
Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

Participants:

Iain MacSween (chairman), Anne Mette Bæk Jespersen, Barry Delany, Bent Pallisgaard, Björn Lindblad, Brian Isbister, Christine Absil, Claus Reedtz-Sparrevohn, Eibhlin O'Sullivan, Eric Roeleveld, Esben Sverdrup-Jensen, Frederik Schutyser, Fredrik Lindberg, Gerard van Balsfoort, Ignacio Fontaneda Lopez, Jerome Nouis, Jesper Raakjær, Jesper Juul Laarsen, John Ward, José Beltran, Kari Stange, Konstantinos Kokosis, Lesley Duthie, Ludmilla van der Meer, Miguel Nuevo Alarcon, Miren Garmendia, Nico Bogaard, Reinier Hille Ris Lambers, Rob Banning, Uwe Richter, Verena Ohms, Victoria Beaz, William Stewart

1) Opening of the meeting by the chairman, Iain MacSween

The chairman opened the meeting at 10.10 hrs and thanked the participants for their attendance. He asked people to silence their phones and to introduce themselves.

2) Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved without amendments. The chairman explained that there were many items to discuss and that it was necessary to condense the discussion as much as possible to finish in time.

3) Follow-up on action points from October meeting

All action items from the previous meeting had been completed successfully.

4) Current utilization of budget 2013-2014

The chairman explained that the first six months of the current Pelagic RAC financial year have almost passed and that the secretariat had prepared a financial overview to bring members up to date in terms of the Pelagic RAC's budget. The figures included an estimate for the current meeting's travel and subsistence costs which was believed to be fairly accurate. Based on this information 58% of the budget has already been utilized. Budget item C (preparation of meetings) has been exceeded due to an increased number of people attending the Pelagic RAC's meetings given that lunch and venue costs are calculated per participant. Therefore the 5% contingency reserve will likely have to be spent on this item. The secretariat uttered concern regarding the level of expenditure and hence has proposed potential ways of reducing costs as to not close the year with a financial deficit. At the same time the chairman pointed out that if the job is to be done properly and additional meetings

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

are necessary then this is reflected in the overall budget.

The proposal by the secretariat included limiting the number of participants, charging a fee to contribute to meeting costs, offering no lunch in the future or appealing to the generosity of members and asking them to refrain from claiming reimbursement. The chairman opened the floor for discussion and wanted to hear from members which solution they would prefer. As an alternative he suggested continuing as before and deciding at the end of the year how to handle a deficit if it occurs.

Gerard van Balsfoort remarked that the Pelagic RAC already raised the issue of limited resources in the past when the Commission asked the Pelagic RAC to do a huge job in terms of proposing a pelagic discard plan. Back then the Pelagic RAC made it clear that this would lead to budgetary problems. He suggested asking the Commission to fund the additional meetings even though the secretariat considered this option as very unlikely. If the Commission will not be able to provide additional resources he suggested cancelling lunch offerings in the future although this would probably not make a big difference.

Sean O'Donoghue wanted to wait until the end of the year when it becomes apparent how big the deficit will be and then solve the issue with the members by raising a small additional contribution from each member organisation.

The chairman agreed with his suggestion as he expected the deficit to be rather manageable. At the same time he considered it worthwhile to ask the Commission for additional funds.

Christine Absil considered it highly unlikely that the Commission will provide additional funding especially since all RACs are faced with a similar problem. Setting a limit might be a good idea, but at the same time she emphasized the importance of allowing people to participate if they want.

The chairman asked Frederik Schutyser whether he thought that the Commission might be in a position to offer any help.

Frederik Schutyser replied that the Commission was aware that the landing obligation meant additional work and costs for all RACs. However, at the moment nothing was foreseen to cover these additional costs and until the EMFF has been adopted there will be definitely no additional money to spend on anything. Nevertheless he promised to take the question on how to deal with the resource issue back to the Commission.

5) Articles of association (from PRAC to PAC)

The chairman explained that at the conclusion of the current Pelagic RAC year the first Pelagic AC year will start and a number of preparations have to be made. The Pelagic RAC is a foundation registered in The Netherlands and as such has articles of association. These will need to be amended in various ways according to the new regulations. The changes to be made to reflect the new situation include removing references to ACFA, changing the name to "Pelagic Advisory Council", changing the references to the new EU regulations,

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

updating the composition rules, including boarfish under article 2 and 3 and including the landing obligation under article 5. The chairman asked whether members detected anything that might be missing.

