Executive Committee
Minutes

Friday 3 July 2020
14:00-17:10 CET
Interactio online meeting

Welcome from the Chair, Guus Pastoor

Adoption of agenda and minutes last meeting (29.05.20): adopted

The Secretary General provided a state-of-play of the last meeting's action points:

- Future allocation of funds to the Advisory Councils: It was included on the draft agenda to be discussed;
- H2020 Project: TRACTION - Micro- and nano-plastics in our environment: Understanding exposures and impacts on human health (Servicio Galego de Saúde): Waiting for the potential approval of the project;
- COVID-19 Pandemic: The topic was discussed in all Working Groups. Further action could be taken, based on the reporting back by the Working Group Chairs;
- Farm to Fork Strategy: It was included on the draft agenda to be discussed. Also to be covered by the agenda item on the Work Programme for Year 5;
- EFCA: It was included on the draft agenda to be discussed;
- Relationship between Focus Groups, Working Groups, and Executive Committee: To keep in mind the general aim to work in a more efficient and cooperative manner under the Farm to Fork Strategy.

New members of the General Assembly

- **Endorsement of ClientEarth**

Click here to access ClientEarth's presentation.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) explained that ClientEarth uses the power of the law to bring about systematic change. The organisation advises on policy and provides legal expertise, while also ensuring citizens' access to the laws that defend them. The main topics are air pollution, coal, infrastructure, logging, chemicals, green investment, and climate risks. The organisation has a team on fisheries focused on the Control Regulation and the EMFF, plus a sustainable seafood team focused on markets and implementation of the law, particularly the CMO Regulation and IUU Regulation. ClientEarth has founded the "Sustainable Seafood Coalition" (UK) and "Plataforma por la

Sostenibilidad Pesquera" (Spain). They decided to join the MAC, because it is directly relevant to their work. Consumer information is fundamental to allow good decisions. They also have experience with voluntary claims and with engaging with industry to promote sustainability. In relation to WG3's discussions on consumer information, they align with the perspective of the NGO members, including the importance of placing scientific names on the labels and applying Article 35 to products with more than 50% of fish as a primary ingredient, in order to have full transparency for the consumer and a level playing field. It should be about providing the consumer with rigorous information to make an informed decision and to reduce fraud.

Emiel Brouckaert (EAPO) wanted to more details as to why ClientEarth was leaving other fishery-focused Advisory Councils, while submitting an application to the MAC.

Pim Visser (VisNed) had the same question as the previous speaker, particularly in relation to NSAC.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) explained that he could not speak on behalf of ClientEarth's fisheries team, that has been involved for years and that it would be better to ask them the question directly. As for his team, he has heard that the MAC provides good and useful debates and is an AC that works well. The seafood team has not participated in the Advisory Councils in the past, so this is an opportunity to engage to topics at a more European level.

The Chair proposed the endorsement of ClientEarth as a member of the General Assembly, which took place. The Chair explained that ClientEarth had applied to become a member of the Executive Committee, which will be discussed at the September General Assembly meeting. ClientEarth will be an active observer of the Executive Committee until then.

Biodiversity Strategy

- **Presentation by Commission representative**

Please click here to access the Commission's presentation.

The Chair highlighted that several other ACs are looking into this topic from their point-of-view, so it is important to focus on the connection to MAC topics.

Katarzyna Janiak (DG MARE) explained that the Biodiversity Strategy is one of the key elements of the European Green Deal and is part of the Commissioner's mandate. It calls for urgent action to protect nature and reverse the degradation of ecosystems. Biodiversity conservation has the potential of economic benefits for businesses, including seafood, and can enable a Green recovery from the COVID-19 crisis. The strategy is divided into four key areas: protecting nature, restoring nature, to enable a transformative change, and an international dimension.

The first one focuses on establishing EU-wide protected areas, building on existing Natura areas. The second one will include a nature restoration plan, which does not include a specific link to fisheries, but it is connected through legally binding targets and the Farm to Fork Strategy. On the third one, it is focused on tools to reach the changes, such as the governance framework, unlocking finances, engaging businesses, knowledge, and awareness. On the fourth one, the strategy established the EU position for the post-2020 CBD framework, the finalisation the BBNJ agreement by the end of the year, the agreement on MAPs in the South Ocean, and IUU and WTO fisheries subsidies.

