaged fish through written procedure. The chairman explained that there had been a couple of WebEx meetings as well as numerous email exchanges, but to date no consensus has been reached. He said that the discussion could either be continued through WebEx or that an advice could be put forward outlining both positions. The latter option has explicitly been mentioned by the Commission as a welcome alternative if no consensus can be found. A third option would be to discuss the issue at a landing obligation workshop that he will talk about under AOB. In summary, the Executive Committee is now closer to a common position than it was in February.

Gerard van Balsfoort considered it a pity that no common position has been found. He recalled that he had started the damaged fish discussion, because small amounts of broken fish are being detected in the processing operation on freezer-trawlers. According to the Omnibus Regulation fish that has been damaged by predators must be disposed of at sea to avoid contamination with pathogens and bacteria. However, it is not possible for the crew on freezer-trawlers to assess whether the damaged fish encountered has been damaged by predators or by the fishing operation itself, e.g. the net. In the end the Executive Committee could not agree on a common position. He received questions like what the total amount of damaged fish is for the entire pelagic fleet. However, this information is not available for the entire pelagic fleet and hence he cannot answer the question. If the Commission wants to receive amendments to the discard plans by the end of May, then dealing with the issue in July will not be sufficient and it would take another year before the issue can be dealt with again. On the other hand, having a non-consensus position is an alien concept to the Pelagic AC whose members always try to reach common ground. He considered it silly to break the long period of consensus positions for such a small issue, but did not see any other way. Therefore, he suggested presenting both arguments to the Member States and the Commission.

The chairman proposed laying out both positions, in addition to also discussing the topic at the workshop on the landing obligation.

Christine Absil applauded the Pelagic AC for having reached consensus on so many occasions, but also thought that people should consider the most effective way to operate. In this specific case she suggested emphasizing the elements that people agree on and then outlining where the differences are. Even though there might be a minority position on a small issue it is obvious that within the Pelagic AC people are always working hard to look for consensus.

The chairman agreed with Christine Absil and pointed out that there are parts of the recommendation that everyone agrees on and for the other parts he suggested outlining the different positions. The Commission was very clear at the last Inter AC meeting to rather have the entire discussion in front of them than to receive no position.

Sean O'Donoghue agreed on emphasizing those elements that people agree on, but he was not in favor of putting forward two opinions. He said that the Pelagic AC has dealt with much more difficult issues and yet always managed to reach a common position. He advocated that the people who have direct problems with the draft recommendation should try one more time to work out an agreed position. If this cannot be achieved, the differences should be explained rather than putting in two positions.

The chairman suggested discussing this issue over lunch. Gerard van Balsfoort agreed and also pointed out that in the original discard plan a number of recommendations had already been agreed on, including on damaged fish due to netting. The current draft recommendation is not entirely new,

but partly building on the original recommendation, but now accounting for the new provision in the Omnibus Regulation.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen agreed with Sean O'Donoghue and offered to facilitate the lunch meeting and to report back during Working Group I.

The next action item was in relation to fine-tuning the implementation of the landing obligation and to provide recommendations on possible solutions to issues identified. The chairman announced that he will come back to this point under AOB.

The decision tree on discard measures and exemptions is part of a wider case study which has been uploaded to the website and can be used by the focus group on control and technical measures for future analysis.

The recommended amendments to the discard plans as agreed on during the previous Executive Committee meeting have been submitted to the regional groups. The amendments were in relation to on-board processing plants, hake bycatch, purse-seine survivability exemption rules and catch composition rules. It was also included in the letters that a recommendation on damaged fish might be submitted shortly, but no guarantee was given.

The final action point was to draft a position paper on the evaluation of the Control Regulation and the chairman thanked the focus group for putting in a lot of effort into this position paper.

4. Allocation of additional financial resources

The chairman recalled that as of the next budget year the Commission's contribution to each AC will increase by 50.000 euro and therefore the secretariat asked members to provide proposals on how to allocate these additional funds. Unfortunately no proposals have been received and the secretariat hence presented its own allocation scheme which foresees additional 25.000 euro for travel costs and 10.000 euro for meetings costs given that there is a high demand for more face to face meetings. It is also foreseen to reserve 12.000 euro for other contracts which would provide the opportunity to get some external scientific help. The remaining money will automatically be allocated to the 5% contingency reserve.