Gerard van Balsfoort fully supported the changes, but wondered whether industrial species should be included in the Pelagic AC, such as sprat and sandeel. The North Sea RAC does not deal with these stocks, but members of the Pelagic RAC do fish them. He was aware that these stocks cannot be added to the articles of association now, but wanted to try again in the future.

Sean O'Donoghue agreed with Gerard van Balsfoort, but also pointed out that the annex to the CFP only includes the five species the Pelagic RAC is already dealing with. Any deviation from that list will have to be arranged specifically. The North Western Waters RAC has previously asked the Commission which RAC should deal with sprat and the reply was that the North Western Waters RAC has to consult with the Pelagic RAC. However, the sprat stocks which the North Western Waters RAC inquired about had nothing to do with widely distributed species. He concluded that at the moment sprat cannot officially be included in the remit of the Pelagic RAC, but that the issue has to be discussed with the Commission.

Frederik Schutyser confirmed that this had been discussed between the North Western Waters RAC and the Commission and the Pelagic RAC is legally limited to a specific number of stocks. At the same time it does not make sense not to work on sprat and the Commission suggested making an arrangement with the other RACs. Frederik Schutyser said that the Commission would be happy to facilitate, but that it cannot change the regulation. He also added that a delegated act was currently prepared regarding the composition of the ACs which should be included in the articles of association. He advised contacting Evangelia Georgitsi for the details.

The chairman pointed out that Marc Ghilia raised an idea about the composition requirements. He was not sure whether this idea was supported by the wider French industry or only by a single organisation. Basically, Marc Ghilia suggested leaving seats vacant if they cannot be filled, but to provide a weighting factor for the votes of the group with vacant seats, e.g. if one of the groups can only fill half of its seats each vote of that group could be counted double. The chairman wondered if this issue might be covered by the delegated act and wanted to hear more specific details.

Frederik Schutyser offered to email Evangelia Georgitsi about this issue and report back later today. He said that one issue included in the delegated act will regard the number of ExCom representatives.

The chairman wanted to know whether this document was imminent given that August is not far away.

Frederik Schutyser replied that Council and Parliament have two months to object to a delegated act. However, this year's Parliamentary recess and the elections may have an impact on timing and process and cause a delay.

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

6) General Assembly membership

The chairman pointed out that a new General Assembly has to be in place before the 17th of August 2014 when the new Pelagic AC year starts. To meet the 90% co-financing requirement, membership fees have to be received in June in order to sign the new Grant Agreement on time. Additionally the Member States have to approve of the members of the General Assembly. This requires a good amount of administrative work to be completed over the next few months to put in place a new General Assembly and later also a new Executive Committee and chairmen. Therefore the secretariat will send out application forms to all current and potential new members, which have to be filled in and sent back before the end of February 2014. Once all filled in application forms have been received they will be submitted to the Member States for approval. This procedure will allow constituting the new General Assembly before the due date in August, so that the Pelagic AC can carry on with the work it is doing. The chairman asked for any comments and for approval of this procedure by the Executive Committee. He also wanted to know whether Gerard van Balsfoort was aware of any Dutch laws that might complicate the process.

Gerard van Balsfoort was not aware of any complications and the Executive Committee approved of the suggested procedure.

7) Letter received from the Scheveningen Group

The next item discussed concerned a letter received from the Scheveningen Group. For those unaware of this group the chairman summarized the occurrences over the past couple of months. He had thought that in the process of trying to implement the landing obligation Member States with an interest in pelagic fisheries would create a Member State group that would act as regional body dealing with the implementation of a pelagic discard plan. However, the Member States considered the creation of a separate pelagic group as illegal and undesirable. As a result the chairman, together with Christian Olesen, met with the so-called Scheveningen Group in December in Copenhagen. The Scheveningen Group grew out of control experts of Member States with an interest in the North Sea. That includes Denmark, the UK, The Netherlands, Germany and France. At that meeting the chairman explained the view of the Pelagic RAC that rather than dealing with pelagic matters in the confinement of the Scheveningen Group, a separate Member States group should be established that does not only deal with pelagic stocks in the North Sea, but also in the West of Scotland, West of Ireland, Bay of Biscay etc. However, this request was immediately rejected. It was the firm view of the Scheveningen Group that legally only the relevant regional body can provide recommendations to the Commission and in an attempt to take care of pelagic stocks they suggested inviting Irish and Spanish representatives to their meetings if stocks were discussed outside the North Sea. The Pelagic RAC had discussions on this issue with various Member States and questioned written form whether this was the best way forward. Until now the Member States have not changed their minds and France and Germany have been tasked to produce a pelagic discard plan. The Scheveningen Group also issued a discard atlas including pelagic stocks in the North Sea.