In relation to the fisheries aspects, the Commission is calling to extend to protect 30% of the EU seas, including 10% strictly protected. The targets under CBD are insufficient to protect and restore nature. Offshore wind projects will be allowed, if these are compatible with the MPAs. It will also focus on reducing pressure on habitats and ensuring sustainable ecosystem use, including though reduction of bycatch of sensitive species. This is about full implementation of the CFP, the MSFD, and the Birds and Habitats directive. There must be zero tolerance for illegal practices.

The representative provided an overview of potentially relevant initiatives for the MAC, as identified by the Secretariat. For MPAs to be effective, there must clearly defined conservation measures. The Commission is working together with the Member States and with the EEA to identify the criteria to designate additional areas, including the definition of “strictly protected” and “appropriate management planning”. Fisheries management measures must be established in all MPAs, according to the best available scientific advice. The aim is to have this guidance agreed by the end of next year and then the Member States will have to time to demonstrate progress by the end of 2023. On this basis, the Commission will analyse, by 2024, to see if the EU is on track to meet the 2030 targets.

In relation to the international aspects, the Commission wants to pave the way in international for a for ambitious targets, including in the COP. The Commission will be calling for extending new MPAs in the high seas. There is already a proposal for three large MPAs in the Southern Oceans. Protection will also be covered in FTAs. As for the action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems, the Commission will propose it early next year. It will include areas where further protection is needed. It will look into the impact of fishing gear. It will be linked to the report on the implementation of the new Technical Measures Regulation. Depending on the results, it will introduce measures to reduce the negative impact of fishing gear. This will include measures under the regionalisation process of the CFP. As for sensitive species, one of the major issues is bycatch. Data collection on bycatch needs to be improved. As for next steps, there is a direct link to the Farm to Fork Strategy and the Renewable Offshore Strategy. The Commission is waiting for reactions from the European Parliament and the Council. The Council is expected to produce their view by mid-October. The Parliament is preparing a resolution for potential adoption in the November plenary. The opinions of the CoR and EESC are in preparation. The Commission will also prepare input for the UNGA Biodiversity Summit in September 2020 and the CDB COP in China in 2021.

- **Exchange of views**

Daniel Voces (Europêche) explained that the fishing industry was not satisfied with the Biodiversity Strategy, as proposed by the Commission. They agree and are committed to biodiversity. The figures of STECF demonstrate that landings from the Northeast Atlantic are coming from sustainable sources. The global figures are positive. The messages of urgency and a massive extinction wave do not show the reality and the progress in fishing management. According to the Technical Measures Regulation, the Commission must develop a report by the end of the year based on the information provided by Member States, STECF, ICES, and Advisory Councils. The report is to be submitted to the European Council and the Parliament. However, they do not understand why the Commission is already announcing an action plan without consulting the relevant parties. They are concerned with the formulation of the MSY policy. They want to know if the current FMSY policy will be maintained. In relation to bottom trawling, they wonder how the Commission plans to use the EMFF for a transition. On the restriction of fishing gear for bottom trawling, they highlighted that it is the most researched gear and that fish is thriving. As for the market's perspective, they wondered if the Commission took into account the impact on the production of fish and in the supply. The restriction of fishing in the EU means that fish will need to be imported.

Pim Visser (VisNed) wanted to know about the difference between "protected" and "strictly protected". They also wanted to know who will pose the questions to the scientists to developed the best available scientific advice. If the Commission is aiming to reduce fish producing capacities with bottom trawling, they wondered if there was a food production plan for the next years, particularly how there will be sustainable seafood without bottom trawling.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) highlighted the importance of focusing on market topics. First, the impact on the supply chain and the markets in relation to the restrictive measures, including the impact on food security and supply in the EU. Second, the impact of the trade agreements. They wanted to know what the Commission was envisaging. The MAC must look at the key parameters. There is a significant link between with the Farm to Fork Strategy.

The Chair agreed with the previous speaker on the importance of focusing on the areas relevant for the MAC. The Chair identified trade agreements, impact on the landings, and economic benefits.

Katarzyna Janiak (DG MARE) explained that she would not be able answer to all the questions, since some were outside her competence. In relation to the number of protected areas, the definition of "strictly protected" will be defined by the Commission services together with the stakeholders. There will be a process to achieve this. It does not mean that it will be a "no-take zone". It is similar to a "no-extraction area". It depends on what is defined to be protected on the site. On FMSY, it is about implementation of the CFP. On the transition for more selective fishing gear and techniques under EMFF, she will contact the relevant Commission services about it. There will be an impact on the fishing market, which why they aim to clarify the connections with the Farm to Fork Strategy to cover

the supply chain. As for FTAs, the strategy is quite broad and involves many stakeholders and officials. There are examples of economic benefits, but early involvement of stakeholders is needed.

