

Executive Committee Minutes

Tuesday, 6 July 2021

14:30 - 17:45 CET

Zoom online meeting

Welcome from the Chair, Guus Pastoor

Adoption of agenda and minutes last meeting (14.04.21): adopted

Click [here](#) to access the meeting's presentation.

Update on Working Groups

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

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) recalled that the last meeting of WG1 took place on 31 May. The working group is undertaking considerable work on the incorporation of sustainability aspects for seafood products in the marketing standards framework. At the 31 May, there was an exchange of views with significant engagement from members. Mr O'Donoghue encouraged members to reply to the questionnaire circulated by the Secretariat. The results of the questionnaire will serve as a basis for a draft advice for consideration at the September meeting.

Mr O'Donoghue informed that the Secretary General and himself attended, as observers, the meeting of the STECF EWG on the Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet II, which took place from 7 to 11 June. The recommendations previously agreed by the MAC were discussed at the STECF meeting and were well received. He expressed satisfaction with the work of the STECF EWG in relation nowcasting to analyse the impacts of Brexit and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr O'Donoghue highlighted that, in September, draft recommendations are expected from the Joint MAC/NWWAC/NSAC Focus Group on Brown Crab, which will be considered by WG1.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) recalled that the STECF 2020 report on the EU Aquaculture Sector had been published, expressing disappointment that it had not yet been addressed by WG1. Nevertheless, Mr Guillaumie expressed satisfaction that the report was foreseen in the future activities of WG1.

Frangiscos Nikolian (DG MARE) explained that the Staff Working Document on the revision of the marketing standards framework will be concluded by the end of September. Therefore, the timing for



the MAC advice is not ideal, but the Commission services will take into account the recommendations. The Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet will be endorsed at the July STECF Plenary, so the report should be publicly available in July or August.

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) recognised the timing difficulties, but that added that it would already be quite difficult to adopt advice by September. The advice must consider the different views amongst the MAC's membership. Mr O'Donoghue informed, that taking into account the date of publication of the Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet, he would invite the STECF EWG Chair to present the report at the September WG1 meeting.

- **Reporting by Pierre Commère, Chair of Working Group 2**

The Chair of Working Group 2 was unable to attend the beginning of the meeting. The reporting was provided by the Secretary General instead.

The Secretary General recalled that, at the last meeting, WG2 held discussions on trade developments. The main trade topics were the ongoing renegotiation of the EEA Agreement, the derogation of rules of origin for trade with Cape Verde, and the EU-USA trade dispute. There was an update by DG MARE and their external consultant on the ongoing evaluation of the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements. There was presentation by an EUMOFA expert of a study on the impact of seafood imports on the EU small-scale coastal fleet.

The Secretary General further recalled that WG2 considered draft advice on flags of convenience. Agreement on the text was reached by WG2. There was a proposal for joint adoption of the advice with the LDAC. The draft is currently being considered by the relevant LDAC WG. Depending on the feedback of the LDAC's membership, the way forward will be determined, which could mean proceeding with approval by the Executive Committee of further consideration by the relevant WGs.

The Secretary General also recalled that, at the meeting, the Chair of the Initial Focus Group on Trade provided an update on the work of the focus group. Later, an informal meeting took place between the FG's members and DG MARE to discuss potential collaboration. DG MARE expressed interest in the joint development of the study, but is checking internally on the availability of the data. A response from DG MARE is expected in the upcoming weeks.

- **Reporting by Benoît Thomassen, Chair of Working Group 3**

Benoît Thomassen (FEAP) recalled that WG3 met on 26 May. Voluntary sustainability claims were one of the topics on the agenda. The draft was finalised by the working group in May. Following adoption by the Executive Committee, there was a reply from the Commission in June. The working group also worked on the draft on labelling of plant-based imitation seafood products. The draft has been put forward for consideration by the Executive Committee. WG3 is currently working on the topic of



health and environmental value of seafood. The Secretariat circulated a questionnaire on the topic with the deadline of 15 July. Mr Thomassen highlighted that, since November, 45% of the MAC's advice was prepared by WG3 and thanked the members for their engagement.

