

DRAFT MINUTES WORKING GROUP 2: EU MARKET

Thursday 18 October 2018
10h30-13h00
SOFITEL
Place Jourdan 1, 1040 Brussels

Welcome from the Chair

The Chair of Working Group 2 (WG), Andrew Kuyk, welcomed those present.

Adoption of agenda and minutes last meeting (24.05.18)

The minutes of the Working Group 2 meeting on EU Market (24.05.18) and the agenda were adopted.

Control Regulation

Members considered the Draft MAC opinion (version 15.10.2018).

The Chair informed that the Focus Group (FG) on Control Regulation, which met several times before this meeting, reports back to this WG for further comments. If WG member do have comments to make, he encouraged member to do them in a constructive drafting form. He noted that there is a minority opinion in the draft.

He opened the floor to the members of the WG to comment on the current draft that has been approved by the FG.

BVFi expressed he would not agree with the draft if it could not be amended, especially as it is based on some incorrect facts, e.g. Art.58.3.a) mentioning that the unique vessel identification number is an *optional* field. He asked for Art.58.3.b) and Art.58.2 to be deleted. He expressed that Art.56.A.5.C. cannot be fulfilled. He expressed that Art.12. had to be reworded.

After discussion between BVFi and Oceana, it was agreed that they would forward to the Secretariat the text agreed between them.

After discussion between KFO and LIFE on the small scale fisheries paragraph, it was agreed that they would forward to the Secretariat the text agreed between them.

Agreed amendments to the draft:

- **Art.58.3. of the MAC Opinion:**

- a. *the unique vessel identification number (IMO number) – which allows verification of a vessel's fishing history, but is currently only an optional field to fill out by operators and therefore in many cases is not provided for imported products;*
- b. *fishing area – the fishing area on the catch certificate can be filled out in several ways, but most operators provide the FAO fishing area code. Many of the FAO fishing areas, however, cover such a vast area of ocean that it is impossible to determine from this code which fishery, and under which country's jurisdiction, the product was caught. One example of this is FAO fishing area 71, which covers parts, or all of the waters of Australia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines and Thailand, as well as some high seas areas. The CMO requires a higher level of detail than that provided for in the current IUU Regulation.*
- c. *a direct link between catch area and catch dates – in addition to the challenges with the fishing area, the catch certificate does not make a direct link between the catch area and the catch dates, which prevents the exact pinpointing of when and where exactly the product was harvested.*

The MAC urges the European Commission, where possible, to address these gaps either in the current proposal or in future revisions to the IUU Regulation in order to ensure ~~the full~~ **comparable** traceability of imported seafood products, and a level playing field for the EU fisheries and seafood sector.

- **Art.58.2. from the MAC opinion was entirely deleted.**

- **Art 56.A.5.C from the COM proposal:**

« the operator responsible for placing the newly created lot on the market is able to provide the information concerning the composition of the newly created lot, in particular the information relating to each of the lots of fishery or aquaculture products which it contains and the quantities of fishery or aquaculture products coming from each of the lots forming the new lot. ». A paragraph should be added to the MAC opinion stating that this paragraph is unworkable, and why it is unworkable.

- **Art.12. Catch Certificate- IUU - from the MAC opinion:**

BVFi suggested adding a paragraph indicating that in addition to the catch certification document, statements from the authorities of the third country in question, such as non-manipulation certificates could be provided as supplementary information.

He added that the veterinarian number cannot be filled in by operators. He expressed that he could not see a full digitalisation of the certificates happening globally, therefore a paper-based certificate will be the basis for a catch certificate. However, an EU electronic system would be welcomed.

Third countries documents are offering non manipulation documents.

Oceana was not in favour of providing more information than the ones required in the catch certificate.

- **Small scale fisheries:**

Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne fully agreed with the content of the paragraph but from a global point of view, he expressed his paragraph would be much more relevant coming from another AC, unless we reword the paragraph and like it to the trade part.

KFO agreed that the MAC should concentrate on issues that are relevant to it. The second paragraph needs to be sharpened and should link the monitoring of position and movement of small-scale fisheries to the potential improvement of the marketing from this sector.

LIFE added that the use of this electronic monitoring is to enable to source where the fish came from and that the fish has been caught legitimately.

KFO, LIFE and Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne are to send the rewording to Secretariat.

Federación Provincial cofradías de pescadores de Lugo stated that the MAC should not be restricting the definition of small scale to 12 meters: the COM has a more flexible definition. On the electronic logbooks, he considered that there should be some flexibility for the fleet to adapt to the bureaucracy of the region.

It was agreed to take out the 12 meters reference.

Eufishmeal re-requested for the MAC to recommend an independent third party certified weight operators on pelagic landings.

KFO expressed that it was decided by the FG to delete it out of the draft, as that there were different opinions on the issue. In addition, this issue is not central to the MAC, but is going to be dealt with by the appropriate ACs.

EMPA expressed that aquaculture is not reflected in this opinion, and suggested to delete on page 2, paragraph 2, and to reword it by "This opinion deals with fisheries products but not with aquaculture products".

The Chair expressed that a new clean version of the draft opinion will be circulated by the Secretariat and will be brought to the members of the Executive Committee for adoption.