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

Recently a letter has been received written by German Jeub who is chairing the Scheveningen Group in 2014. He made it very clear that he intended to have a discard plan in force on 1 January 2015. To deal with the necessary legalities that discard plan has to be submitted to the Commission in June this year which means that drafts of the plan have to be ready for discussion in March. In conclusion the Pelagic RAC was requested to submit input by the end of February at the latest. The chairman was aware that not every Pelagic RAC member was happy with this deadline, but he suspected that there was not much the Pelagic RAC could do about the situation. Mr Jeub made it very clear that only the Scheveningen Group will be allowed to submit a discard plan together with the North Western Waters states. He concluded that the Pelagic RAC will have to deal at least with these two Member State groups which may or may not be working in harmony. Tomorrow the Pelagic RAC will continue the work it began on discards and he invited Sean O'Donoghue to add any remarks at this point.

Sean O'Donoghue explained that he doubted that the North Western Waters and Scheveningen Group had come to an agreement regarding who deals with what stocks. He also pointed out that it will be impossible for the Pelagic RAC to meet the deadline of 28 February. He said that the Member State groups had to be mindful that they have to fully consult with the RACs and giving a completely unrealistic deadline is not acceptable as consultation. A year ago when the Pelagic RAC started working on this issue the timescale was set in accordance with the information received from the Commission and the deadline was set at the end of April, beginning of May. A lot of work has since been done, but a lot of work still has to be completed particularly regarding articles 15 and 16 which are open to interpretation. In addition he did not like the tone of the letter which was very demanding. He suggested sending a diplomatic reply saying that if they want to proceed without consulting the Pelagic RAC they will have to do so. Furthermore, the Pelagic RAC does not have the resources to travel to all different kinds of regional group meetings. Besides the Scheveningen and the North Western Waters Group there is also Baltfish and possibly a South Western Waters group. Rather than having the Pelagic RAC travel to all these regional meetings the Member States should participate in the Pelagic RAC meetings and all parties could cooperate with each other. There will be another discard meeting in April, which will hopefully be the last one and the pelagic discard plan could be finished at the end of April. If the Scheveningen Group insisted on receiving input now the Pelagic RAC will have to submit an unfinished document. He pointed out that North Western Waters Group also invited the Pelagic RAC to a meeting, but their letter was less demanding and more cooperative. He proposed writing again to the Commission and the Member States and explaining that it does not make sense to split up the pelagic stocks. An informal solution would be to have an informal group among the Member States.

Frederik Schutyser recalled that the Pelagic RAC had previously uttered worries regarding excessive travelling and also pointed out that it had already put a lot of work into developing a pelagic discard plan. The Commission had promised to bring this message back to the Member States and will see whether it is possible to add it to the agenda of the formal director general meeting in April. He said that the Commission has not been actively involved in the discards work of the Scheveningen Group and therefore does not have a complete picture of what the Group has done to date. The North Western Waters

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

Group informed the Commission that the Pelagic RAC was providing input to its work, and the Commission asked whether that is indeed the case. While the North Western Waters Group explained to the Commission that it was performing technical work, no output has yet been received so it is not yet clear what exactly this work encompassed. Frederik Schutyser also understood that the Pelagic RAC chairman will be invited to the next meeting of the North Western Waters Group. This group wants to submit a plan in June, while ensuring compatibility with the work of the Scheveningen Group. Frederik Schutyser wondered whether the Pelagic RAC knew to what extent the North Western Waters Group depends on the Pelagic RAC's input or whether the group sees the RAC's work as complementary.