The Chair recognised the increased output of the MAC, highlighting the essential work of the WGs. Ms Pastoor thanked the Chairs of the WGs for their work.

Work Programme of Year 5 (2020-2021)

- **Update on priorities and deliverables by Pedro Reis Santos, Secretary General**

The Secretary General provided an update on the implementation of the work programme, specifically the priorities and deliverables. In total, the MAC has adopted 20 pieces of advice.

The Chair commented that it was clear that the output from the MAC has increased successfully. Due to legislative developments, from time to time, procedures need to be sped up. The drafting process is rather complex, so it is not always easy to adapt.

Frangiscos Nikolian (DG MARE) expressed satisfaction, on behalf of the Commission, with the increase in activities from the MAC. The advice is appreciated. It demonstrates that the MAC developed good working methods. There are still challenges, such as the alignment of the timing of recommendations with the Commission's initiatives. This is particularly a challenge under the Farm to Fork Strategy, since many initiatives touch upon the seafood sector. Mr Frangiscos thanked the MAC for the precious recommendations.

The Chair highlighted that, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a change to virtual meetings, which could be useful in the future for *ad hoc* meetings or timeline changes.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) congratulated the MAC for the work, but expressed concern about the low representation of aquaculture topics. Many initiatives of the Commission are focused exclusively on fisheries. The number of aquaculture members is insufficient in the MAC, which impacts the level of participating in the drafting processes. Therefore, the MAC should reflect on the balance between fisheries and aquaculture interests.

The Chair highlighted that the more aquaculture-specific topics were addressed by the AAC, while the MAC only covers market topics. The MAC should not differentiate the source of the product. There is no deliberate distinction between fishery and aquaculture products. There is a significant number of Commission initiatives that focus on fishery products, but many initiatives are generic. Aquaculture representatives should provide input, if there are market topics relevant to the MAC. The AC Secretariats should make an effort to avoid duplication, but also to avoid leaving out initiatives. For



example, the new strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture do have an impact on market supply.

The Secretary General thanked Mr Nikolian for the positive feedback and the constant cooperation. The Secretary General mentioned that it can be quite difficult to follow the timelines of the Farm to Fork Strategy initiatives and the feedback period of the Commission's public consultations is quite short. The MAC tried to follow as much as possible and it will remain a challenge in Year 6.

In relation to Mr Guillaumie's intervention, the Secretary General stated that efforts are made to integrate the comments from all participating members and to always work via consensus. The draft agendas of the working groups are circulated in advance and open for comments. If topics relevant to the aquaculture sector are missing, members can always inform the Secretariat, in order to try to accommodate these. Executive Committee members can also propose amendments to the draft work programme. The Secretary General highlighted that, under the agreement on the allocation of seats in the Executive Committee, there are seats specifically for aquaculture producers, plus that the Chair of WG3 is a representative of the aquaculture sector.

- **Update on the accounts by Panos Manias, Financial Officer**

Click [here](#) to access the presentation.

The Financial Officer explained that the third quarter of the operational year had just concluded. There were several differences between the budget and the realised operating expenses. The budget of Year 5 was drafted under the assumption that meetings would take place in person. Groups A, D, and F, the fixed costs groups, progressed based on what was planned. On the other hand, groups B, C and E varied based on the usage.

Groups A and D have 75% usage, which corresponds with the timing of the end of the third quarter. The majority of the expenses of F take place at the end of the year. Groups B and C have no expenses, since physical meetings did not take place. The costs with interpretation and translation increased significantly, due to scheduling of online meetings across several days, while previous practice was to hold several physical meetings in the same day. Income from members remained stable, while there was a decrease in financial support from Member States.

The Financial Officer put forward a proposal of budgetary amendment. Taking into account that no physical meeting is expected until the end of September, budgeted expenditure would be moved from Groups B and C into Groups D, E, and F. The changes would cover the increased interpretation and translation costs, the hiring of a consultant for an external performance review, and a review of the MAC's website.

