

Vigo, 5 April 2022

**MINUTES OF 38<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE  
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD  
HYBRID MEETING (IN VIGO AND ONLINE)**

**5 APRIL 2022**

**From 09h30 to 16h30**

## **0. ATTENDANCE**

The Acting Chair, Mr Yiannos Kyriacou, opened the 38<sup>th</sup> AB meeting at 09h30 by welcoming the AB members, the Advisory Board member and all the participants, highlighting that this was the first hybrid meeting held by this Administrative Board .

Since the last AB meeting of EFCA there are a few new appointments of representatives or alternates:

- Bulgaria (BG): Mr Hristo PANAYOTOV (Representative)
- Bulgaria (BG): Mr Dobrin LECHEV (Alternate)
- Germany (DE): Ms Ms Anne LOOS (Representative)
- Ireland (IE): Mr Paschal HAYES (Representative)
- Ireland (IE): Mr Micheál O'MAHONY (Alternate)
- Greece (EL): Mr Triantafyllos KOUNTOURIS (Alternate)
- Romania (RO): Mr Marian AVRAM (Representative)
- Spain (ES): Ms Aurora de BLAS CARBONERO (Alternate)
- Commission: Mr Anders JESSEN (Representative)

He welcomed them and encouraged them to use their experience in the field of fisheries control to contribute actively in the work of the AB, especially in the setting up of the annual work programme and the priorities of the agency.

He also commented about the gender balance among the AB representatives and alternates and encouraged MS to increase the % of female representatives:

- AB representatives: men 75 %, women 25 %.
- AB alternates: men 69 %, women 31 %.

The Acting Chair also informed on the observers participating in the AB as experts and highlighted that only members of the AB have the right to vote:

- Observer representing the Advisory Board: Mr Julien Daudu (LDAC)
- Observer from Denmark: Ms Tea Theilgaard

- Observers from the European Commission (EC): Ms Sarah Vitiello-Ferrara and Ms Manuela Musella (expert)

Present	Proxies were given for all agenda items from the EC, Mr Economou to Ms Andersson Pench, Mr Jessen to Mr Donatella and Mr Paardekooper to Ms Arena  The presence list is attached in Annex I.
Quorum	The Chair concluded that the quorum was obtained.

The Acting Chair asked if anyone of the participating AB members had any direct or indirect interests in relation to any matter on the agenda. There were no direct or indirect interests raised by the AB members.

He recalled that there is a decision from the AB to declare the absence of any conflict of interest through a duly completed and signed form, to be provided annually to the EFCA together with the résumés, are subject to publication on the EFCA website and should be updated whenever necessary. To date, not all AB members have met that obligation.

Board members were reminded that the meeting would be recorded and that during the meeting some photographs could be taken for communication purposes. If anyone would prefer not to be photographed or that his/her image is not published on the EFCA website and social media profiles, their choice would be respected.

## **1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The Acting Chair informed the Board of the documents and presentations circulated and presented the agenda for approval:

In the absence of comments, the agenda was adopted (Annex II).

## **2. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD**

The Acting Chair referred to the letter sent by Ms Veronika Veits informing of her decision to resign from the position of Chair of EFCA's Administrative Board. He expressed gratitude to Ms Veits for her commitment and dedication both as member of the AB and later in her function of Chair.

According to Article 2 of the rules of procedure, the AB shall elect a new Chair from the EC representatives. Ms Veits was appointed on 16 October 2020 and her office of Chair terminated on 28 February 2022. The AB has been informed by letter of the EC of 25 February 2022 that Mr Fabrizio Donatella has been proposed as candidate for the position of Chair. In accordance with Article 34 of the EFCA Regulation the AB is invited to vote for the election of a new Chair today.

The representative of the EC presented the application of their candidate. Mr Donatella has been a member of the AB since 2017, he is currently Director in DG MARE, Directorate C, responsible for the Baltic, the North Sea, the Atlantic and the Outermost regions. He also has a long experience as head of unit responsible for control and for the Mediterranean fisheries management. The

representative of the EC believed the lengthy experience and expertise of Mr Donatella makes him the right person to chair the AB.