The Executive Committee adopted the proposal unanimously.

5. Election of a new Management Team member from the 40% interest group

The chairman announced that the Executive Committee has to elect a new Management Team member, because Christine Absil will leave the Pelagic AC in a few months. She has been a Management Team member since the beginning of the Pelagic AC in 2005. While there have been challenging situations in which it sometimes seemed impossible to reach consensus, Christine Absil has always put in a lot of effort to find compromises. She recently founded a new NGO, called the Good Fish Foundation, and the chairman congratulated her with this achievement. He also handed her a small token of appreciation on behalf of the Pelagic AC.

Christine Absil thanked the Pelagic AC for the acknowledgement and wished everybody a lot of success in the future. She concluded that the Pelagic AC is one of the best functioning ACs and she remembered many occasions when she was the only NGO representative present at meetings. Despite being in such a minority the Pelagic AC has always given the NGOs a lot of room and she very much appreciated this.

The chairman said that the only application to join the Management Team has been submitted by Stella Nemecky who is a very active member and also co-chair of the ecosystem focus group. Her application was unanimously endorsed by the Executive Committee and the chairman welcomed Stella as new Management Team member.

6. Representation at Executive Committee meetings

Jesper Raakjaer said that he had requested this issue to be discussed. This topic has not been discussed in AIPCE, but he has been working in marine governance for more than 20 years and been involved in some of the work that eventually led to the establishment of the ACs. Like Christine Absil he agreed that the Pelagic AC is functioning quite well, but he also noticed that there are a lot more members now and almost everybody is participating in the Executive Committee meetings. Many discussions are now being held in the Executive Committee meetings which means that these meetings feel more like Working Group meetings. To him it was not clear anymore who is an Executive Committee member and who is a Working Group member. While most of the seats in the 60% group are taken there are some seats available in the 40% group and he was of the opinion that people participating in Executive Committee discussions should also become members of the Executive Committee and take responsibility, especially if seats are available. It was important to him to know who takes decisions and is responsible for them. He therefore strongly encouraged members to take the vacant seats of the Executive Committee. Finally he pointed out that the border between Working Groups and the Executive Committee is very fluffy and he thought it is important to reflect on what is best for the functioning of the AC.

The chairman thanked Jesper Raakjaer for his explanation and pointed out that he had asked the secretariat to arrange tables in such a way that it is clearer who is on the Executive Committee and who is not.

Sean O'Donoghue thought that Jesper Raakjaer had a valid point, but he also thought that the Pelagic AC has worked well in terms of dividing the workload between the Working Groups and putting forward recommendations from the Working Groups to the Executive Committee. Recently it happened that issues are often dealt with in the Executive Committee which previously were dealt with in the Working Groups, because of the increased workload on the Working Groups. He pointed out that other ACs work with a color code where Executive Committee members get a green color and everyone else gets a white color. This way it is easy to see who is an Executive Committee member and the chairman can take comments from the Executive Committee members first and from observers later. Any decisions will be taken by green-colored members. He considered this a useful tool in the future.

Gerard van Balsfoort said that he is very much in favor of a debate where everyone can join in. Indeed sometimes the Executive Committee deals with horizontal issues that do not fit into the Working Groups. In such cases a focus group is set up that directly submits proposals to the Executive Committee for decision making. He agreed that there should be an order in which comments are taken and the chair should be able to manage that. While he did not want to formalize this procedure too much, he also acknowledged that in difficult discussions the chair should be able to use some formal rules and he thought that in the past the Pelagic AC has let it slide too much. Usually issues are not formalized by voting, but he agreed that a color code for Executive Committee members would be useful as well as taking their comments first.

The chairman summarized that the proposal is to have a color code for Executive Committee members and to have a debate among them first before opening the floor to observers.

Jesper Raakjaer agreed to this proposal.

Stella Nemecky understood Jesper Raakjaer's point and thought that the proposed way forward is good for situations that are contentious. However, she also pointed out that she considered the current practice of having Executive Committee meetings in a very open way as beneficial and she would prefer to keep it that way.