Hans Nieuwenhuis (MSC) asked the Commission to elaborate on the connection with the Renewable Energy Strategy.

Katarzyna Janiak (DG MARE) explained that the strategy is being developed and should be adopted in the Autumn.

Pim Visser (VisNed) expressed disappointment, since the Commission made a significant announcement, providing priority to biodiversity over food supply, yet the questions are outside the competence of the Commission representative, which does not allow for an informed discussion. They suggested that, for future discussions, the Commission could send a group of specialists instead.

Pascale Colson (DG MARE) stated that it was not possible to cover everything. The Biodiversity Strategy is quite new, so not everything is known. As an AC, the MAC can write questions and deliver an opinion. It would be impossible to have a team of Commission representatives attending meetings.

- **Way forward: definition of priorities for the MAC**

The Chair stated that, for the MAC, it could be possible to integrate the Biodiversity Strategy with the Farm to Fork Strategy. The Farm to Fork Strategy should take the lead, while taking into account elements of the Biodiversity Strategy that are under the MAC's competence.

Frangiskos Nikolian (DG MARE) emphasised that there are several requests coming from all the ACs. The MAC cannot expect everything from the Commission. The Biodiversity Strategy is led by DG ENV, even though it also concerns fisheries. The Commission representative recalled that a meeting with Europêche and EAPO representatives had taken place. The same questions were posed and discussed at then. If there are specific questions, the MAC can submit these in writing.

The Chair thanked the Commission representatives for their participation in the meeting and the presentation. The MAC will like to stay in close contact with the Commission during the coming discussions on the topics.

Farm to Fork Strategy – Draft Action Plan

- **Presentation by Commission representative**

The Chair explained that a presentation by the Commission was not going to take place. Instead, the Chair proposed to go through the initiatives under the Draft Action Plan of the Biodiversity Strategy. The elements identified could be used for a common approach and to set the priorities for the MAC.

- **Exchange of views**

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) suggested to go through the list of the Draft Action Plan to identify the priority areas.

Andrew Kuyk (CEP) emphasised the importance of fish as a food supply for the world. In much of the world, it is the primary source of protein for many millions of people. Fisheries does not fit perfectly into the initiatives under the strategy, since many of them focus on land-based production. There are a few horizontal issues, which are highly relevant, such as origin labelling and consumer information. A seafood dimension must be ensured on these. The issues around sustainable seafood production and the nutritional information on seafood must be reflected. They suggested that DG MARE should come up with a coherent strategy on the role of seafood in relation to general food supply. Some of the climate change pressures on land-based pressures demonstrate the greater role of seafood in future food security. It is necessary to balance between food security and environment.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) commented that it would be difficult to go through the list online. They exemplified that points 1, 2, 7 and 8 have direct relevancy. There are also points in indirect relevance. For example, point 5 on active substances used in agriculture. This can impact the quality of phytoplankton at sea. They suggested sending a questionnaire to the members to rate the relevance of the initiatives. This would allow members to make comments and put questions, avoiding partial answers.

The Chair suggested the use of categories to select initiatives, for example 1) "direct effect", such as the marketing standards for fishery and aquaculture products, 2) "indirect", such as spill overs of land production into sea, and 3) "horizontal", such as food labelling. The Chair agreed that a written procedure could be an option. It is important to keep in mind that it is not possible for the MAC to tackle all initiatives.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) agreed with CEP that seafood is not correctly dealt with under the Farm to Fork Strategy. The MAC should look into identifying relevant areas. If there would be a written consultation on the priorities, it is important to look into the priorities according to the timetable and deal with the most urgent.

Els Bedert (EuroCommerce) commented that the Farm to Fork Strategy is largely driving the Work Programme for Year 5. Going through the initiatives in the action plan overlooks some of the fisheries references in the text of the initiatives. They supported more time to look analyse the document. It is important to be clear on the output.

Hans Nieuwenhuis (MSC) agreed with more preparatory work to determine the MAC's priorities. They highlighted that the Farm to Fork Strategy focus on a coherent approach in all policy domains connected to food. In relation to the draft action plan, the MAC has only been involved in point 18 on the inception impact assessment for the marketing standards. The advice was developed in early May before the publication of the strategy. Therefore, it is important to take an integrated approach.

- **Way forward: definition of priorities for the MAC**

The Chair proposed to use a written procedure to go through the list and the underlying text. These can be prioritised in terms of content and timing. Then, it would be possible to look at the Working Groups to determine where they stand.