The AB voted by secret ballot via the voting platform on the proposal to appoint the new Chair for the term from 5 April 2022 until 15 October 2023 (end of term of his predecessor).

The results of the secret ballot were 31 votes: 29 votes in favour; 2 votes abstention.

Mr Fabrizio Donatella was appointed as new Chair from this day, 5 April 2022 until 15 October 2023, or until the end of his membership, if he ceases to be member of the AB earlier.

Proposed action	Election of new Chair
Legal Basis	Article 34 of Regulation (EU) 2019/473 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 March 2019 on the European Fisheries Control Agency and Articles 2 and 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Administrative Board
Decision	Adopted by majority of the members with the right to vote

The new Chair thanked the participants for their trust and looked forward to having a physical AB meeting to have everyone present. He also thanked the Deputy Chair for his work in running today's meeting. The Chair further praised the role played by Ms Veits chairing the AB meetings during the difficult times of the pandemic. He complimented the ED and her team on the documents and presentations prepared for the meeting. Finally, the Chair commented the importance to provide support and guidance to the agency and added that he would listen to the AB members points of view and concerns, which always help enriching the debate.

### **3. INFORMATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

In her introduction, the ED defined EFCA as an agency dedicated to sustainability who lives by living blue in its actions. She also stated that as an institution that promotes the highest common standards for the control, inspection, and surveillance under the Common Fisheries Policy, EFCA staff has been working hard to organise operational coordination activities with Member States with the aim of complying with the rules but also ensuring effective and uniform application.

The ED also explained that 98.6% of the Annual Work Programme was implemented, a programme adopted by the AB in the framework of the Single Programming Document and whose implementation, despite the challenges of COVID 19, was aligned with a coherent budget execution of 99.1% with no open audit findings.

Furthermore, she shared the main points raised on the meeting the day before with Advisory councils, EFCA's eyes and ears on the ground, and which gave a very good snapshot of what is happening.

Next, she presented the development of the Agency focusing on the main recent outcomes. The main highlights are the following:

- EFCA's chartered OPVs carried out 77 inspections, which are very targeted, and found 22 infringements. Having inspectors from different Member States on board the vessels is of high value in driving harmonisation as well as Training.
- All six joint deployment plans in 2021 were implemented as planned. EFCA has been keeping in place measures and protocols due to the COVID 19 pandemic and has been working on

- joint coordination with the national enforcement services to apply rules of the CFP in a uniform and effective manner.
- During 2021, the work programme of the Agency was amended to cover three new projects subsidised by grants in the framework of the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and additional budget was also granted to the agency to provide the necessary operational capacity for assisting the Member States and the EC in monitoring control and surveillance regime harnessed to the CFP, including the issues with the UK becoming a third country. An update was given on the state of play of the different projects.
  - In what concerns EFCA's chartered means, there is an open call for chartering of three offshore fisheries patrol vessels and EFCA is expecting a decision on this as soon as possible. Member States will be informed on the planning in a meeting once we are in the position to know when the contract dates will start. The competition for charter of aerial surveillance have been reopened (flights for PESCAO) to support joint control operations involving Gambia, Guinea, Bissau Guinea and Sierra Leone.
  - In relation to European Coast Guard cooperation, the tripartite working arrangement with EMSA and Frontex was renewed in 2021 and as a key outcome of our chairmanship of the TWA, the EC adopted the Practical Handbook on European cooperation on coastguard functions following a draft prepared by the three Agencies.
  - The Agency has been working with the control expert groups of the main regional bodies on REM monitoring.
  - EFCA's role in cooperation with the UK is particularly focused on the Virtual Coordination Network, which has played a valuable role in providing a situational awareness picture to Member States of the activities impacted by the UK departure. Thus, the Agency has been able to enhance IMS capabilities for vessel and port alarms. The Virtual Coordination Network has acted as a forum for highlighting control challenges, looking for sharing solutions and common understandings, and a route to highlight issues to the EC, and to share information received from the EC.
  - European Court of Auditors has no observation to remark following their visit to the Agency and the Internal Audit Service has no open recommendations. Besides, the discharge 2020 and the adoption by the parliament is foreseen in May 2022 and there has not been any significant issueraised to date.
  - By chance, on International Women's Day the entire crew on the Lundy Sentinel were women. Currently there is a gender balance of 51% in the agency/ A fully inclusive agency needs to be ensured.