Christine Absil wanted to confirm that people should also look at the role of the meeting. Sometimes it was not clear to her where decisions are being made and she said that other ACs have much clearer distinctions. However, she also pointed out that not all issues can be dealt with in the Working Groups and she wanted to formalize the process a bit more, e.g. agree on first discussing all issues in the Working Groups or having discussions directly in the Executive Committee.

The chairman replied that in his mind it has always been very clear that all decisions are taken by the Executive Committee, but he understood Christine Absil's point. He said that a lot of issues, mainly in relation to the landing obligation, have been dealt with by the Executive Committee, because the Working Groups are overloaded. He thought that it might be better to deal with these issues either in the Working Groups or in specific focus groups again and avoid long discussions during Executive Committee meetings.

Irene Kingma said that she specifically decided to join the Working Groups and not the Executive Committee, because the advice is prepared in the Working Groups. She found it worrying to hear people say that they want to deal with contentious issues in the Executive Committee. She also found it counter-intuitive to have an Executive Committee meeting before the Working Groups although the only decision taken today was in relation to electing a new Management Team member.

Jesper Raakjaer said that Irene Kingma misunderstood what he said. He wanted to know why she refuses to join the Executive Committee even though a seat is available for her. At the same time she insists on participating in the Executive Committee meetings and the discussions. It did not make sense to him that she did not want to join the Executive Committee under these circumstances.

Sean O'Donoghue suggested to make a few procedural changes. Rather than discussing issues in the Executive Committee that have not been discussed in either one of the Working Groups or a focus group, he proposed that each focus group should report to a Working Group first which then reports to the Executive Committee. He agreed that in normal circumstances it is logical to have an Executive Committee meeting after the Working Groups meet and this is always done at the July and October meetings when the Working Groups actually have a proposal to put forward to the Executive Committee. However, at today's meeting it was clear that the Working Groups would not put forward any recommendations to the Executive Committee and therefore Irene Kingma's comment was a non-issue. It was fine to him to arrange seating in such a way that the Executive Committee members are at the top of the table, but even then it was not clear to him where the line is drawn and therefore he preferred a color code.

The chairman concluded that members welcomed having an open debate at Executive Committee meetings but that the responsibility for decision making lay with the members of the committee. A color code to identify Executive Committee members would be used in the future.

7. Commission proposal on Technical Measures Regulation

Norman Graham thanked the Pelagic AC for giving him the opportunity to present a first insight in the content of the Technical Measures proposal and how the Commission got to that proposal. The history of technical measures in the EU is regulation upon regulation, whether it is technical measures squeezed on the back of the TAC and Quota Regulation or somewhere else. At the moment there are 90 of these regulations in place. It is generally accepted that technical measures have been

performing sub-optimally, are prescriptive and complex and it is difficult to measure their effectiveness. There is a lack of flexibility and from a stakeholder perspective there is also a general lack of buy-in from those affected by these regulations. The way the objectives and targets of the current technical measures are formulated is very qualitatively without quantitative metrics on how to measure success. Rather than providing an incentive to avoid unwanted catches the incentive under the current regulation is to mitigate the regulation. More and more rules are being added leading to a technological and legislative arms race. In 2011 the Commission launched an intensive consultation process with continued consultation of key stakeholders from 2011 until 2015 and a public consultation in 2014. The contributions received to this consultation process have fed significantly into the current proposal and are also included in the impact assessment. The main conclusions were that people want results-based management, accountability of fishermen for catches, simplification while safeguarding a level-playing field, regionalization, a framework approach setting overarching objectives, common standards and safeguards and incentivizing structures for selectivity. In the impact assessment a number of possible options were compared, e.g. a baseline scenario, a scenario which leaves measures as they are, but combines them in one document, a framework scenario with and without baseline standards and an elimination scenario. The outcome was that the most preferable option is a framework scenario with baseline standards that leaves the details to regionalization. Therefore, the Commission tried to maintain the current measures, but to simplify them and consolidate them into one document. The key elements of the new Technical Measures proposal is a general structure for future technical measures that is in agreement with a long-term perspective and co-decided, e.g. a prohibition of using dynamite and poison, followed by baseline measures by sea basin in absence of measures adopted under regionalization. There are no fundamental changes to existing rules, but there will be a review of area closures and restrictions based on scientific advice. Natura 2000 sites will remain unaffected. There will also be a simplification of mesh size regulations and a shift of detail to Commission acts. The Technical Measures proposal also contains some new elements linking it to the MSFD, e.g. environmental impacts of fishing should not exceed levels that are required for good environmental status. Chapter I of the proposal contains general provisions that will be co-decided, chapter II contains common technical rules, which will also be co-decided. Chapter III is about regionalization and constitutes a fundamental shift compared to the current regime. This chapter provides flexibility to change certain elements through delegated acts. So, if a regional group wants to propose alternative measures, then there is the flexibility to do so. Finally there is a range of annexes, one for each region, which contains all the details. Norman Graham said that the proposal has just recently been presented to the Council and the Parliament and hence the process is very much at the beginning.