Sean O'Donoghue replied that the only formal communication from the North Western Waters Group was an invitation to its next meeting. He understood from the Irish administration that the group was not working on pelagic stocks, but was waiting for the outcome of the Pelagic RAC's efforts. The North Western Waters Group seemed to focus more on demersal stocks. However, besides the meeting invitation no formal communication has taken place with the Pelagic RAC and it has never been confirmed which stocks this group is dealing with. Therefore it remained unclear whether mackerel, horse mackerel and blue whiting will be dealt with by the Scheveningen Group or the North Western Waters Group.

José Beltran was very concerned that several Member State groups will deal with the same pelagic stocks. He wondered what the Pelagic RAC will actually be able to contribute and whether the Commission will weigh the output of one group stronger than the output of another group. He also was not sure whether other RACs will be consulted with regards to pelagic stocks and if so, how their work will compare to the Pelagic RAC's work. He wondered how migratory stocks will be dealt with and he was frustrated about the lack of communication from the Member States. He wanted to know what the Pelagic RAC could do to prevent wrong decisions being taken.

The chairman explained that the Scheveningen Group draws its power from regionalisation. At the meeting in December the group explained that as recognized regional group it has the power to submit discard plans to the Commission and that the Pelagic RAC only has to be consulted, but that the RACs cannot submit discard plans themselves. The problem for the Pelagic RAC is that it will have to deal with different regional Member State groups. It started with the Scheveningen Group, but now there is also the North Western Waters Group and in the future the Pelagic RAC may have to deal with Baltfish and possibly a South Western Waters Group as well. It also was not clear whether the different Member State groups coordinated their efforts with each other at all. The chairman was under the impression that Mr Jeub, currently leading the Scheveningen Group, is very determined to get a discard plan in place before January 2015.

Gerard van Balsfoort said that the Scheveningen Group is a bit of a mess, but nevertheless has already produced a discard atlas which includes a lot of information on North Sea pelagic stocks. At the moment the Scheveningen Group seemed to move forward quicker than the Pelagic RAC regarding the North Sea and Gerard van Balsfoort was hesitant to simply say that the Pelagic RAC could not meet the deadline. Instead he

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

suggested a personal meeting with Mr Jeub to discuss how to move forward.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen agreed with this suggestion. He was very surprised by the letter received from the Scheveningen Group, especially since he understood from the Danish administration that a discard plan for industrial fisheries will be drafted in the summer and supposedly this plan will be combined with the pelagic discard plan. It seemed illogical to have two different deadlines while the timeframe for implementing the landing obligation was the same for both pelagic and industrial fisheries.

Sean O'Donoghue remarked that the regional Member State Groups can only put forward a discard plan if there is unanimity. Without stakeholder support it will be unlikely, however, that all Member States agree. Therefore he could imagine that the only document available in the end will be the Pelagic RAC document.

It was concluded that a letter should be sent to the Scheveningen Group suggesting a meeting to discuss the best way forward in terms of creating a pelagic discard plan. Sean O'Donoghue and possibly Esben Sverdrup-Jensen should represent the Pelagic RAC in such a meeting and also in meetings with other regional Member State groups.

8) H2020 fisheries call 2014-2015

The chairman invited Jesper Raakjær to give a short presentation on the upcoming Horizon 2020 fisheries call which will deal with the implementation of the landing obligation.

Jesper Raakjær thanked the Pelagic RAC for this opportunity and pointed out that last year it was decided by the Executive Committee that research ideas should be presented to the Pelagic RAC before it will be asked to join a consortium. Therefore he was going to present some ideas on the project which will be headed by Martin Pastoors from Imares. He said that some members might consider this call as coming too late given that the landing obligation for pelagics will enter into force in January 2015. However, having followed EU policy for many years he doubted that the landing obligation to be implemented by the 1st of January will be fully developed and hence it might still be a good idea to get involved in the research project. The scope of the project addresses six main points: how to avoid unwanted catches, how to handle unwanted catches, how to best use unwanted catches without creating economic incentives, how to estimate possible ecological consequences of the discard ban, how to control and monitor the discard ban and how to estimate its socio-economic consequences. Jesper Raakjær explained that it will be up to the different research groups to address as many of these points as possible. One of the main objectives of this consortium is to actively involve the fishing industry, but also managers, and to address the issues together. While the pelagic fisheries are forced into a pioneer position other fleets will be affected as well and the knowledge gained might prove useful across fleets. A large portion of the project will regard modelling and it will take some time to properly implement the models. Jesper Raakjær also pointed out that this was a long-term project and that a lot of time will pass before the discard ban will be properly implemented. One of the case studies will deal with pelagic fisheries and the Pelagic RAC's

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

ideas on how to make that case study meaningful are very much appreciated. Jesper Raakjær presented a slide with several potential issues, but this list was not exhaustive and he invited the RAC members to contribute to the list. The ideas he presented included how to integrate the discard plan into multi-annual plans, issues of documentation and self-monitoring and institutional aspects such as decentralization and industry ownership. He finished his presentation by stating that he would like to invite the Pelagic RAC to be part of the process and to consider joining the consortium.