The representative of the EC stated that the war in Ukraine was also something that the European EC is working on from two perspectives: first, to try to help Ukraine as much as possible, but also to try to help Member States in other countries with the consequences of the war, paying particular attention to the Black Sea fisheries and to Romania and Bulgaria.

She also said that the EC is looking forward to receiving new information on the procurement procedure from EFCA and hoping EFCA will be able to procure the three vessels and use the money allocated for this aim, especially seeing how much the patrol vessels have contributed to EFCA's functions.

The ED remarked that the representative from Austria expressed the same remark online. She explained that the procurement process is very detailed and all the steps need to be followed correctly. EFCA is waiting for the report from the Evaluation committee. As soon as there is an award decision, the AB will be informed as quickly as possible. She completely agreed it is essential that the agency maintains active patrol vessels.

Cyprus remarked how important it is for the patrol vessel to be active in the Mediterranean. He also asked if there would be an opportunity also for a conventional aircraft to be active in the Mediterranean, as previous experiences were very positive.

The ED replied that, in relation to aerial means, EFCA operates under the procurement of Frontex under a quota of amounts system and informed that, as decided during last meeting with Frontex, the amount available for aircraft and aircraft surveillance will be increased.

Regarding EFCA patrol vessel to be deployed in the Mediterranean Sea, the ED assured it is the intention to dispatch one of the three vessels to the Mediterranean rapidly because the Agency is very conscious that there is a significant requirement for it. In relation to the aerial surveillance, she stressed the positive experience with it. As a result, EFCA receives significant amounts of data from the Mediterranean.

The Head of Unit Coast Guard and International Programmes (HoU 3) added that the Agency is in discussions with Frontex to have additional volume of amounts of budget available for chartering planes. He also said that there are some difficulties due to the reduced number of airplanes available.

The representative of Denmark welcomed the study on weighing process for fisheries products in the Member States. She reported that Denmark has recently implemented a new sampling plan using the outcome for quota management and taking EFCA's recent experience into account. The new guidelines need to be simple and making sure that the regulation is actually implemented. Likewise, it is important that the implementation across Member States will be uniformed, so a level playing field is guaranteed. It would be a very important task for EFCA to coordinate technical discussions among Member States. Denmark looks very much forward to share their best practices and solutions in the working group.

The ED expressed her pleasure to be able to have a role in helping with the best practices. In her opinion, the strength is brought by the experiences and by the interaction of the Member States. She hoped that the Agency will be able to come to a good solution and work with all Member States to make sure a good harmonisation on weighing practices is going forward.

Ireland took Denmark's lead and remarked also upon the weighing project. Firstly, he welcomed the continued expansion of EFCA's coordination work not just at sea but in post landing fishery control, pointing out that there is more and more space for EFCA to provide a coordination role across the Member States. Secondly, he encouraged EFCA to consider a broadening of the project to include the control of weighing, which might be of more assistance to Member States.

The ED considered this reflection very valid and agreed that the weighing of products is the responsibility of the operator.

The AB took note	of the information provided in writing as well as orally, at the meeting
------------------	--

#### **4. ADOPTION OF EFCA's ANNUAL REPORT 2021**

EFCA presented an outline of the Annual Report, stating the comments received by the EC were taken on board.

The representative of the Netherlands considered the report very extensive. He expressed concern about the negative audits received by some MS by the EC, in relation to fishery inspections, as well as the feedback of certain NGOs. He urged the Administrative Board to reflect on how the Agency's direction could be adjusted to reflect these concerns in the future, to improve the coordination of control, at sea but not only.

The ED reminded that the Annual Report refers to the work done in the precedent year. She stressed that the assistance work of the Agency should address the specific needs of the MS, such as with the new project on weighing. The ED considered this was a key role for the Agency, driving for harmonisation and for effective fisheries control, offering assistance in the common issues, and supporting interactions since MS receive the findings individually.