Stella Nemecky wanted to know on what rational minimum conservation reference sizes (MCRS) have been decided.

Norman Graham said that they largely stem from existing sizes with few exceptions.

Sean O'Donoghue thanked Norman Graham for his presentation and welcomed the new Technical Measures proposal. He wanted to know from a legislative point of view how the targets in the proposal, e.g. catches below MCRS should not exceed 5%, can be enforced given that they are just targets. He also pointed out that the Pelagic AC has to deal with three different regional groups given the nature of pelagic stocks and it seemed to him that this will also be the case in the future although there was an opportunity here to avoid that.

Norman Graham responded that the rationale was to simply continue the regionalization process and the proposal pretty much follows what has been put in place already. He did, however, acknowledge the problem with boundary areas for pelagic stocks and said that the Commission tried to harmonize measures in that regard as much as possible, e.g. in terms of MCRS of mackerel. In terms of targets he did not consider it unreasonable to have specific numbers. Everybody agreed to

follow a results-based approach and for that it is necessary to define targets. The question is more what target to pick. The 5% below MCRS catch number is directly linked to the Basic Regulation which contains a de minimis of 5%.

Sean O'Donoghue understood the logic behind the proposal, but he wanted to know how this is going to be enforced. The target applies across all stocks and Member States, but people will not know before the end of the year whether a target has been reached or not. He wondered if this is enforceable at all.

Norman Graham said that the same argument could be applied to de minimis exemptions. However, Sean O'Donoghue pointed out that the de minimis applies at a specific level, i.e. per trip whereas the targets in the Technical Measures proposal apply overall and then have to be broken down on Member State level. He did not believe that this will be enforceable.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen said that the technical measures are the basis for everything that is being done in the sector. The current measures are 28 years old and he wondered if the newly proposed measures can stand the test of time. In a few years people might want to develop a new fishery, e.g. due to climate change which could lead to new species showing up while others move out. He wanted to know whether under the proposed provisions it would be possible to develop a new fishery. He also asked whether it makes sense to have mesh sizes in pelagic fisheries.

Norman Graham said that it was not the intention to stop a developing fishery through the Technical Measures Regulation.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen said that this was the case for boarfish. Even though this was the speediest process ever to change the Technical Measures Regulation it still took 8 months and he was worried that it might be very difficult in the future to change the Technical Measures if someday the industry wants to develop a new fishery.

Gerard van Balsfoort thanked Norman Graham for the presentation and thought that the Commission really tried to take the Technical Measures Regulation a step further. Of course some people have argued to get rid of the Regulation completely, but he considered this a good start. It is difficult, however, to envision how to translate the 5% target for below MCRS catches into the future and how to enforce that. To him this number felt more like a symbol of a target rather than a real target. The annexes are shorter than in the current regulation, but still very long and complex. He wanted to know whether it is possible to change MCRS.

Norman Graham said that MCRS can be deviated from if it is scientifically shown that it is safe to do so.

Gerard van Balsfoort further pointed out that the new Technical Measures Regulation will likely not be in force before 2020. Still, the whole fleet is suffering under the current Technical Measures which have a lot of ambiguity especially under the landing obligation. He wanted to know if there is a fast-track process for really obsolete technical measures, so that Member States could change them before the new regulation comes into place.

Norman Graham said that he will take the question back to the Commission and discuss it internally.

