

Working Group 2: EU Market

Minutes

Monday, 20 September 2021 14:00 - 17:15 CET Zoom online meeting

Welcome from the Chair, Pierre Commère

Adoption of draft agenda and minutes of last meeting (25.05.21): adopted

Click <u>here</u> to access the Chair's presentation.

Action points of the last meeting

- State of play of the decisions made during the last meeting information
- Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements (SFPAs):
 - Once the external consultant's evaluation report and the Staff Working Document are published, Working Group 2 to analyse these and consider if further advice is needed on the topic
 - Publication of evaluation report & Staff Working Document still pending
- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU):
 - Draft advice on flags of convenience to be recirculated to the working group for a written consultation of two weeks
 - $\circ~$ Secretariat to contact LDAC Secretariat for potential consideration and endorsement of the amended draft by LDAC
 - In case LDAC submits a small number of comments, the draft will be put forward to the Executive Committee for integration of the comments and adoption. Otherwise, the draft will continue at the working group's level for further consideration
 - WG written consultation: 7 22 June 2021 (no comments)
 - LDAC's input circulated to WG2 members
 - Consideration of the input scheduled on the draft agenda
- Brexit:
 - Agreed draft advice to be put forward to the Executive Committee for adoption through written procedure
 - Advice adopted on 11 June 2021
 - European Commission's reply on 30 June 2021





Trade

• Update on latest developments, including EEA Agreement & EU-Ukraine FTA, by Commission representative

<u>Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE)</u> provided an update on the EEA Agreement negotiations. The mandate to renegotiate the financial mechanism with Norway and Iceland and potentially amending the market access conditions for fisheries products was adopted in May 2021. The negotiations have not started yet. The EU's chief negotiator has not been appointed yet. DG MARE and DG TRADE will work together on market access matters. Elections took place in Norway recently and the government has not been formed yet, so some delay is expected. In July, Cabinets of Commissioner Dombrovskis and of Commissioner Sinkevičius were approach by Iceland with a general request to fully renegotiate market access conditions for fisheries products under the EEA Agreement. These were exploratory talks without specific offers or requests.

From the EU's perspective, the Commission noted that the fish products that do not benefit from duty reductions when importing into the EU from Iceland are salmon, herring, and mackerel. For herring, the quota expired in the end of April. Salmon and mackerel are not liberalised at all for Iceland. The timeline for the negotiations is unknown. Mr Szatkowski drew attention to the recent amendment of the ATQs Regulation adopted by the Council in July 2021, which provides six additional quotas. The quotas linked to the EEA situation will remain in force during a transitional period until end of October 2022. The other new quota on Patagonian squid being linked to the Brexit situation will remain in force until the end of validity of the ATQs Regulation, meaning of end of 2023.

Mr Szatkowski provided an update on the renegotiation of market access in the EU-Ukraine FTA. Under the FTA, there is a provision for possible renegotiation of market access conditions. DG TRADE is preparing to launch the talks on the basis of this provision. The Commission would like inputs on potential offensive interests when exporting fisheries products to Ukraine. The EU liberalised almost all fisheries products: the schedule shows that the last EU duties will expire in the beginning of 2023. On the other hand, Ukraine did not liberalise for the all EU's fisheries products. There are 48 tariff lines that will not be fully liberalised even after 2026. Canned tuna will also not be liberalised. Therefore, the Commission representative encouraged the industry to provide input, by the end of September, on the fisheries products with the most offensive interest. DG TRADE will launch the discussions with Ukraine in October.

• Exchange of views & way forward

<u>Sean O'Donoghue (KFO)</u>, in relation to the EEA Agreement, wanted to know which Council adopted the mandate. Mr O'Donoghue also wanted to know if the mandate was generic or specific, particularly if it included references to market access for fisheries products. He further wanted to know if the mandate was publicly available.





The <u>Chair</u> recalled that the ATQs Regulation will be transitionally used during the negotiation period. However, the timeframe and pace of negotiation is quite slow. Therefore, the Chair wondered if the application period of the ATQs would be sufficient.