The Head of Unit EU Waters and North Atlantic (HoU 2) emphasised that the EC, the MS and EFCA are all working for the same objective, with the focus in compliance and level playing field. He remarked that there other sources such as the assessment reports of the JDPs, and the control expert groups to provide output-oriented results, rather than the Annual Report. He highlighted the work regarding the compliance evaluation with the provisions of the landing obligation, and reminded the AB members about the ongoing 5-year evaluation, as a good way to analyse the perspectives for the future.

The EC also thanked the AB for raising this issue to ensure the quality of the Agency's services, and requested a clarification on the number of coordinated inspections, regarding the consistency of the reporting methods by different MS.

The ED gave the floor to the HoU 3, who acknowledged an increase in the number of inspections in the Mediterranean, which could partly be explained due to the enhanced cooperation with all MS in that area.

The Irish representative observed that the amount of coordination and coherence between those inspections and ultimately the outcome from those inspections was more important than the number of inspections.

The representative of Denmark made a remark regarding the efficiency of inspections and asked about the involvement of MS in the risk assessment. This delegate considered that specific actions such as that on acoustic deterrent devices in the Baltic Sea were not representative of the fisheries there.

The HoU 2 explained that regional risk assessment workshops were carried out with MS each year to plan the JDP, with nominated national experts to provide tactical advice, and good participation from Denmark. He admitted that predictions cannot always be made more than a year before, as for example due to changes in the pelagic fisheries behaviour, and this is why is important to keep an adaptive strategy in place during the implementation of JDPs.

The Portuguese representative asked whether the radio contacts were considered inspections, and requested more information about the reduction of joint teams in NAFO.

The HoU 2 explained that although the "radio inspections" became an issue with COVID, with restrictions in terms of boardings, this was discussed at the steering group level, and it was concluded that they should not be counted as inspections but as sightings.

On the second part of the question, he signalled that this reduction was mainly due to the limitations on the travel for some MS inspectors. He thanked Portugal and other Member States for their contribution and commitment in providing inspectors to the deployment of EFCA chartered means, key for exchanging experiences and best practices.

Ireland requested clarification regarding the AR graph showing the ratio of suspected infringements by inspection in different JDP areas.

The HoU 2 emphasised that the number of infringements detected must be differentiated from compliance. NAFO is a very good example to understand that tactical risk assessment is only a

limited way to know the compliance level, and this was why it was decided to remove that indicator for the future. He highlighted that zero infringements in LO does not mean perfect compliance, but the established methods to derive a compliance index based on some observed inspections.

EFCA representatives took on board the comments of Portugal and Ireland to distinguish the average of a year compared to a five-year rolling average in the compliance indicator of the AR.

Latvia asked about the differences in the figures of infringements between the total numbers of infringements and inspections with at least one suspected infringement. Unit 2 representative clarified that a single inspection may involve the finding of several suspected infringements.

The ED took note of these remarks and agreed to take all on board and adjust the table so it is clear for everyone.

Ireland added that it would be useful to explain that the cost evaluation is done for the year preceeding the AR.

The Chair thanked all interventions and reminded the importance of the adoption of the AR as a flagship.

Proposed action	Adoption of the Annual Report 2021
Legal Basis	Article 32(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2019/473 Article 48 of AB Decision No 19-W-5 of 29 August 2019 concerning the Financial Regulation of the European Fisheries Control Agency
Decision	Adopted by consensus.



**5. DRAFT SINGLE PROGRAMMING DOCUMENT CONTAINING THE MULTIANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2023-2027 AND ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2023**

HoU 2 reminded that the updates of this document are done every year taking into consideration the EC's opinion and the contributions from EFCA Administrative Board and He reminded EFCA's four areas of intervention and horizontal tasks.

This document is to be adopted in October.

The EC welcomed that EFCA has followed the guidelines also when it comes to key performance indicators and the international relations strategy.

Ireland commented that the interface with the United Kingdom features strongly in the multianual objectives and enquired about his treatment as a third country.

He also asked what was anticipated as regards the accreditation of union inspectors.

Regarding the cooperation with the UK, HoU 2 said that it is going to be an evolving factor. He stressed that EFCA had a very good first start in addressing the operational needs in the context of coordination and coordinated response in the JDPs. He considered about the main objective for EFCA is the compliance with the JDPs.