The Secretary General explained that, in the draft Work Programme for Year 5, the Secretariat tried to identify initiatives related to the seafood market, while focusing on the ones scheduled for 2020 and 2021, corresponding to the operational year. The only exception is nutritional labelling, because it was already identified by Working Group 3 as a priority. There is flexibility for, as the initiatives are presented by the Commission, to look at these and see in more detail if an advice should be pursued.

Frangiskos Nikolian (DG MARE) informed that DG MARE is internally reflecting on the Farm to Fork Strategy. Therefore, if the MAC goes for a written consultation, they could also, before the Summer break, provide their view on the most relevant points for fishery and aquaculture products.

The Chair agreed that it would be a very good input. It is important for the MAC to coordinate with the Markets Unit of DG MARE. If the Commission can provide their list, then the MAC can look at it at the next meeting and come up with a decision on priorities. As for the Work Programme, there is enough flexibility.

Update on Working Group 1's work

The Chair, taking into account the recent Working Group meetings, asked the Working Group Chairs to focus on the more pressing work as well as the work that require decisions.

- **Reporting by Sean O'Donoghue, Chair of Working Group 1**

Sean O'Donoghue, Chair of Working Group 1, explained that there had been some technical difficulties at the online 2 June Working Group 1 meeting, but that they managed to go through the

agenda. The Chair of Working Group 1 recalled that a document had been produced on case studies via EUMOFA. The Commission sent a comprehensive reply, which explains that it is not possible to do everything at once. The Secretariat has put together a questionnaire to the members. It is important to prioritise what was included. Additionally, in light of COVID-19, it is important to reassess potential studies. The Commission is eager to progress on EUMOFA, so it is important to organise a Working Group 1 as soon as possible. Therefore, the idea would be hold an online meeting on 1 September to focus on EUMOFA studies and on STECF price data.

The Chair proposed to set September 1 as the date for Working Group 1 with emphasis on EUMOFA and STECF. The Chair recalled that the next Executive Committee is on 22-23 September.

Update on Working Group 2's work

- **Reporting by Andrew Kuyk, Chair of Working Group 2**
- **Decision on way forward: Control Regulation**

Andrew Kuyk, Chair of Working Group 2, recalled that the MAC adopted an advice on the Control Regulation in 2018, with the expectation that the file would be concluded under the previous mandate of the European Parliament. The newly elected European Parliament restarted their work. Around 1200 amendments have been tabled. The work in the Council has not concluded either. The Commission's proposal has not changed. At the 3 June meeting, there was a useful discussion with MEP Aguilera, EP PECH Rapporteur, who is trying to come up with an opinion. The Rapporteur expressed a strong wish to hold a more detailed discussion with the MAC on the identified issues. The Chair of Working Group 2 suggested to have a further meeting devoted to the Rapporteur providing a summary of the current state-of-play, while raising the points where the MAC can add value to her work as Rapporteur. It would not about advising the European Parliament, but about holding an exchange of views. Then, the MAC would look to produce a supplement/addendum to the original MAC advice, highlighting the issues more relevant taking into account the recent developments. The Chair of Working Group 2 suggested holding a meeting dedicated to exchanging with the Rapporteur, then working on the addendum. The request from MEP Aguilera was to hold a face-to-face meeting, if possible. A conference call should be no more than 2 hours and primarily centred on that topic. Afterwards, the Secretariat and the Working Group Chair could try to develop a first draft.

The Secretary General informed that he was contacted by MEP Aguilera's office earlier that day. The MEP remains interested in meeting with the MAC. The dates would be 8 or 9 September, but these still need to be confirmed. The office actually prefers online, due to the recent COVID-19 developments.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) emphasised the importance of having a direct conversation with MEP Aguilera. During the last EP PECH Committee, some amendments were interpreted as if the supply chain was opposed to traceability, when it is the opposite. The operators are in favour of traceability,

which is very important for sanitary matters. The difficulty would be with a complex double traceability system. The operators are open to traceability, which should be smooth and constructive. Therefore, a clear and straightforward debate with MEP Aguilera is welcomed.

Katrin Poulsen (WWF) welcomed the idea of holding a debate with MEP Aguilera. They suggested that it could be beneficial to identify the topics of focus for an amendment to the advice. The process is moving quickly, so it is important to ensure that the MAC's work is on time.