Gerard van Balsfoort remarked that the pelagic fleets are already highly involved in preparing the landing obligation. Questions on how to increase selectivity, how to deal with possibly emerging markets, how to enforce the discard ban and how to handle unwanted catches are already being addressed and many pelagic companies are currently looking at very practical approaches. This project will only start in 2015 and then last for 4 years. The output should provide solutions on how to cope with the landing obligation, but the reality is that in the meantime pelagic fisheries will already deal with it.

Jesper Raakjær understood what was being said, but nevertheless considered it valuable to do some things in collaboration from January onwards, especially since the fishing industry might have some useful input into the project. Besides, there was no reason to wait for four years before applying available results. He said that even after the discard ban comes into effect there will be issues that need to be investigated and solved.

Gerard van Balsfoort imagined that the scope of the pelagic case study might change based on information being collected at the moment. He wanted to know whether, as a consequence, the scope of the project would change as well and whether that would even be possible.

Jesper Raakjær replied that the consortium could try to implement flexibility, but also said that the proposal would have to be relatively specific. It could be possible to state that depending on results currently collected the case study might have to be adjusted in order to build on the latest findings.

Gerard van Balsfoort subsequently wanted to know whether the project was also looking for partnerships with other, non-industry, organisations.

Jesper Raakjær explained that also other organisations will be taken on-board while at the same time making sure that the group will not become too large. He added that if the Pelagic RAC decided not to become a partner, it might not make sense to have a pelagic case study.

Esben Sverdrup-Jensen pointed out that people were rather late in addressing issues such as how to integrate discard plans into long-term management plans. He was certain that the Pelagic RAC could learn something from this project and therefore suggested embracing it.

Sean O'Donoghue agreed that the Pelagic RAC should embrace project. However, he also thought that it should take some of the things on-board which will already be implemented by the time the project is up and running. The effect of some of

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

the measures that will be in place should be investigated.

Jesper Raakjær pointed out that there is no guarantee that the project will be funded due to lots of competition. However, he hoped that it will receive funding and even though he was not able to exactly specify what the starting point for the pelagic case study will be he said that the Pelagic RAC could provide input during the drafting phase.

Gerard van Balsfoort wanted to support the project under the assumption that there will be some flexibility, because what is needed at the moment might be different from what is needed in a year.

Jesper Raakjær promised to take the comments by the Pelagic RAC on-board. The chairman noticed that there are big differences between pelagic fleets across countries and some are further in preparing for the landing obligation than others. He wished Jesper Raakjær well with the project and said that unless someone is otherwise minded he would like to work together on this in the future.

9) Report from MIRAC meeting

Christine Absil provided an overview of the MIRAC meeting which took place in Copenhagen on 15 and 16 January. A lot of the discussion focussed on demersal and mixed fisheries and less on pelagics. ICES asked for feedback regarding last year's advisory process and most people were quite positive about it. Only the North Sea RAC raised the problem that ICES did not present the advice at their meeting. However, ICES explained that they had received the inquiry very late and therefore could not accommodate the request. It was important to communicate wishes for ICES presentations during RAC meetings as soon as possible. The Pelagic RAC also mentioned that it had received very positive feedback from members about the two day training course offered to Commission officials in which RAC representatives may participate as well. ICES explained that it will put a lot of effort into integrating MSY and multi-species considerations. Already, some work has been done in the Baltic where the situation is comparatively simple. Nevertheless the outcome is not uncontroversial. ICES also emphasized that the workplan is published on the Sharepoint and changes constantly. If people want to stay up to date regarding meeting dates they should regularly consult the workplan and it is their own responsibility to do so. If people do not yet have access to the Sharepoint they can request access by contacting the ICES secretariat. During the MIRAC meeting the NWWRAC requested that scientists should engage stakeholders early on in project proposals just as Jesper Raakjaer did at the current meeting. This issue was raised with ICES so that the word can be spread throughout the scientific community. ICES also suggested having an MSY workshop in an ecosystem context. The Commission had quite some reservations, because this was considered to be a political issue. However, Christine Absil and Michael Andersen from the Baltic Sea RAC agreed that there could be such a stakeholder meeting with the Commission just listening to the discussions.