He also reminded that already last year there were exchanges of UK inspectors on board of EFCA means promoting active cooperation.

Regarding training, HoU 3 stated that it was a point to be included following a discussion last year on the creation of a pool of inspectors in which some members of the AB requested to create a type of logbook that serves to accredit their participation in EFCA training courses or even in missions at sea. Thus, in his opinion, the word "accreditation" means more focus on the expertise, but other words can be suggested.

The ED recalled that the discussions revolved around the training being accredited and not that the Agency, under the Control Regulation, would be moving to the accreditation of inspectors in Member States. Therefore, she proposed to clarify that the aim is to offer accredited training rather than the accreditation of inspectors.

The Chairman reminded the attendees that this document is just for information, The decision will take place in the October meeting, so there is still time to make some adjustments about the focus of EFCA in relation to the founding regulation and the outcome of the five years evaluation.

The delegate from Italy stated that, in order to be consistent with the language used in the draft proposal about the involvement of third countries, the third bullet point in page 79 should be rephrased.

HoU 3 explained that that annex with the international strategy needs to be updated and that the point will be taken into account.

The AB took note	of the information provided in writing as well as orally, at the meeting
------------------	--



## 6. COOPERATION WITH OTHER EU AGENCIES

The Chair gave the floor to EFCA to inform the AB members on the state of play of the cooperation with other EU agencies.

The HoU 3 intervened and reminded the mandate of the Agency to cooperate with other bodies in matters inside the scope of its founding regulation and , the procedure requires to inform the Board about the start of the negotiations with other bodies or agencies and then the result of this discussion has to be presented to the Board to start the formal cooperation.

He also recalled that in the Administrative Board of April last year, the proposal of the Executive Director to enter in a discussion for administrative cooperation with EUSPA (European Union Agency for the Space Programme), EU SatCen (European Union Satellite Centre) and ESA (European Space Agency) was endorsed. Following this authorisation, EFCA has established contact points and has initiated the process of discussion for the administrative cooperation with the three agencies:

- In the case of EUSPA, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been agreed, presented to the AB by written procedure and accepted. Its signature is foreseen on 3 May.
- In the case of EU SatCen, the process is in earlier stages: a meeting was held last week where both agencies have advanced in the discussion of the administrative test. A proposal is expected by September/October for the adoption at the AB level.
- In the case of ESA, the agencies have exchanged points of contact for setting the scene for bilateral cooperation.

Additionally, he explained, EFCA is now in the initial phase of discussion with the European Environmental Agency (EEA), looking for synergies. Mutual interest has been identified in two areas: the exchange of knowledge and the operational capacities, where the agency can benefit from the operations at sea not limited to fisheries control, but also linked to other multipurpose operations. The AB is asked for authorisation to enter into discussions with the EEA to prepare an administrative agreement that afterwards will be presented to the AB for endorsement, as it was the case with the EUSPA.

Spain shared the reflection that not only the environment and Green Deal have great importance, but also the socio-economic aspect of the fisheries sector.

The ED thanked the contribution and commented then each Advisory Council has a significant number of members that come from the fishery sector as well as from the NGOs and hearing those voices through the Advisory Councils is very important to EFCA.

The EC expressed that the benefit of the cooperation should be mutual for the two agencies and pointed out that such inter-agency cooperation with EEA shall not divert EFCA from its main tasks and deliverables, EFCA's core business remaining fisheries control. The HoU 3 replied that both Agencies are still in exploratory discussions. In his opinion, one important point would be to have a proper view of the contribution of the fisheries policy to the environmental policy, since in fact environment protection is built from contributions from each of the sectors. Therefore, identifying possible actions could be an added value for the Green Deal. As a possible area of interest in this sense, he pointed out the control activities EFCA is implementing in protected areas and fisheries restricted areas. Another example was having means in fishing areas and cooperate with Member States in retrieving lost gears, examining the content of plastics in the water.

The ED intervened and said that the question would be what the benefit for EFCA and where are the savings for Agency. This is one of the things the preliminary discussions is exploring. She

continued explaining that the reports the EEA is producing show a need for a stronger basis on the fisheries side.