- **Decision on way forward: Autonomous Union Tariff Rate Quotas**

Andrew Kuyk, Chair of Working Group 2, recalled that ATQs were discussed at the last meeting. There is not yet a Commission's proposal. The decision is expected to be taken next week. Officially, it will only be available in three to four weeks. The LDAC is preparing an advice on one of the issues that will be covered by the proposal. It is expected to be transmitted to the MAC to be seen and for consideration of endorsement. It is necessary to decide how to address this topic. Different members of the MAC have different views on this. The ATQs proposal addresses specific needs for specific species of fish, putting forward quantities for preferential treatment. The mechanism is not new, but needs to be updated every few years with new figures. It is a decision of the Council only. Once the proposal is tabled, there will be a discussion among the Member States on the figures for the next three years period. It will not be a debate on the need for an ATQs system. In the MAC, there will be a similar debates. It is unlikely that there will be consensus on the quantities. There could be a debate on some species, but the proposal is not yet known.

The Chair of Working Group 2 wondered about the added value of the MAC participating in this debate, once the Commission's proposal is available. If an advice is produced that demonstrates the diverging views of the members, the added value might be low. Even if there is unanimity on some points, since this will be a debate among different Member States with different national interests, the Working Group Chair wondered if an advice from the MAC would add value. The process will be fairly accelerated. The new regulation will be in place by 1 January, meaning there will probably be agreement by October, so that the relevant supply chain can plan. The last time, it was quite contentious, and the decision was later than normal.

In relation to potential options, the first one would be, since there is no proposal and it will be difficult to reach an agreement, to not produce an advice. The second option would be to look at an isolated issue proposed by other ACs. The third option would be to, as soon as a proposal is published, to convene a Working Group meeting to look at the proposal. The fourth option would be to avoid focusing on specific quantities on this specific proposal, and to look more broadly on preferential treatments from several instruments, such as ATQs, FTAs, Anything But Arms. This fourth option would contextualise the proposal and allow for general consensus comments. Nevertheless, the Working Chair doubted that this fourth option could be concluded in time for the Council decision on the ATQs proposal.

The Chair emphasised that the main question was the added value. Advices adopted by the MAC should have value, particularly for the Commission. The MAC should address its own competence. It is a very technical file, therefore, the Chair wondered if everyone knew the details and context, particularly the relationship with other trade instruments. The timeframe will be short and the MAC must consider its priorities.

Katarina Sipic (AIPCE-CEP) asked the other members if they all believed that it was an efficient use of their time. They wondered for how many members the ATQs Regulation was actually of their direct interest. They feared that the discussion might be relevant to very few interested parties. The question of added value for the MAC can be posed. There is also a question of added value of the final advice for the Commission and Members States, taking into account the very fundamental differences in the MAC. It will be simply a repetition of interests already known from the public consultation on this regulation.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) disagreed with the previous speaker that the ATQs proposal was not relevant to a significant number of MAC members. It is quite relevant for the primary producers and for the processing sector. They considered that, at this stage, there would be little value to have a discussion on the Commission's proposal, since the positions are known. It would not be conducive to a productive discussion. They supported going for the fourth option in the course of Year 5. This would allow a full evaluation of the tariffs framework. There are pre-conceived ideas in all parts. A factual discussion is necessary. LDAC is expected to produce an advice on the tuna aspect of the ATQs regulation. If this is adopted, it will be incumbent on the MAC, as the key AC with markets remit, to look at the advice.

Roberto Carlos Alonso (ANFACO-CECOPESCA) agreed with the two previous speakers that it is not the best moment to discuss the ATQs Regulation. In relation to a potential discussion on other trade instruments, they argued that the MAC should focus on more constructive topics. The Commission launched a new consultation on world trade, which could be interesting for the MAC to discuss. As for the LDAC's advice, they consider that it is not a consensus topic and not useful. The MAC should avoid competitive issues where there is no consensus. Trade regimes is a more interesting topic for the MAC, for example.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) agreed with KFO's proposal. It is important to have an overall discussion. At the last meeting, they suggested to have a more general discussion. The discussion was initiated three months ago, when an advice was submitted for the consideration of LDAC and MAC. In the LDAC, in the past three months, there was a constructive discussion, and, after three meetings, the file was finalised. The draft advice at the level of the LDAC's Executive Committee and is expected to be sent for the MAC's consideration soon. Even though there is no Commission's proposal, the MAC can still produce an advice, as it was the case on the marketing standards framework. The same way that a new advice is being proposed on the Control Regulation, an advice can be done for the Member

States on the ATQs Regulation. The advice would indeed be technical, but the MAC members are able to work together and achieve that.

In the Chat, Daniel Weber (European Fishmeal) and Els Bedert (EuroCommerce) agreed that a MAC advice on the legislative proposal on ATQs would not bring significant added value.