Statistics PRODCOM: amendment proposal

With regards to PRODCOM the COM expressed that the submission period is over and proposals are being analysed by competent services also in the MS. The decision will be taken by the competent working group, which is composed of COM and MS, before the end of the year. This will impact data collection from 2019 onwards. DG MARE is also looking into the proposal submitted by AIPCE.

Matthias Keller (BVFi) gave a [presentation](#) on the proposal submitted by AIPCE-CPE for restructuring the PRODCOM-Nomenclature.

AIPCE-CEP had proposed an amendment which complies with the structure and the basic principles of the PRODCOM list classification, namely to follow and detail further the classification of products by activity (CPA) and to maintain the correspondence with the combined nomenclature (CN).

The Chair expressed it is fundamental that in any reflections that COM makes on the future of the industry and its economic performance that the evidence should be as accurate as possible. It is a legitimate function of the MAC to assist the COM in this. He invited the MAC to follow up on this subject and invited the COM to give an actual response to know where they are in relation to the concerns and issues that were raised.

Presentation Report STECF AER Fish Processing Industry 2017

Michael Turenhout (VisFederatie) presented the [STECF report – The Economic Performance of the EU fish processing sector 2017](#), which was published in April 2018.

He believed that the MAC could help in improving the report and make it more trustable. He recommended for the MAC to go through the report, and suggested for one of the authors of the report to come and present it to the MAC at a next meeting.

KFO agreed and suggested for the MAC to actively engage with STECF, and maybe getting specific reports that the MAC requires.

The Long Distance Advisory Council agreed that there is an added value for stakeholder's involvement, such as ACs, in this area.

AIPCE expressed that trade and processing is an area where little is known, and thought that the MAC could provide an added value to that. He thought that the aim should be to get an overview of the whole value chain.

EMPA agreed and added that even less is known on processed and produced aquaculture products. He expressed that the EMFF could be used to this end.

BVFi expressed that the issue comes from the MS, as they get too much time to deliver the figures.

Update on Level Playing Field

Guus Pastoor (AIPCE) reported back from the 2 FG meetings (June and September) that tried to set out what is it actually that the MAC wants. There are a couple of elements that the FG would like to look at: the level playing field between EU and non-EU products, and within the EU products. Various points were pointed out, such as:

- Legislation, such as label conditions, thresholds conditions, trainings: this needs to be specified.
- Statistics: to look at where the flows are going
- Implementation and control
- Aquaculture

The FG has now to see how to put those points all together. The FG tried to identify a number of case studies, to demonstrate possible differences between either products, trade flows or situations. The members of FG has to now been asked to give input on specific case studies in order to identify common denominators, and then see if an advice could come out of it.

FEAP added that the AAC sent an official opinion on this level playing field.

AOB:

VisNed regretted that the “seaweed” point was not on this meeting’s agenda. The agenda item was just aimed to reply three questions made by a particular member, therefore a written answer was considered more suitable rather than an oral answer within the context of a MAC meeting. VisNed asked for an informed debate to be held on seaweed, and on the (im)possibilities of seaweed based on facts and figures.

BVFi expressed that he made a presentation on this topic to the attention of the COM, which included some questions to be answered by the COM. He asked for a deadline for these questions to be answered by.

EMPA underlined that we need to know what we are talking about as all seaweed production are not the same: exclusive production or together with shellfish, fisheries etc.

The Chair expressed that, once the COM replies received, the MAC should have a discussion with the COM on how best to take forward discussions.

End of the meeting

NAME		ORGANISATION
Alexandre	Rodriguez	EU Long Distance AC
Andrew	Kuyk	CEP
Anna	Boulova	FRUCOM
Arnault	Chaperon	FEAP
Béatrice	Gorez	CFFA
Bruno	Guillaumie	EMPA
Brian	O'Riordan	LIFE
Christine	Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Daniel	Voces	Europêche
Eduardo	Miguez López	Puerto Celeiro s a OPP 77
Emiel	Brouckaert	EAPO
Erik	Bjorn Olsen	Living Sea
Georg	Werner	EJF
Giorgio	Rimoldi	AIIPA/ANCIT
Guus	Pastoor	AIPCE
Hans	Nieuwenhuis	MSC
James	Warwick	SEAFISH
Jane	Sandell	FPO
Janne	Posti	MSC
Jarek	Zielinski	PSPR
Jean-Marie	Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Jens	Høj Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association
Jessica	Demblon	Market Advisory Council
Jose Basilio	Otero Rodriguez	Federación Pescadores de Lugo
Julie	Mandrille	EuroCommerce
Katarina	SIPIC	Conxemar
Katrin	Vilhem Poulsen	WWF
Marc	Eskelund	EUfishmeal
Marco	Baldoli	AIPCE-CEP
Massimo	Bellavista	Europêche
Matthias	Keller	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V. (BVFi)
Michael	Turenhout	Visfederatie
Micol	Bertoni	Federcoopescas - CopaCogeca
Mete	Karakaya	FEAP
Nicolas	Fernández	OPP 72
Patrick	Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation, CLG (IS&WFPO, CLG)
Paul	McDonald	Scottish Fishermen's Organisation
Pim	Visser	VisNed
Poul	Jensen	Danish Seafood Association
Roberto Carlos	Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPESCA
Rosalie	Tukker	Europêche

Sandra	Sanmartin	Market Advisory Council
Sean	O'Donoghue	KFO
Sergio	López García	OPP Lugo
Vanya	Vulperhorst	Oceana

DRAFT