<u>Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE)</u> responded that a long bridging period is expected, while the ATQs will be valid for one and half year. The previous time, the renegotiation of the financial mechanism took almost two years. Agreement could be achieved quite fast, once the negotiations formally start. The mandate is not public. The mandate is focused on the negotiation of the financial mechanism. A satisfactory conclusion is needed on both the financial mechanism and the market access conditions. It is not a generic mandate to fully renegotiate the market access conditions under the EEA Agreement. Still, it provides the possibility to open new quotas or bilateral concessions. There should be a satisfactory balance of the overall negotiations for the EU.

<u>Daniel Voces (Europêche)</u> wondered if the mandate included a specific reference to reciprocity between market access and fishing access. Mr Voces drew attention to LDAC advice that recommends that negotiations on free trade need to take into consideration access to the third country's fishing waters, but also to ports, business ownership, investment, and services. In his view, the EU is liberalising the market of fisheries products, but there is not the same level of openness in Norway and Iceland. It is important to have a level-playing-field with the EU's neighbours. He emphasised that, following Brexit, the EU's position on fisheries resources and access to waters cannot remain the same.

<u>Poul Melgaard Jensen (Danish Seafood Association)</u> highlighted that there were discussions of Brexit having a significant influence on trade, which could warrant a second revision of the ATQs Regulation. In Denmark, there were ATQs that expired due to Brexit, which led to prawns being exported from Canada to the UK, instead of to the EU. Mr Melgaard Jensen wanted to know if the mentioned second revision of the ATQs Regulation was foreseen.

<u>Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE)</u> responded that no new revision of the ATQs Regulation is foreseen and that the Commission would prefer to avoid a revision. The amendments were also triggered by Brexit and the loss of market access. Additional quota was provided based on this reason. The negotiation of the bilateral quotas will have an impact. The expiry of the transitional quotas will encourage the negotiating partners to reach an agreement. An extension of the quotas would reduce the motivation for Norway to negotiate. Mr Szatkowski explained that the mandate does not allow a full renegotiation of the market access conditions under the EEA Agreement. To achieve this, a new mandate from the Council would be needed. The current mandate is focused on the financial mechanism and contributions for the next seven years and to negotiate the expired bilateral concessions.

The <u>Chair</u> encouraged members to share their views on the renegotiation of the market access conditions under the EU-Ukraine FTA. The Chair noted the short timeline to produce advice.





Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) called for the liberalisation for bivalve molluscs.

The <u>Secretary General</u>, in terms of way forward, suggested the circulation of a short questionnaire to the members for one week, to gather input from the members. The urgent written procedure could be used for the consideration and adoption of the advice. It would be very difficult to adopt the advice by end of September, but it could be concluded by early October.

The <u>Chair</u> wondered if other chapters will be renegotiated under the EU-Ukraine FTA, such as rules of origin.

<u>Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE)</u> responded that the renegotiation is purely about tariffs and market access conditions. The rules of origin are connected to different negotiations.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) wanted to know if market access conditions include health and sanitary certification.

<u>Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE)</u> expressed willingness to receive input on any potential barriers faced when exporting to Ukraine, such as SPS certificates.

The <u>Chair</u> suggested the inclusion of a question on non-tariff barriers in the questionnaire to be circulated to the members.

• Update on USA Marine Mammal Protection Act

Marta Moren Abat (DG MARE) explained that this legislation aims to ensure that fisheries and aquaculture products entering the USA market do not harm protected marine mammal species. All Member States that wish to export to the USA must submit an application by 30 November 2021. As of 1 January 2023, products that are not included in the approved list of "foreign fisheries" will be banned from entering the USA market. The Commission is supporting Member States in the provision of data to the USA authorities, particularly NOAA. The Commission is trying to coordinate the process, so that there is a common vision among Member States and heterogeneity. Significant amounts of data are connected to EU fisheries and environmental legislation. The legislation is equal for all Member States, but there are differences in implementation. The necessary information might be connected to the EU's commitments in RFMOs. Member States' submissions should be coherent with the EU's positions in RFMOs. Research data will need to be submitted, which might be relevant to several countries. The Commission held discussions with all interested Member States during the summer period. Discussions have been organised by area of operation and fishery. Technical discussions took place in September. In the upcoming weeks, Member States will inform on the submission of data. The Commission maintains the Council's Working Party continuously informed. Ms Moren Abat encouraged members to cooperate with their national authorities.