The Chair concluded that there is interest to look at overall EU trade policy as well as to address the different elements, including ATQs. This would require time and should be addressed in the Work Programme for Year 5. The Chair suggested adding this to the overall discussions on trade negotiations. Therefore, option 4 would be followed.

Andrew Kuyk, Chair of Working Group 2, highlighted that option 4 might be impacted by the future UK-EU trade relationship, which might also have consequences on the EU's relationship with Norway, Iceland, and other supplier countries. The Commission is undertaking several FTA discussions with several countries on fisheries chapters. A solid factual base is fundamental, including on the percentage of required imports and the sources of this streams. This will require some time.

The Chair highlighted that the Farm to Fork Strategy will inevitably touch upon trade relations with third countries. An assessment of the EU production will require an assessment of the production of imported products. There will be probably be several opportunities to discuss this. It should be included in the Work Programme for Year 5. The output needs to be planned.

Update on Working Group 3's work

- **Reporting by Benoît Thomassen, Chair of Working Group 3**
- **Decision on way forward: Plastics**

Pierre Commère, Vice-Chair of Working Group 3, concerning the consumer information draft, recalled that, at the 4 June WG3 meeting, the draft was revised and continued at the 1 July meeting. The text structure will be changed, with the main text containing the introduction and recommendations to be clearer for the reader, plus an annex. A final meeting will take place on 14 July to close outstanding issues. The final document will be sent to the Executive Committee for approval under written procedure. Concerning nutritional labelling, WG3 heard presentations by Els Bedert (EuroCommerce) and Paulien Prent (Visfederatie), who proposed themselves to produce a first draft, but it has not yet been presented. Concerning labelling of vegetarian and vegan products that imitate seafood products, Paulien Prent (Visfederatie) offered to produce a first draft, but it has not yet been presented. Concerning plastics, WG3 received the draft advice from NWWAC, which is focused on the implementation of the Single Use Plastics Directive and operational aspects of the Fishing for Litter Scheme. The WG3 sent this advice to the Executive Committee for endorsement. WG3 is also asking the Executive Committee for their views on how the MAC should move forward on its own advice plastics, particularly timeline, structure, and relevant topics. Concerning ecolabels and certification

schemes, the workshop will take place on 13, 14 and 15 July under 3 morning sessions and the Secretariat is available to present the draft programme.

The Chair highlighted that there were two matters concerning plastics. First, the endorsement of the NWWAC advice. Then, the future work of the MAC. There are several advices being produced by other Advisory Councils according to their competence.

Els Bedert (EuroCommerce), regarding the advice on front-of-pack-labelling, explained that, in their view, there should be a general advice from the MAC, but not on the nutri-score itself. Therefore, EuroCommerce will not contribute to this nutri-score draft. It would be better to address it as part of the discussion on the Farm to Fork Strategy, when the Commission will be looking a EU scheme.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) highlighted that the Executive Committee should make a right away decision on the endorsement of the NWWAC's advice. There was a clear recommendation from Working Group 3 to endorse this advice and to include a sentence in the cover letter stating that the MAC is working on its own advice.

The Chair proposed the endorsement of the NWWAC's advice by the Executive Committee. The advice was endorsed by the MAC. In relation to nutritional labelling, the Chair stated that the topic could be linked to the Farm to Fork Strategy, but the work on the specific will remain. Visfederatie will work on a draft text for a next meeting. The Working Group can determine if the advice should be more general or more specific.

Pierre Commère, Vice-Chair of Working Group 3, on front-of-pack labelling and nutritional labelling, stated that it would be important to have a global reflection on the Farm to Fork Strategy and the upcoming proposal from the Commission. At the same time, the issue of nutri-score should be discussed. On the nutri-score, the nutritional value of fish is not being taken into account. The Vice-Chair suggested the development of a small advice on the nutri-score, which can contribute to the broader discussion at a later stage.

The Chair agreed with the proposal form the Vice-Chair.

Future allocation of funds to the Advisory Councils

- **Update: Commission's reply to the letter of opposition by the MAC**
- **Reporting back by Secretary General: Inter-ACs Seminar on Financial Issues 2020 (12.06.20)**

The Chair recalled that this topic had been discussed at the last meeting. A letter had been sent by the MAC to the Commission and a reply was received.

Pascale Colson (DG MARE) informed that DG MARE had financial margin, so the MAC could request up to €300.000 as a contribution for the Year 5's budget.

The Chair welcomed the Commission's approach.