Italy supported the start of this preliminary discussion. However, taking also into account the current situation in which the optimisation of the resources would be an asset, the main goal of EFCA should remain.

The ED confirmed that in EFCA's relationships fisheries control is always at the forefront of what the agency does and it will continue to be.

The Netherlands also requested EFCA to keep focus on fisheries control. Portugal supported also this viewpoint and reminded that the the action plan on the development of the CFP by the Commission has to be taken into account.

The AB took note	of the information provided in writing as well as orally, at the meeting
------------------	--

## 7. **ANTI-FRAUD STRATEGY**

The Head of Unit Resources and IT (HoU 1) presented the third anti-fraud strategy of EFCA. He made clear that the decision presented was in line with the anti-fraud strategy of EFCA adopted by the Board in previous years. EFCA maintained its strategy on an annual risk assessment analysis, which showed that the risk for fraud at EFCA remained low. Nonetheless, in the previous strategy risk was mitigated since it was low but not zero.

He summed up the main actions:

- promotion of the highest level of integrity of EFCA staff;
- up to date of all the procedures for reporting and handling potential fraud cases;
- high level of budget control;
- enhancement of cybersecurity.

Procedures in place for mitigating the low risk were adequate.

The action plan was updated to take into account what had been implemented in the past three years and included a new element, the cyber warfare fight. The HoU1 stated that EFCA had been under attack and had been in contact with the EC and its responsible entity for coordination of the fight against cyber warfare called CERT-EU. Actions to mitigate the latter were adopted, which included raising awareness among the staff.

The HoU1 warned the Board of the emergence of a future cybersecurity regulation developed by the EC for and to be applied in all EU bodies. He raised the fact that this will have a significant impact on the measures and structures EFCA will be obliged to put in place in order to comply with it.

As a final note, it was concluded that there had been no cases of successful fraud reported since the agency was created.

There were no comments and the Decision was adopted by consensus.

Proposed action	Adoption of the EFCA Anti-fraud strategy 2022-2024
-----------------	--

Legal Basis	Article 32(2)(h) of Regulation (EU) 2019/473
Decision	Adopted by consensus

## 8. STAFF REGULATION IMPLEMENTING RULES

The HoU 1 explained that the first set of implementing rules of the Staff Regulation was presented to the Board for adoption and the other for information.

The set of rules for administrative inquiries and disciplinary proceedings was based on a model decision developed jointly by the EC and the agencies. This model implements and completes the measures that were already in place, and it gives a clearer way of working. Nonetheless, no such cases had been reported since the agency was created.

The new decision on working time and hybrid working recently adopted by the EC could present difficulties for EFCA staff work modalities, in particular for allowing for sea-going staff to recuperate all surplus time worked within a monthly period. EFCA may propose to ask for a derogation in this respect. Derogation modalities should be decided on the basis of the EC decision. It was concluded that, if necessary, the Board would adopt a written decision requesting formally the derogation from the referred EC decision, in the coming months.

Finally, the HoU1 informed the Board about the upcoming EC rules on prevention of harassment and on absences as a result of sickness and accident. EFCA will be expected to either apply them by analogy or to follow the same process for applying agency model rules or other derogation.

The decision was adopted by consensus and the Board took note of the information on the advanced warning for the other decisions.

Proposed action	Adoption of the Staff Regulation Implementing Rules: - administrative inquiries and disciplinary proceedings
Legal Basis	Articles 28 and 32(2)(h) of Regulation (EU) 2019/473
Decision	Adopted by consensus

## 9. FIVE-YEAR INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF EFCA: STATE OF PLAY

The Accounting Officer (AccO) presented the overview of the actions carried out since the last AB meeting:

- ✓ Signature of the contract with the external evaluator on 17 November 2021
- ✓ Kick-off meeting and start of the inception phase: 26 November 2021
- ✓ Inception report: 21 December 2021
- ✓ Preparation of stakeholder feedback and piloting: March 2022
- ✓ Launch of online survey, followed by around 50 in-depth interviews by representatives of the main stakeholder groups and launching of case studies: April 2022
- ✓ Interim report including the emergent results from the stakeholders' feedback should be available by mid-May 2022.