The Executive Committee agreed with the proposed budgetary amendment.



Work Programme of Year 6 (2021-2022)

- **Presentation of draft priorities and deliverables by Pedro Reis Santos, Secretary General**

The Secretary General provided an overview of the draft Work Programme for Year 6 (1 October 2021 – 30 September 2022), focusing on the priorities and deliverables.

- Revision of Fisheries Control Regulation: Taking into account the recent adoption of the Council's position, the inter-institutional negotiations are expected to begin soon. The aim is to produce advice, once there are tangible outcomes.
- CATCH IT System: The system will become mandatory, once there is a legal basis in the revised Fisheries Control Regulation. The aim is to produce advice, once the legal basis is adopted.
- EMFAF: The Member States are currently preparing their national programmes. The aim is for the MAC to keep track of the priorities and provide advice.
- Farm to Fork Strategy: The MAC already worked on many initiatives under Year 5. The aim is to continue following those initiatives, plus to produce advice on new ones.
- Trade: The MAC keeps constant discussions on international trade developments. The aim is for the MAC to submit submissions to public consultations and *ad hoc* advice when there are relevant developments.
- Marketing Standards: The Commission's legislative proposal is expected in early 2022. The aim is to adopt advice on the proposal.
- IUU Fishing & Global Governance: The MAC always followed the topic, including through presentations from DG MARE on the carding system and from members on specific issues. The aim is to continue following developments and adopt advice on an *ad hoc* basis.
- EUMOFA: DG MARE could present the work programme of EUMOFA, so that the MAC can provide suggestions on additional studies or prioritising of foreseen ones.
- SFPAs: DG MARE is undertaking an evaluation of the SFPAs. The aim is to follow-up on the evaluation report and the Staff Working Document.
- Food Information to Consumers: The MAC adopted advice on the recent Commission's Roadmap. The aim is to follow up on the work.
- Traceability: The NSAC expressed interest in the organisation of a webinar on new technology tools to improve traceability in the supply chain, such as blockchain. The topic is mainly a MAC competence, but co-organisation would be possible. The aim would be to learn about new technologies and how these are being used by different operators. Then, there could be advice about potential legislative action or public support.
- Landing Obligation: Every year, DG MARE does a report on the implementation of the landing obligation and requests information from the ACs.
- STECF: The aim is to maintain cooperation, including through presentation of the economic reports on the EU Fish Processing Industry, the EU Aquaculture Sector and the EU Fishing Fleet. Plus, to participate as active observers in relevant meetings.



- Sanitary & Hygiene Rules: The topic has been dealt with by WG3 on a regular basis. When members perceive there are problems, advice can be developed on an *ad hoc* manner.
- Substantiating Green Claims: DG ENV is working on a proposal, including the development of requirements for Life Cycle Assessments. The MAC previously adopted advice on the matter. MARE A4 encouraged the MAC to continue working on the topic. There will be significant impact on other initiatives using LCA to calculate environmental impact of seafood products.
- Empowering the consumer for the green transitions: DG JUST launched an initiative that will potentially set minimum requirements for sustainability logos and labels. MARE A4 encouraged the MAC to follow-up on the topic.
- Other work: There can be *ad hoc* requests from the European Commission, Member States and members.

The schedule of the meetings remains the same, so meetings in January, March, May and September.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) highlighted that, in the context of the Farm to Fork Strategy, the European Commission published the new strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture. The work programme should recognise that the structure of the EU market will change with an increase of aquaculture products. It is necessary to start reflecting on the impact on the market, if the amount of aquaculture products doubles. The MAC requires more aquaculture stakeholders, in order to have sufficient human resources to follow aquaculture developments.

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) emphasised that traceability is under the remit of the MAC, so he did not understand the involvement of the regional fisheries ACs. Mr O'Donoghue expressed doubt that the organisation of a webinar should be the focus of the MAC. The MAC already had intense discussions on the revision of the Fisheries Control Regulation. For information purposes, it could be useful for the members to know more about blockchain, but the concerned operators are already working with it. Traceability is very important for the MAC, but there should not be a commitment to such a specific webinar. In relation to Mr Guillaumie's intervention, he highlighted that many topics were generic and would be applicable to fisheries and aquaculture products.