Grant Agreement Year 5 (2020-2021)

- **Draft Work Programme for Year 5: Presentation of priorities and deliverables**

The Secretary General provided an overview of the draft Work Programme for Year 5, focusing on the priorities and deliverables. There are a few outstanding issues connected to delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the developments on certain interinstitutional negotiations.

- EMFF: under Year 4, the MAC should reassess its advice and consider a follow-up advice depending on the evolution of the interinstitutional negotiations.
- Control Regulation: Working Group 2 is working on a follow-up and will be meeting the EP PECH Committee Rapporteur.
- Brexit: the MAC is expected to produce an advice on the impacts, once the results of the negotiations are known.
- Ecolabels and certification schemes: the workshop was delayed due to COVID-19, but will take place in July.
- Catch IT system: it is a new topic, but it is a continuation of the Control Regulation.
- Trade agreements: it is always on the MAC's Work Programme, so the MAC can react to public consultations and *ad hoc* issues raised by the Commission and members.
- Marketing Standards: the Commission will publish a new consultation at the end of the year.
- Nutritional labelling: it was identified by Working Group 3 as an important topic.
- Labelling of vegetarian and vegan product: it was also identified by Working Group 3.
- Farm to Fork Strategy: the idea is to address specific initiatives, but there is flexibility to address these as the initiatives are published.
- Biodiversity Strategy: there are several initiatives that could be relevant for the EU market, so the MAC can consider advices, as these are published by the Commission.
- Health and environmental value of seafood: in several statements, the Commission has recognised the nutritional value of seafood and the importance of shifting towards healthy and sustainable diets.
- Collaboration with STECF: it is always on the MAC's work programme, in order to exchange on the relevant economic reports.
- Other work: members are always allowed to proposed new topics and the MAC can receive requests from the Commission and the Member States.

In relation to the meetings schedule, the idea would be to hold meetings in January, March, May, and September. Currently, it is unclear if it will be possible to hold meetings in person.

The Chair requested information on the time for the Executive Committee to decide.

The Secretary General explained that the Work Programme must be sent to the Commission two months in advance of the end of the year. The Secretary General highlighted that the Commission also proposes amendments to the Work Programme, so it is important to keep in mind the Summer break. Therefore, ideally, the work programme would be sent in mid-July.

Pascale Colson (DG MARE) emphasised that recommendations to the Commission should be specific, urging to avoid writing long advices. On the EMFF and the Control Regulation, the representative expressed scepticism on the usefulness of these advices, adding that these topics should not be priorities for the MAC, since the Commission's proposals have been published two years ago. The representative called on the MAC to focus on the Biodiversity Strategy and the Farm to Fork Strategy.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) stated that the aim on the EMFF and the Control Regulation was not to present new recommendations to the Commission, but it was about tracking some of the new amendments. The MAC should actively look at the new EMFF. They expressed support for the priorities in the work programme, but emphasised that the COVID-19 pandemic should be added to the work programme.

Els Bedert (EuroCommerce) argued that the topic of labelling of vegetarian and vegan products should not be a main priority, since there does not seem to be any institutional work on this topic. There was once an amendment in the European Parliament on this topic, but it has been removed. This discussion took place in relation to meat products, so the same argumentation is expected. Therefore, they wondered about the relevance of a specific MAC advice on this topic.

Andrew Kuyk (CEP), on the Control Regulation, stated that it idea would be an addendum to take into account of the debate. They agreed with KFO that COVID-19 should be mentioned in the Work Programme. There is a potential impact of economic recession. Plus, there is general consumer behaviour matters, such a move towards more online shopping, sources, food safety, food hygiene and animal welfare. It is important to mention that there will be implications from the COVID-19 crisis that will have economic and consumer behaviour impacts.

The Chair suggested to group several of the priorities under the Farm to Fork Strategy item. The Chair proposed for the Secretariat to amend the draft and circulate through written procedure for comments. Once it is endorsed by the Executive Committee, the Secretariat can send it to the Commission.

- **Draft Budget for Year 5: Presentation by Panos Manias, Financial Officer**

Panos Manias, Financial Officer, explained that the draft budget assumes that all Year 5 meetings will be in person. Regarding the differences in relation to Year 4, the way that meetings are presented has

changed. Instead of grouping the meetings based on their type, these are grouped based on the scheduled. Most likely four groups of combined meetings. The same calculation was used for the preparation and for the reimbursement of the meeting. For Year 5, it was not necessary to keep a 5% reserve, taking into account the new financial guidelines from the Commission. On the amounts, compared to the previous year, it includes a raise for the staff, for the preparation of the meetings, on the operational costs. There is a small decrease in the interpretation. These were based on the usage of the previous years. This allows spending more on the meeting rooms and the catering for Year 5. The budget is not binding, so changes during the year is possible. Due to the new financial guidelines, it is no longer necessary to inform the Commission on changes.