The <u>Chair</u> commented that his organisation received requests from the French authorities on this matter already two years prior. The coordination amongst Member States is quite relevant.

<u>Daniel Voces (Europêche)</u> thanked the Commission for their coordination work. Mr Voces wanted to know whether other regions in the world are facing the same legislation. Mr Voces also wanted to know whether the EU will require the same level of standards to products imported from the USA. Otherwise, the USA measure could be seen as a protectionist measure.

<u>Marta Moren Abat (DG MARE)</u> responded that all countries that want to export fish products into the USA market are subject to the same rules and approach. Concerning the potential distortion of the market, according to the Commission's legal service, it is not clear whether the measure is against the WTO's rules, so it is not advisable to follow that line of action. The Commission preferred to see the requirements and to analyse the level of equivalence between the EU and USA legislations. There is a certain level of equivalence: products entering the EU market need to follow EU legislation, which should be reciprocal to the USA Marine Mammal Protection Act. Further, as the implementation of fisheries and environmental rules varies in the EU, it is important to have similar requirements between Member States and avoid the discrimination of EU operators. Ms Moren Abat highlighted that, in general, the USA is starting to take a stricter approach in the implementation of environmental legislation, for example in the case of marine turtle exclusion devices. The Commission is working with the USA authorities, while also aiming to prevent discrimination of EU companies. In this matter, a collaborative approach with the USA is more fruitful than a confrontational one.

The <u>Chair</u> encouraged members to approach their national authorities, in order to ensure good coordination with the Commission and an appropriate submission of information.

Fisheries Control Regulation

- Update on interinstitutional negotiations developments
- Way forward

The <u>Chair</u> recalled that, in November 2018, the MAC adopted advice on the Commission's legislative proposal of May 2018. The Parliament adopted its position in early 2021 and the Council in June 2021. The interinstitutional negotiations have started. According to the Work Programme of Year 6, as soon as tangible outcomes from the inter-institutional negotiations become available, follow-up advice is to be produced on the impact of the revision of the Fisheries Control Regulation. It could be relevant to see if the positions of the MAC were taken on board by the Council and the Parliament. <u>Daniel Voces (Europêche)</u> commented that the schedule of inter-institutional negotiations was very ambitious. In that period, the Slovenian Presidency will be quite busy with TACs and quotas. It is likely that the French Presidency will have to finalise the negotiations in the next semester. The three

institutions have very different positions in several topics, so a political agreement by the end of the





year seems unlikely. Mr Voces suggested sending the MAC's position to the new Presidency as a follow-up step.

The <u>Chair</u> agreed with Mr Voces's suggestion. As the French authorities are preparing to take up the negotiations on the Fisheries Control Regulation, it would also be quite relevant to send the MAC's advice to the French delegation too.

The <u>Secretary General</u> expressed support for the suggestion and informed that a translation of the advice into French would be undertaken.

TRACES.NT System

• Exchange of views on operational issues

Click <u>here</u> to access the presentation.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) explained that, in the past months, the system was not working correctly, translating into significant expenses for operators. The general performance of the system is not satisfactory. The entry of the Common Health Entry Document in the system is too time consuming for the border inspection posts. The updates of the systems should not happen during business hours of the border inspection posts, in order to avoid delays of consignments. The codes of certain product categories are not correctly linked to the required entries in the import certificates, for example, in the case of some products, the "aquaculture/wild" origin cannot be entered correctly. There are important documents missing, such as private attestation for composite products. Until July 2021, online modifications of the CHED were not possible. This has caused problems, because third countries' veterinarians were told by the Commission that these documents cannot be amended by hand.

The <u>Chair</u> informed that the Secretariat requested the attendance of a DG SANTE representative, but that had not been possible. The Chair asked members whether they had faced similar problems.

<u>Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.)</u> emphasised the importance of informing the Commission about these problems and of receiving a written response.

The <u>Secretary General</u> explained that the Commission could not be present, but that the Commission services do accept written questions on the agenda items. Therefore, one option could be for the Secretariat to send a written question, via email, to DG MARE on behalf of Mr Keller. Otherwise, the MAC could develop an advice, which would require a consultation of the working group and adoption by the Executive Committee.





Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) agreed with the submission of a written question via email on behalf of his organisation.

Technologies for the Transmission of Data in the Supply Chain

• Presentation on blockchain and traceability of food products by Petter Olsen, Senior Scientist, NOFIMA

Click <u>here</u> to access the presentation.

<u>Petter Olsen (NOFIMA)</u> provided an overview of the use of blockchain for verifying data recorded in a traceability system. In terms of the components of a traceability system, there must be an identification of traceable resource units (TRUs), documentation of transformations, and attributes of the TRUs. A traceability system contains claims about the TRUs. For claims with a biochemical component, analytic methods can be used. For matching records in one place with recordings in another place, there can be an input-output analysis. Another method is mass-balance accounting. There is an increasing interest in blockchain-based technologies in the fishing industry. The development dates back to October 2008, when an article was published on bitcoin as a peer-to-peer electronic cash system.

Mr Olsen highlighted that several news articles about the use of blockchain to prevent mislabelling of food products and to increase the speed of checks are entirely false. There is overselling of blockchain solutions. Mr Olsen explained that blockchain is an incorruptible digital ledger of transactions. It is an online database with many users distributed with many copies, synchronised, encrypted, and immutable. Any entry recorded in the system is always tied to a known user identity. It does not mean that what was registered is true. The challenge is inserting accurate data of the physical world into the blockchain. Blockchain suffers from the same "garbage in, garbage out" problem that other systems suffer from. Nevertheless, it has the added security that it is always possible to know who added the data and that the data cannot be changed.

Mr Olsen explained that blockchain cannot help in a better identification of TRUs. In relation to attributes, blockchain can help somewhat finding previous recordings of attributes. Blockchain can really help in the documentation of transformations. In summary, blockchain is an exciting technology that has the potential to underlie a major technological paradigm shift. Solution providers are currently overselling the benefits of systems based on blockchain technology. Confidentiality and speed can be a challenge for traceability systems based on blockchain technology, but otherwise the technology is well suited for the purpose, and interoperability will be easier. For traceability in the supply chain, blockchain can remedy some potential problems because while claims that are recorded in the blockchain might still be wrong, it will be quite clear who made those claims, and we will know that those claims have not been tampered with. He drew attention to a NOFIMA report on the applications, limitations, costs, and benefits related to the use of blockchain technology in the food





industry. The EU recently launched a call to develop a roadmap on blockchain in the European food industry.

The <u>Chair</u> highlighted that blockchain technology is already being used in certain regional fisheries.

• Consideration of draft Terms of Reference for joint MAC/NSAC/NWWAC webinar

The working group proceeded to consider the webinar's draft terms of reference.

The <u>Secretary General</u> explained that the organisation of the webinar was initially an initiative of the NSAC Secretariat as an information exercise for fishers. The transmission of data and traceability information is very much a market topic that affects the entire supply chain, so there was a decision to organise it as a joint webinar between the MAC, NSAC and NWWAC. The draft Terms of Reference were prepared by the three secretariats. The draft has been submitted to the respective working groups. The Secretary General explained that the webinar would be particularly focused on blockchain, but that it would also touch upon other technologies. The Secretary General provided an overview of the background, purpose, proposed outcomes, proposed agenda, profile of speakers, target audience, schedule and timelines, and resources.

<u>Sean O'Donoghue (KFO)</u> stated that the webinar could be a very useful information gathering exercise. Mr O'Donoghue disagreed with the commitment to develop advice to the European Commission under the "proposed outcomes" section of the draft. It would be more appropriate for the MAC to decide, after the webinar and based on the report, whether there were recommendations to pursue, particularly on the traceability aspects of the Fisheries Control Regulation. The MAC is the key player in terms of traceability on the seafood supply chain. He suggested the deletion of the third paragraph in the "proposed outcomes" of the draft terms of reference.

<u>Christine Absil (Good Fish)</u> agreed with the previous intervention. It can be too early to develop policy recommendations, since for many stakeholders is a very new subject. Ms Absil highlighted that the webinar would be very useful to know more about what blockchain technology can do and cannot do. The exchange of experiences between operators would also be quite relevant.