The Secretary General explained that he did communicate to the NSAC Secretariat that traceability is under the remit of the MAC, plus that it would not be appropriate to discuss it without the representation of aquaculture producers, processors, traders, and retailers. Taking into account the interest of the NSAC in working on the topic, the most appropriate solution found by the Secretariat was to work together. Nevertheless, if the members were not interested, then the Secretariat would not participate in the organisation of this event.

In relation to Mr Guillaumie's intervention, the Secretary General recognised that efforts could be made to improve the representation of aquaculture associations in the MAC. The Secretary General



stated that the members could agree to produce advice on the aquaculture strategic guidelines or choose to include a reference to these in the work programme.

The Chair stated that the issue was not necessarily the number of associations present in the MAC, but a matter of agenda. The Farm to Fork Strategy has many implications on the market supply. The vision on aquaculture should be under that heading, in order to account for the promotion by the EU institutions of aquaculture as a way to increase supply. In relation to the development of advice, at a later stage, it could be determined if the MAC should adopt its own advice or joint advice with the Aquaculture Advisory Council.

Christine Absil (Good Fish Foundation) stated that the topic of traceability was relevant for the MAC and should be mentioned in the work programme. Ms Absil expressed support for the organisation of an informational webinar, including to assess potential policy developments. At the same time, Ms Absil disagreed with the organisation of a joint event with the NSAC. The MAC should move at its own pace, instead of being bound to the initiatives of other Advisory Councils. When relevant, the MAC could still assist other Advisory Councils in their work.

The Secretary General informed that the idea was to work together with the NSAC. The NWWAC also expressed interest. A meeting would be taking place the following week between the three secretariats. The Secretary General highlighted that it was important to avoid duplication of events. Nevertheless, members could choose to not co-organise the event with NSAC and to work on the topic at a later stage.

The Chair wondered if the webinar would add value to the work programme. The MAC already committed to a significant amount of work. The MAC and the members have limited resources. Traceability is always part of the MAC's work, since it is part of the discussions on IUU, the Fisheries Control Regulation, and the information to consumers. In terms of output, the event should also have added value for the European Commission. Technology developments, such as blockchain, are already being address in other contexts.

Els Bedert (EuroCommerce) agreed with the Chair, highlighting that there are other tools available for those that want to learn about blockchain and other technologies.

Frangiscos Nikolian (DG MARE) highlighted that the inter-institutional negotiations on the revision of the Fisheries Control Regulation would start right after the summer break.

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) recognised that traceability is always a component of the MAC's work. The work programme should refer that the MAC will be addressing traceability in the context of fisheries control without mentioning blockchain and other technologies. It is important to consider the outputs from the event.



Pierre Commère (AIPCE) highlighted that the topic of traceability is quite wide. It is important to have precise wording in the terms of reference of the event. The issue is more about the transmission of data in the supply chain.

The Chair recognised that heading 9 on traceability would need to be amended. The Executive Committee should wait for the meeting between the three secretariats, in order to better understand the ideas. If there is commitment from the MAC to co-organise, then the wording should be clearer on the work programme. If not, then there should be wording outlining the MAC's work on the topic of traceability in connection with other topics. The Chair suggested the use of the written procedure to determine. In relation the aquaculture strategic guidelines, the Chair agreed with the inclusion with a reference in connection with the Farm to Fork Strategy. At a later stage, the MAC could assess potential collaboration with the AAC.

- **Presentation of draft budget by Panos Manias, Financial Officer**

The Financial Officer encouraged members to send their signed membership commitments, which is a requirement to receive financial support from the European Commission. The Financial Officer proceeded to present the draft budget for Year 6. The costs of Groups A, D, F are fixed costs, which remain the same across the years. Groups B and C vary with the number of meetings as well as E, which is dedicated to interpretation and translation. The budget is drafted under the assumption that meetings will take place in person in Brussels. The budget foresees four groups of meetings, four focus group meetings and one workshop.