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

Sean O'Donoghue who unfortunately could not participate in the MIRAC meeting remembered that he wanted to raise two issues with ICES. One regarding the traffic light system, the other one regarding the methodology ICES uses when choosing external reviewers. He wondered whether any of this had been discussed.

Christine Absil replied that there was a general presentation on how ICES advice is produced and how it works, but there was no direct referral to the traffic light system.

Verena Ohms explained that the question on the methodology ICES uses when choosing external reviewers was raised and ICES explained that the external reviewers are always experts in the relevant field, but not directly involved in the process to ensure their independence. If two reviewers disagree the opinion of a third expert will be sought.

Sean O'Donoghue recalled that in relation to the blue whiting special request last year, ICES had difficulties finding appropriate reviewers because their methodology did not allow providing sufficient means to cover the reviewers' costs. Therefore it was difficult to get people to commit to the review process.

However, Verena Ohms understood from ICES that the issue with blue whiting was not a resource issue, but rather that both reviewers were unhappy with the framework provided for the harvest control rule proposed by the Pelagic RAC.

10) EMFF: funding opportunities

Sean O'Donoghue informed the meeting that in the new EMFF there will be the specific possibility for RACs to apply for additional funding. He pointed out that this was something the RACs have requested many times in the past and successfully so. He suggested discussing at the upcoming Inter RAC meeting how this will work in practice.

Christine Absil thought that this sounded very interesting and she wondered whether more information was available on this issue, e.g. whether the funding will be allocated through the Member States or whether it will be a separate allocation. She pointed out that some things, like long-term management plans, should not be dealt with on Member State level, but rather on regional level.

Sean O'Donoghue did not remember the precise wording, but understood that the intention was to have a separate allocation.

The chairman agreed that it would be very beneficial for the RACs to be able to apply for additional funding under the EMFF.

Frederik Schutyser remarked that he had received a reply from Evangelia Georgitsi regarding the delegated act that is currently prepared by the Commission on the functioning of Advisory Councils. She answered that the delegated act will incorporate most of the provisions of decision 2004/585 currently in force, unless they are incompatible with the new CFP. There will certainly be some flexibility concerning the members of the Executive Committee, but no derogation from what is already in Annex

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

III of the new basic regulation. The Commission strives for having the delegated act adopted before August. The Commission encouraged the Pelagic RAC to raise the French idea about the seat allocation and empty seats at the Inter RAC meeting in March since the issue is of relevance to other RACs also.

11) AOB

Sean O'Donoghue suggested that the Executive Committee should recognize the work of Christian Olesen who recently retired as chairman of Working Group I and who served the Pelagic RAC for almost 9 years.

The chairman agreed and it was decided that the secretariat will arrange a small acknowledgement.

12) End of meeting

The chairman closed the meeting at 12.30 hrs and asked people to resume at 13.45 hrs for the Working Group meetings.

Location: Parkhotel, Molenstraat 53, The Hague, Netherlands (+31 (0)70 362 43 71)

Date: 4 February 2014

Start time: 10:00

End time: 12:30

More info: see www.pelagic-rac.org

Annex I: action items

- Ask the Commission for additional funds to cover the meetings on the landing obligation (secretariat, chairman)
- Include delegated act in the articles of association (secretariat)
- Discuss with other RACs who should work on sprat (chairmen, Commission)
- Complete application procedure for new General Assembly 2014-2017 (secretariat)
- Raise issue of splitting up pelagic stocks with the Member States at the formal Director General meeting in April (Commission)
- Send letter to Scheveningen Group suggesting a personal meeting to discuss how to proceed regarding a pelagic discard plan (chairmen, secretariat) ✓
- Discuss at the Inter RAC meeting in March how RACs can draw funding from the EMFF (Sean O'Donoghue)
- Raise French idea regarding seat allocation (weighing factor) at the Inter RAC meeting in March (chairman)
- Arrange acknowledgement for Christian Olesen's service to the Pelagic RAC (secretariat)