<u>Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.)</u> agreed with the previous interventions. Mr Keller argued that it is important for the webinar to cover already existing data transmission systems.

The <u>Chair</u> suggested a few editorial changes to the draft text.

The <u>Secretary General</u>, in relation to Mr Keller's comment, explained that the aim of the secretariats was to avoid a long webinar. The webinar is expected to last half day. Therefore, existing systems would be touched upon in the panel session. In the panel, operators can be asked about how they compare existing systems with the new ones. In terms of procedure, the Secretary General explained





that the established practice in the MAC is for Terms of Reference to be adopted at the working group's level. If there are any controversial points, this can be put forward to the Executive Committee. The organisation of the webinar is already included in the Work Programme for Year 6, which was developed by the Executive Committee. The Secretary General informed that he would contact the NWWAC and NSAC secretariats to see about the working group's amendments would be acceptable.

The working group agreed with the amended draft terms of reference.

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU)

• Update on LDAC's consideration of the draft advice on flags of convenience by Sophie Nodzenski, Oceans Campaigner, EJF & Alexandre Rodríguez, Executive Secretary, LDAC representative

The <u>Chair</u> recalled that, at the previous meeting, the working group reached agreement on the text of the draft advice on flags of convenience. The working group decided to check with the LDAC about a potential joint adoption, before putting forward the draft text to the Executive Committee. Ahead of the meeting, a new draft version that integrates LDAC's comments was circulated.

<u>Sophie Nodzenski (EJF)</u> provided an overview of the amendments by the LDAC's Working Group 5. In the introduction, references were added to the problem of flag States selling their flags to non-EU countries' operators and the acknowledgement that the EU IUU Regulation covers activities of EU nationals regardless of the flag of their vessels. Some nuanced language was included to reflect the complexity of the issue. Amendments were included to demonstrate the EU's efforts to fight non-compliant flags of convenience.

In relation to the draft recommendations, Ms Nodzenski explained that, in recommendation a), concrete actions were specified. A reference to Article 40 of the EU IUU Regulation was included in recommendation b). The reference to the publication of a list of vessels owned and/or operated by EU nationals under non-EU country flags was deleted due to the lack of consensus among the LDAC's membership. Recommendation c) was redrafted to be in line with the LDAC's advice on the level-playing-field. Recommendation d) was reworded to achieve a clearer text. Recommendation e) is new and encourages the Commission to direct funding for third countries to increase their capacity in the fight against IUU fishing. Recommendation i) is new and encourages the adoption of policies against transhipment at sea. Recommendation o) is new and encourages increased scrutiny over imports into the EU of raw material and processed fishing products from countries which are non-signatories to key international fisheries treaties.

<u>Alexandre Rodríguez (LDAC)</u> emphasised that there were several amendments, but that these focused mainly on the clarity and accuracy of the text and not on the substance. The topic is of great interest





for the LDAC. There is a focus on cooperation and enforcement of the existing rules as well as on transparency. Mr Rodríguez drew attention to recommendation o), since it is a market measure. From the LDAC's side, the draft text is ready to be put forward to the Executive Committee.

• Consideration of LDAC's amendments to the draft advice

The <u>Chair</u> wondered if "operators" was the most appropriate in the third paragraph of page 2.

<u>Alexandre Rodríguez (LDAC)</u> explained that the word was meant to cover both the investors and the vessels.

The <u>Chair</u>, in relation to draft recommendation o), commented that it would be more appropriate to precise the key international fisheries treaties.

<u>Daniel Voces (Europêche)</u> suggested to refer to the table of relevant treaties used in the LDAC's advice on the level-playing-field (UNCLOS, FAO Compliance Agreement, UNFSA, PSMA).

The working group agreed with the amended draft advice.

• Consideration of LDAC's amendments to the draft advice

The <u>Chair</u> proposed to put forward the advice to the Executive Committee for consideration and adoption through two weeks written procedure.