The Executive Committee agreed with the proposed budget for Year 6.

External Performance Review

- **Budgetary amendment**
- **Way forward**

The Secretary General recalled that the LDAC undertook an external performance review. DG MARE is reviewing the functioning of the Advisory Councils and one of the suggestions is for the Advisory Councils to periodically undertake external performance reviews. At the 14 April meeting, the Executive Committee agreed that the MAC should undertake an external performance review with a similar structure to the LDAC one. As mentioned earlier, there was a request for a 12.000€ budgetary amendment to cover the review. Under the applicable rules, this is considered a “very low value tender”, so it only requires an offer from one consultant. The Secretariat initiated contact with Mr Benoît Guerin (BG Sea Consulting), who was the external consultant for the LDAC. Mr Guerin has professional experience in the Secretariat of the Advisory Councils, in NGOs, fisheries, and consulting.



The Secretary General highlighted that the aim of the agenda item was for members to agree with the expenditure and to provide some preliminary feedback. Terms of reference would be prepared afterward, so that the contract can be signed in September under Year 5. The review would include interviews between September and December 2021, a preliminary report in December 2021, plus attendance of meetings and the final report in January 2022.

Benoît Guerin (BG Sea Consulting) recalled his professional experience as Executive Secretary of the SWWAC between 2007 and 2013, which included a performance review. In 2018 and 2019, he was responsible for the performance review of the LDAC. Previously, he had experience as a member of the MEDAC. Mr Guerin stated that the content of the review would have to be agreed with the members. The review will provide an overview of the functioning of the MAC, including work of the General Assembly, the Executive Committee and the Working Groups, participation from the members, decision-making process, quality of the advice, and the relationship with the Commission services. The consultant will analyse the work of the Secretariat and the Management Team as well as the collaboration between members, with other Advisory Councils and with other external bodies. The review will identify external practices. It could also establish the impact of Brexit on the work. The report will include a set of recommendations on the quality of the work. The tools used will be MAC documents, participation in meetings, and targeted interviews with MAC members. In the terms of reference, the MAC should identify the priorities.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) express agreement with the potential selection of Mr Guerin, taking into account his professional experience in the Advisory Councils, in international NGOs and as a fisher. The main questions should be the participation of stakeholders in the MAC and the contribution to the EU's decision-making. Mr Robert suggested an increase of the assessment period, taking into account the time required to prepare a topic, draft advice, adopt it, and to receive a reply from the European Commission. He wanted to know the timeframe of the LDAC's review.

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) recognised the expertise of Mr Guerin. Mr O'Donoghue emphasised the importance of having a clear process and clear deliverables. The MAC must set the terms of reference, which will be used for the contract. Draft terms of reference need to be prepared, so that the contract can set out deliverables and a timescale. He suggested the circulation of draft terms of reference via written procedure for approval by the Executive Committee.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) wanted to know if Mr Guerin had experience with the aquaculture and processing sectors. The review should take into account the different market segments, including aquaculture, fisheries, processing, and retailers.

The Chair highlighted that the review would be about the functioning of the Advisory Council. The Executive Committee needs to consider the terms of reference.



Benoît Guerin (BG Sea Consulting) agreed that the timeframe needs to be specified. Taking into account the dates of the MAC meetings, it could be relevant to conclude the review at a later date, in order to have more discussions with the Executive Committee. In response to Mr Guillaumie's intervention, Mr Guerin explained that his professional experience in the aquaculture and processing sectors was limited, but that he would be analysing the functioning and the procedure, not the actual positions argued. It is an evaluation exercise, so it does not require technical expertise on the sectors.

The Chair proposed for the Secretariat to prepare draft terms of reference, in consultation with the Management Team, so that the Executive Committee can approve these via written procedure. If Mr Guerin agrees with the terms of reference, then it will be possible to proceed with the contract.