The chairman wanted to know when the Commission would look for feedback on the proposal from the ACs.

Norman Graham replied that in the NSAC it has been suggested to set-up a subgroup looking at the proposal and gathering internal views to communicate them to the Commission and regional groups. This process is foreseen to be done over the next few months. He said that the Council and the Parliament will soon start reading the proposal line by line and he had no idea how long that is going to take.

The chairman said that the Pelagic AC is already a bit ahead given that it already has a focus group dealing with control and technical measures. He invited interested members who are not yet members of the focus group to contact the secretariat if they want to join the focus group after all. He also announced that the focus group will meet for a WebEx meeting within the next few weeks to start formulating a response.

Sean O'Donoghue suggested that the focus group should report back to Working Group I in light of the earlier discussion.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen agreed with this suggestion and reminded participants that the Pelagic AC has submitted a recommendation on technical measures in 2009 which should be looked at for inspiration.

8. AOB

John Andersen explained that he attended a workshop last week in Edinburgh which was hosted by the UK and dealt with quota swaps to avoid choke species. The meeting was mainly attended by civil servants, but also some AC members were present. Before the meeting people were asked to do some homework and identify potential choke species and at what level, e.g. vessel, PO, Member State, sea basin or biological. At the meeting itself solutions to the problems were discussed, focusing on choke species at sea basin level. Some scenarios to avoid choke species were certainly more fanciful and difficult to implement than others, e.g. bycatch quotas, removing TACs for zero TAC stocks, changing existing quota swap platforms, forced gifting of quota etc. The most interesting options are probably the others quota and relaxing MSY constraints. All options have been documented and will be presented to the High Level Groups. The UK said that it is determined to push for solutions.

The chairman thanked John Andersen for the summary and announced to circulate the report once available.

Irene Kingma added for the three specific issues raised by the Pelagic AC that bycatch of hake is an issue for all countries, but less so for Spain. Scotland had proposed a solution, but Spain said that the proposed solution would change relative stability and therefore Spain was against it. Zero TACs were mentioned a lot and different options have been discussed. The ITQ system in Sweden was not discussed in detail, but it was discussed how to re-distribute quota and maybe setting aside some uplift for certain species.

John Andersen added that for hake and spurdog neither a de minimis nor the inter-species flexibility have been discussed. However, he thought it was worth pursuing these options since bycatch of these species is a selectivity issue and it is not really possible to increase selectivity.

The next AOB item was to follow-up on issues in relation to the landing obligation. The chairman said that he has been looking at ways on how to take this forward and the Commission kindly agreed to host a workshop in the morning of 5 July in Brussels for a maximum of 30 people. His idea was to invite people from the regional groups dealing with control, from EFCA, relevant scientists etc. He will further discuss the invitation list with the secretariat. He said that there will be limited seats available for AC members, but he asked everyone interested in attending the workshop to inform the secretariat. Once the Management Team has discussed the specifics more information will be provided. He warned people that there might not be enough money left in the budget to reimburse participation in the workshop.

The last action item was in relation to a research proposal called MaxFish that asked the Pelagic AC to join as a partner. Verena Ohms explained that she had received a one page summary of the

proposal the previous day and that she will circulate it to the Executive Committee for further discussion. In brief, this project will try to sustainably maximize yield and revenue of the pelagic fish complex in EU and international waters by taking into account variability in fish stock productivity.

9. End of meeting

The chairman closed the meeting at 12.00 and reminded people to sign up for the July meeting in Peterhead as soon as possible to keep costs low.

Action items

- Continue work on damaged fish recommendation (Executive Committee)
- Discuss vessel tonnage draft recommendation and submit recommendation to Executive Committee (focus group on control and technical measures)
- Decide on vessel tonnage recommendation (Executive Committee)
- Use color code in future Executive Committee meetings (chairman, secretariat)
- Circulate official report from quota swap workshop once available (secretariat)
- Organize specifics of landing obligation workshop on 5 July in Brussels (Management Team)
- Circulate MaxFish proposal to Executive Committee (secretariat)
- Plan WebEx meeting of the focus group on control and technical measures to discuss Technical Measures proposal (chairman, secretariat)