Initial Focus Group on Trade

• Update on the work by Poul Melgaard Jensen, Focus Group Chair

<u>Poul Melgaard Jensen (Danish Seafood Association)</u> recalled that the aim of the Focus Group is to review available information on existing trade policy instruments and their impact on the market of fishery and aquaculture products. The report will have three parts: 1) trade balances and the size of the EU market, 2) map the existing trade instruments, and 3) a distribution of relevant species across different trade instruments. There is ongoing dialogue with DG MARE in relation to part 3). DG MARE and DG TRADE offered to provide information on trade balance, implementation reports, and preference utilisation rate of individual agreements. The Focus Group will be submitting a list of species to DG MARE and DG TRADE, so that the Commission services can provide data for part 3) of the report. The timeline depends on the Commission's time of response.





Information system on commercial designations

• Presentation of new features by Commission representatives

Click <u>here</u> to access the presentation.

<u>Christophe Vande Weyer (DG MARE)</u> explained that the information system has been in place for several years. A new system feature was developed: a generation of QR codes to enable users to directly access specific pages of interest. The Commission would like to gather stakeholders and invited the MAC recommendations on the relevant use of the QR codes, relevant information, and where it could be placed (packaging, publications, others). Based on the interest of the MAC, a pilot group could be established with members.

<u>Alessandro Russo (CNR)</u> explained that the CMO Regulation serves a legal basis. Article 35 defines the mandatory information requirements for fisheries and aquaculture products, such as commercial designation, fishing gear, production methods, etc. There is also voluntary information that can be included on the label. Under Article 37, Member States must define national lists of commercial designations and scientific names. Information on commercial species, valuable to consumers and other stakeholders in the supply chain, is scattered across heterogenous sources. There is a need to create bridges between the national lists of commercial designations published by EU Member States. There is also a need to improve transparency and ease of access for consumers and other stakeholders as regards key elements of product labelling. DG MARE's objective is to develop a single multilingual tool to collect, integrate and make available existing information related to scientific names and commercial designations of fisheries and aquaculture products marketed in the EU. This is already publicly available as a multilingual official website of the EU. The website provides access to searchable information on commercial species, species profiles and factsheets, the national lists of commercial designations, and access to different devices.

Mr Russo provided an overview of the mobile access opportunities. Approximately half of the visits to the website originate from mobile devices. The opportunity to develop a dedicated app is being evaluated and a first prototype is ready. The usage of QR codes has grown in recent years and during the COVID-19 pandemic. People are more accustomed to scanning QR codes and it is increasingly used on product packaging to give access to additional information. QR codes can be generated for any species profile page or other pages of the website. It is an opportunity to valorise the system and its data.

Massimiliano Raciti (CNR) provided a demonstration of the mobile app and QR code.





• Exchange of views

<u>Alessandro Russo (CNR)</u> encouraged members to provide feedback on whether QR codes and a mobile app would be valuable tools to complement the system's capabilities, who could be interested in and benefit from the introduction of QR codes along the supply chain, where QR codes could be put, and who might be interested in pilot activities to evaluate the feasibility and usefulness of the approach.

The <u>Chair</u> highlighted the relevance of the initiative, even thought it would be difficult to predict how operators could use the new features of the system.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) recognised the increasing usage of QR codes. Nevertheless, companies only provide QR codes that give access to their own webpages, not to third party's pages, even if it is a neutral EU one. When using QR codes, companies hope to create a relationship with their customers. In relation to the reference to national lists of commercial designations, Mr Keller argued that the status of the national list should be indicated. The national lists are continuously amended. In the website, it is not possible to know when was the latest update of the list. In the case of the German list, there are some provisional allowances for new designations, which are not included on the Commission's website. The German list also includes footnotes that are missing on the website. The information on the website should correspond exactly to the information on the lists. Otherwise, users must know that they can use the website but should also check the national list. As for the use of QR codes, Mr Keller highlighted that, in Germany, the fTRACE system¹ is used.

<u>Christine Absil (Good Fish)</u> stated that, from a consumer's point-of-view, access to more information would be welcomed. In small shops, in particular, information is often lacking. Ms Absil wanted to know who would check that the correct QR code is used on the package, since often there is mislabelling. Therefore, it would be relevant to know if the use of QR codes could help to reduce mislabelling in the supply chain.