As regards the online survey, it is composed of two parts:

- ✓ Individual invitations will be sent with the link to the survey to the AB, Advisory Board members, relevant experts/WG members, training participants, RFMOs, other agencies, industry and any other relevant distribution lists EFCA may hold.
- ✓ The link to the survey will be published on the website and on social media. In this sense, the AccO greatly encouraged the AB members to promote in their national organisations the importance of the survey. He stressed that the survey was open to anyone that has an interest in EFCA or has participated in any activity organised by the agency.

The timeline and main deliverables were displayed. Following the release of the interim report, the evaluator will analyse the results of the survey to come up after the Summer with a draft final report. The AB will be requested to give an opinion on the report; the AccO stressed the importance of having a quick feedback to be able to present the final report during a seminar to be held in the vicinity of the next AB meeting in October 2022. He further highlighted that the survey is an opportunity for the answerers to mark their opinion where things should be improved. Based on the evaluation findings, the AB members will have the opportunity to come up with a set of recommendations to the EC to have changes in the agency's working practices.

The Chair emphasised the importance of having everybody actively involved in providing observations. He stated that the comments put forward earlier in the meeting should be reflected in the survey and urged the AB members to provide their contribution.

The ED pointed out that the voice of the AB members was very important and, since the next evaluation will be in five years' time, they should take full advantage of this opportunity.

The EC added that DG MARE supports the exercise and would spread the word to have a good level of feedback and looked forward to a fruitful discussion.

The AB took note	of the information provided in writing as well as orally, at the meeting
------------------	--

## 10. AOB

The Chair suggested the dates for the next meeting in October, having the AB meeting, after the Advisory Board meeting and the External evaluation seminar.

He asked AB members to convey their opinion on the format of the meeting. He indicated that he would favour physical presence for this important AB meeting.

Romania expressed their preference to have a physical meeting, depending on the conditions of the pandemic, and that they were open to any other solution.

Denmark said they would appreciate one meeting physically & another virtually, to avoid long travel, but allowing to have physical meetings once in a while.

Germany was also in favour of hybrid meetings, because the COVID situation might be different in the Member States, so it allows everyone to take a decision.

Cyprus agreed with Denmark, expressing preference for one meeting, virtually and one physical. For the next meeting, due to the Seminar, they would favour a physical meeting. He would rather prefer a either a virtual or a physical meeting, instead of a hybrid.

The ED agreed that this year it would make more sense to have the October meetings physically presential because of the five-year external evaluation.

Italy expressed their flexibility, but preference for the AB to meet physically at least twice a year if possible.

Ireland supported all arguments both ways. He stressed that the five-year review involves an effort to translate the external report into set of recommendations, so it would benefit from physical presence.

The Chair commented that in the chat Austria expressed her preference for going back into physical meetings. He concluded that presential would be the preferred option for October, because of the Evaluation and the Advisory Board. Depending of the evolution of the situation, he hoped to have a meeting where interaction is indeed facilitated by the physical presence.



## ANNEX I

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS TO THE ONLINE MEETING OF THE  
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE EFCA  
VIGO, 5<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2022**