The Chair proposed the adoption of the budget, while keeping in mind the uncertainty surrounding the organisation of physical meetings in Year 5. The budget was approved.

MAC's Secretariat (2020-2023)

- **Way forward: Launch of Tender**

The Chair recalled that the MAC signed a three years contract with EBCD to provide secretariat services, which ends on Year 4. Therefore, the MAC needs to launch a tender. The proposal is to use the same text as for the previous tender. The tender will be open for 35 days. There would be a Selection Committee composed of the Chair and the Vice-Chairs for a first evaluation of the proposals. Afterwards, there would be a decision by the Executive Committee. The Chair expressed satisfaction with the recent work of the Secretariat. The Executive Committee agreed with the terms to launch the tender.

EFCA's Advisory Board Terms of Reference

- **Overview of advices by other ACs: LDAC, PELAC/BSAC, NWWAC, MEDAC**
- **Way forward**

The Chair recalled that several Advisory Councils produced papers on the Terms of Reference for EFCA's Advisory Board. The MAC is a member of the Advisory Board and is interested on IUU and Control Regulation. The Chair asked the Executive Committee members if they wanted to comment on the advices from the other Advisory Councils. The Chair proposed to follow the advices from the other Advisory Councils and to return to this topic following the developments at EFCA.

AOB

- **Date of the next group of meetings:** 22 & 23 September 2020

Summary of action points

- **New members of the General Assembly:** ClientEarth has been endorsed as member of the General Assembly. At the September General Assembly meeting, the application of ClientEarth to join the Executive Committee will be assessed.
- **Biodiversity Strategy:** The MAC will aim to link it with the Farm to Fork Strategy initiatives.
- **Farm to Fork Strategy – Draft Action Plan:** The members will be asked to go through the action plan of the Farm Strategy to determine the priorities. The Secretariat will find the format for this consultation.
- **Update on Working Group 1's work:** Meeting on 1 September to discuss EUMOFA and STECF.
- **Update on Working Group 2's work:** The MAC will not produce an advice on ATQs, but work will be initiated to evaluate the EU's trade policy. On the Control Regulation, there will be a meeting with the EP PECH Committee Rapporteur, which will help determine a potential follow-up to the previous advice.
- **Update on Working Group 3's work:** Working Group 3 meeting on 14 July to finalise the consumer information draft advice, so that it can be approved by the Executive Committee through written procedure. The MAC has endorsed the NWWAC's advice on plastics and will continue working on its own advice.
- **Future allocation of funds to the Advisory Councils:** DG MARE expressed flexibility to return to the original €300.000 amount.
- **Grant Agreement Year 5 (2020-2021):** A revised work programme will be sent for approval by written procedure. The draft budget has been approved.
- **MAC's Secretariat (2020-2023):** The tender will be open for 35 days and the Selection Committee will report to the Executive Committee.
- **EFCA's Advisory Board Terms of Reference:** The MAC will follow the advices from the other Advisory Councils and wait for the developments at EFCA's level.

Market Advisory Council

List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Andrew Kuyk	AIPCE-CEP
Angeles Longa	EMPA
Anna Boulova	FRUCOM
Arnault Chaperon	FEAP
Béatrice Gorez	CFFA-CAPE
Catherine Pons	FEAP
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Christophe Vande Weyer	Euroropean Commission
Daniel Voces de Onaíndi	Europêche
Daniel Weber	European Fishmeal
Els Bedert	EuroCommerce
Emiel Brouckaert	EAPO
Fragkiskos Nikolian	European Commission
Gaël Lavielle	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Georg Werner	Environmental Justice Foundation
Guus Pastoor	AIPCE-CEP
Hans Nieuwenhuis	Marine Stewardship Council
Haydeé Fernández Granja	CONXEMAR
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF
Katarzyna Janiack	European Commission
Katarina Sipic	AIPCE-CEP
Katrin Vilhelm Poulsen	WWF
Massimo Bellavista	COPA COGECA
Panos Manias	Market Advisory Council
Pascale Colson	European Commission

Representative	Organisation
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council
Pierre Commère	ADEPALE
Pim Visser	VisNed
Quentin Marchais	ClientEarth
Roberto Carlos Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPESCA
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche
Sean O'Donoghue	EAPO
Stavroula Kremmydiotou	Market Advisory Council
Vanya Vulperhost	Oceana