Inter-Advisory Councils' Coordination

- **Preparation of position for 15 July 2021 meeting**

The Secretary General recalled that DG MARE is holding an Inter-AC meeting on 15 July. The MAC will be represented by the Vice-Chairs and the Secretariat. The first agenda item is dedicated to financial matters, including general financial matters and the transition to lump-sums financing. The Secretariat welcomes the transition to lump-sums, since it provides administrative simplification. There will be a presentation on the functioning of the Advisory Councils, in which the Commission will present the draft delegated act amending Delegated Regulation (EU) No 2015/242. The Secretary General explained that, at the time of the meeting, the draft had not been circulated, so it was not possible to comment on it. DG MARE will also present the 2020 Annual Communication. Minutes from the Inter-AC meeting will be circulated to the members.

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) wondered if seafood market-related issues will be dealt with by the Specialised Committee on Fisheries or another committee of the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement, adding that it would be useful to get information from DG MARE at the Inter-AC meeting. Mr O'Donoghue emphasised the importance of cooperation between the Advisory Councils and the Specialised Committee on Fisheries.

The Secretary General recalled that, on 30 April 2021, the MAC signed a multi-AC letter requesting more information on the Specialised Committee on Fisheries and emphasising the need for stakeholder engagement, including the Advisory Councils. Under the advice on Brexit, the MAC also requested further information on the Committee. According to the Commission's reply, the EU and the UK were still considering the composition of the delegations and stakeholder involvement.

Pim Visser (VisNed) highlighted the need of engagement with UK stakeholders through the Specialised Committee on Fisheries. Mr Visser argued that it is essential to emphasise the importance of the Advisory Councils as platforms for stakeholder engagement.



Participation of Observers

- **Agreement on guidelines on participation in MAC meetings**

The Secretary General recalled that the development of draft guidelines was an action from the previous meeting. The draft was circulated ahead of the meeting. As determined by the rules of the Common Fisheries Policy, there are active observers who do not require invitation. According to the CFP, there are other active observers that require invitation: qualified scientists and stakeholders from third countries. The Secretariat proposed the inclusion of “other individuals with specific knowledge or interest on scheduled agenda item” as active observers that require invitation. According to the draft proposal, the majority of the members can oppose the participation of the observers that require invitation.

The Chair expressed satisfaction that the rules of the Common Fisheries Policy were closely followed, in order to provide clear criteria.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) highlighted that, under the CFP rules, the meetings of the Advisory Councils are public, which means that passive observers must be accepted.

The Chair mentioned that the draft covered the matter of public access to General Assembly and Executive Committee meetings, but did not include a reference to the Working Groups.

The Secretary General explained that, on passive observers, the draft followed the CFP rules, meaning that meetings of the General Assembly are open to the public and that the meetings of the Executive Committee are open to the public unless, in exceptional cases, decided otherwise by a majority of the Executive Committee. The CFP does not provide specific rules on the Working Groups, but these could be included in the draft.

Sean O’Donoghue (EAPO) requested more information on the inclusion of “qualified scientists” under active observers with invitation requirement, taking into account the distinction between (i) and (k) of Article 2 of Annex III of the CFP Regulation.

The Secretary General explained that the draft reflects the requirements of Annex III of the CFP Regulation, which states that “any other qualified scientist may also be invited”.

Sean O’Donoghue (EAPO) argued against general public access to Working Group meetings.

The Chair, in relation to public access, emphasised the different nature of Working Group and Focus Group meetings in comparison with General Assembly and Executive Committee meetings.



Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA), in the draft's section dedicated to active observers with invitation requirement, suggested that the reference should not be only to "fishing interest".

Sean O'Donoghue (EAPO) argued that, in practice, representatives of the seafood sector and other interest groups from third countries should only be invited attend as active observers to Working Group meetings, but not to Executive Committee and General Assembly meetings.

The Chair proposed the recirculation of the draft guidelines, in order to include the comments.