Members	Alternates
(BE) Belgium: Mr Geert DEVOGEL	-
(BG) Bulgaria: Mr Hristo PANAYOTOV	Mr Dobrin LECHEV
(CZ) Czech Rep.: -	Mr Jakub MORICKY
(DK) Denmark: Ms Nanna MØLLER	-
(DE) Germany: Ms Anne LOOS	-
(EE) Estonia: Mr Indrek ULLA	-
(IE) Ireland: Mr Paschal HAYES	Mr Micheal O'MAHONY
(EL) Greece: Ms Theoni PAPADOPOULU	Mr Triantafyllos KOUNTOURIS
(ES) Spain: -	Ms Aurora DE BLAS
(FR) France: -	Ms Bérengère LORANS
(HR) Croatia: -	Ms Ivana FURAC
(IT) Italy: Mr Ricardo RIGILLO	Mr Lorenzo MAGNOLO
(CY) Cyprus: Mr Yiannos KYRIACOU	-
(LV) Latvia: Mr Miks VEINBERGS	-
(LT) Lithuania: -	Mr Tomas KAZLAUSKAS
(LU) Luxembourg: Mr Pierre TREINEN	-
(HU) Hungary: Mr Peter LENGYEL	-
(MT) Malta: Mr Bjorn CALLUS	-
(NL) Netherlands: Ms Carian POSTHUMUS MEIJES	Mr Gerrit Albertus LAM
(AT) Austria: Ms Margareta STUBENRAUCH	-
(PL) Poland: Ms Marta Rabczynska-Kapcinska	Mr Stanislaw KASPEREK
(PT) Portugal: -	Mr Carlos FERREIRA
(RO) Romania: -	Ms Ancuta KAZIMIROVICZ
(SL) Slovenia: Mr Slavko SSKO	-
(SK) Slovakia: Mr Jan SUKOVSKY	-
(FI) Finland: Mr Harri KUKKA	-
(SE) Sweden: Mr Niclas TÖRNELL	-
<u>European Commission (EC):</u>	
-	-
-	-
-	-
Mr Fabrizio DONATELLA <sup>1</sup>	-
Ms Lena ANDERSSON PENCH <sup>2</sup>	-
Ms Francesca ARENA <sup>3</sup>	-
<u>Advisory Board representative:</u>	
Mr Julien DAUDU (LD AC)	
<u>Observers:</u>	
Ms Sarah R. VITIELLO-FERRARA (EC)	
Ms Manuela MUSELLA (EC)	
Ms Tea Theilgaard (DK)	

<sup>1</sup> Proxy from EC (AJ) for all items

<sup>2</sup> Proxy from EC (CE) for all items

<sup>3</sup> Proxy from EC (JP) for all items

EFCA:

**Office of the Executive Director**

Dr Susan STEELE (Executive Director)

Mr Marcel DEDIC (Accounting Officer)

Ms Patricia SÁNCHEZ (Head of Sector Policy and Communication)

Mr Paulo CASTRO (Internal Control Coordinator)

Ms Gregoria CUESTA (Assistant to the ED)

Ms Marta RAMILA (Assistant Communication Officer and Deputy DPO)

Ms Maria CORONADO (Executive Assistant Policy and Communication)

Ms Federica LIGGIERI (Trainee Policy and Communication)

Ms Eva MADARIAGA (Administrative Assistant Accountancy)

**Unit Resources and IT (Unit 1)**

Mr Niall MCHALE (Head of Unit)

Ms Donianzu MURGIONDO (Head of Sector Finance and Procurement)

Ms Rieke ARNDT (Head of Sector - HR and Legal)

Mr Daniel CABALEIRO (Head of Sector ICT)

**Unit EU Waters and North Atlantic (Unit 2)**

Mr Mario LOPES SANTOS (Head of Unit)

Ms Cristina MORGADO (Deputy Head of Unit)

Mr Miguel NUEVO (Head of Sector - JDPs and Regional Cooperation)

Mr Piotr STACHOWIAK (Head of Sector - Operations in EU Waters and North Atlantic)

**Unit Coast Guard and International Programmes (Unit 3)**

Mr Pedro GALACHE (Head of Unit)

Mr Vytautas LUKAS (Deputy Head of Unit)

Mr Rafael DUARTE (Head of Sector - Cooperation)

Ms Clara FERNANDEZ (Head of Sector - JDPs Mediterranean and Black sea)

Mr Alexandre KEMPF (Head of Sector - Training and Capacity Building)

Ms Marietta ASIK (Head of Sector - Chartering of means)





ANNEX II



**Agenda of the 38th meeting of the Administrative Board of the EFCA**

**on 5 April 2022**

**09h30 – 13h00  
15h00 – 17h00**

(D=decision; I=Information)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Approval of the draft agenda   | D |
| 2. Election of the Chair  | D |
| 3. Information from the Executive Director  | I |
| 4. Adoption of EFCA's Annual Report 2021  | D |
| 5. Draft Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2023-2027 and Annual work programme for 2023 | I |
| Lunch   |   |
| 6. Cooperation with other EU agencies   | I |
| 7. Anti-fraud Strategy  | D |
| 8. Staff Regulation implementing rules  | D |
| 9. Five-Year Independent External Evaluation of EFCA: state of play   | I |
| 10. AOB (next meetings)   |   |