<u>Christophe Vande Weyer (DG MARE)</u> recognised that the use of the app and QR should not be only directed at retailers. The QR code could be used along the supply chain, but also by other actors, including on publications. In relation to Mr Keller's comments, Mr Vande Weyer explained that the information in the website comes from authoritative sources. The information is extracted from the national lists of commercial designations. Whenever a Member State updates its list of commercial designations, the Member State has an obligation to communicate the update to the European Commission. Once the Commission is informed, the amendment will be made public and will update the list. At most, there would be a gap of a couple of days. The level of reliability is very high. In relation to Ms Absil's intervention, Mr Vande Weyer emphasised that the mandate of the Commission

¹ <u>https://web.ftrace.com/en/</u>





is to increase transparency. An information system that allows communicating and bridging on national lists of commercial designations contributes to increased transparency in the market.

<u>Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.)</u> wanted to know if provisional lists are taken on board in the website. The most recent amendment to the German list was in March, but this is not reflected on the Commission's website.

<u>Christophe Vande Weyer (DG MARE)</u> explained that, once a Member State officially communicates a change to the European Commission, then the amendment is made public. It is an obligation under the CMO Regulation. This is then reflected on the information system. The only shortcoming is if a Member State fails to inform the Commission about amendments to the national list.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) emphasised the importance of including the last date of update on the website.

The <u>Chair</u> commented that the use of the QR code would require further testing. Operators interested in participated in the testing should inform the Commission. There might be small operators without high IT capacity who could see relevant to use the public system.

AOB

None.





Summary of action points

- Trade
 - Questionnaire to be circulated to the members on market access conditions under the EU-Ukraine FTA
 - Based on the replies to the questionnaire, draft advice to be prepared and considered under urgent written procedure
- Fisheries Control Regulation
 - Advice on the Fisheries Control Regulation to be sent to the Slovenian presidency, and to be translated and sent to the French delegation of the Council
- TRACES.NT System
 - Written question to be submitted to DG MARE by email, on behalf of Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.
- Technologies for the Transmission of Data in the Supply Chain
 - Secretariat to work with the NSAC and NWWAC secretariats, to reflect the working group's amendments in the final terms of reference of the webinar
- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU)
 - Agreed draft advice on flags of convenience to be put forward to the Executive Committee for adoption through written procedure





List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Aitana López	Spain
Alessandro Russo	CNR
Alexandre Rodríguez	Long Distance Advisory Council
Anna Boulova	FRUCOM
Aurora Carbonero de Blas	Spain
Benoît Guerin	BG Sea Consulting
Bruno Guillaumie	EMPA
Carla Valeiras	EuroCommerce
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Christophe Vande Weyer	European Commission
Daniel Voces de Onaíndi	Europêche
Daniel Weber	European Fishmeal
Emiel Brouckaert	EAPO
Felicidad Fernández Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPESCA
Frangiscos Nikolian	European Commission
Garazi Rodríguez	APROMAR
Georg Werner	Environmental Justice Foundation
Gerd Heinen	European Commission
Giorgia Lodi	CNR
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie
Jennifer Reeves	MSC
Jens Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association
José Basilio Otero Rodríguez	FNCP
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF
Katarina Sipic	AIPCE-CEP





Representative	Organisation
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA
Marta Moren Abat	European Commission
Massimiliano Raciti	CNR
Massimo Bellavista	COPA COGECA
Matthias Keller	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.
Monika Kolodziejczyk	Poland
Nicolás Fernández Muñoz	OPP72
Nieves Noval	ClientEarth
Patrick Murphy	IS&WFPO
Pawel Szatkowski	European Commission
Petter Olsen	NOFIMA
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council
Pierre Commère (Chair)	ADEPALE
Poul Melgaard Jensen	Danish Seafood Association
Purificación Fernández	OPPC-3
Roberto Carlos Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPESCA
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche
Santiago Folgar Gutiérrez	AVOCANO
Sean O'Donoghue	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation Ltd
Sergio López García	OPP LUGO
Silvia Corral	CONXEMAR
Sophie Nodzenski	EJF
Stavroula Kremmydiotou	Market Advisory Council
Tuure Eskelinen	EuroCommerce
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana
Yannis Pelekanakis	FEAP