Website

- **Agreement on guidelines on the publication of documents**

The Secretary General explained that there was a suggestion from the Management Team to develop clear guidelines on the publication of documents on the website. Advice from the MAC and the official replies from the Commission and the Member States should be available to the general public. Draft documents should be circulated via email to the members and published in a members' area. In terms of correspondence, official letters from the Commission and the Member States should be available to the general public. Correspondence with other relevant entities should be available to the general public in a different sub-section. The selection of relevant entities was inspired by the CFP's rules on active observers. Relevant correspondence from other entities, particularly private associations, should be circulated via email to the members. The Secretary General provided an overview of the draft guidelines.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) highlighted that rules on languages were missing, arguing that documents should be available in the 21 official languages of the EU.

The Secretary General recalled that the working languages of the MAC were English, French and Spanish. Minutes of the meetings are translated into the three working languages. Even without translating every document into the three working languages, the costs with interpretation and translation already represent a very significant part of the budget. The translation of documents into all official languages would require a very large increase in financial resources.

The Chair argued that the MAC should maintain the choice of three working languages. Additional working languages would have very significant budgetary implications.

The Executive Committee agreed with the proposed draft guidelines on the publication of documents on the website.



- **Budgetary amendment**
- **Way forward**

The Chair highlighted that, the underspending connected to the organisation of virtual meetings, could be an opportunity to review the website.

The Secretary General explained that the aim was to review the website until the end of September. Members have expressed interest in a members' area. The Secretariat is still in the early stages of the process and is open to suggestions from the members.

The Executive Committee agreed with proceeding with a review of the website.

EFCA

- **Reporting back on Advisory Board (15 April 2021) by Daniel Voces, MAC Representative**

Daniel Voces (Europêche) informed that a meeting of EFCA's Advisory Board took place on 15 April 2021. At the Advisory Board meeting, Mr Voces provided an overview of MAC advice, including on the COVID-19 pandemic, SFPAs, the landing obligation, IUU fishing activities by Ghana's industrial trawl sector, better alignment of import control schemes in major market States. The MAC representative also drew attention to the ongoing work on flags of convenience. The official conclusions of the Advisory Board meeting were circulated by the Secretariat beforehand.

AOB

- **Date of the next meeting**

The Chair proposed the organisation of the next General Assembly meeting on 16 September online. Depending on the applicable sanitary restrictions, the organisation of an in-person meeting in Brussels could be considered at a later stage.



Summary of action points

- Work Programme of Year 6 (2021-2022)
 - o Secretariat to incorporate the proposed amendments
 - o Draft work programme to be recirculated for approval via written procedure
- External Performance Review
 - o Secretariat to prepare draft terms of reference, which will be circulated for approval via written procedure
- Inter-Advisory Council's Coordination
 - o At the 15 July 2021 meeting, representatives to raise the importance of additional information on the Specialised Committee on Fisheries, particularly market coverage
- Participation of Observers
 - o Secretariat to incorporate the proposed amendments
 - o Draft guidelines to be recirculated for approval via written procedure
- Website
 - o Secretariat to proceed with the review of the website
 - o Members to provide suggestions via email



List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Antonia Leroy	WWF
Benoît Guerin	BG Sea Consulting
Benoît Thomassen	FEAP
Bruno Guillaumie	EMPA
Catherine Pons	FEAP
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Daniel Voces	Europêche
Daniel Weber	European Fishmeal
Els Bedert	EuroCommerce
Frangiscos Nikolian	European Commission
Georg Werner	Environmental Justice Foundation
Gerd Heinen	European Commission
Guus Pastoor (Chair)	AIPCE-CEP
Javier Ojeda	FEAP
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Jennifer Reeves	MSC
Katarina Sipic	AIPCE-CEP
Panos Manias	Market Advisory Council
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council
Pierre Commère	AIPCE
Pim Visser	VisNed
Quentin Marchais	ClientEarth
Rebeca Díez	CONXEMAR
Roberto Carlos Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPESCA
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche



Representative	Organisation
Sean O'Donoghue	EAPO
Stavroula Kremmydiotou	Market Advisory Council
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana
Yannis Pelekanakis	FEAP

