



Vigo, 14 March 2018

**MINUTES OF THE 30TH MEETING OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
VIGO – 14 MARCH 2018**

0. ATTENDANCE

The Chair, Mr Reinhard Priebe, opened the meeting at 08h39 by welcoming the Administrative Board (AB) members and the Advisory Board representative present at the meeting. It was reminded that only the AB members had the right to vote, and the appointment of the following representatives was announced:

- **Denmark:**
Representative: Ms Mariya Krestyanska
- **Germany:**
Representative: Ms Melanie Seibert
Alternate: Mr Hermann Pott
- **Latvia:**
Alternate: Ms Evija Smite
- **Slovakia:**
Alternate: Mr Peter Juhász

The Chair gave the floor to the newly appointed members present in the meeting room to briefly introduce themselves.

The Chair informed that two observers, Ms Sarah Rosaria Vitiello, from the European Commission (EC) and Ms Nicoletta de Virgillo, from Italy, were participating to the AB meeting as experts without voting right.

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

The Chair reminded the participants that it was a Decision of the AB to declare the absence of conflict of interest through a duly filled and signed form, to be provided annually to the European Fisheries Controls Agency (EFCA) and which is subject to publication on the website of the Agency; he urged those AB members that had not met that obligation, closely monitored by the European Parliament as part of the discharge procedure, to do so without delay.

Finally, AB members were reminded that the meeting would be recorded and that during the meeting some photographs could be taken for communication, stating that if anyone would prefer not to be

European Fisheries Control Agency

Email efca@efca.europa.eu – Tel: +34 986 12 06 10 – Fax: +34 886 12 52 37

Address: Edificio Odriozola, Avenida García Barbón 4, E-36201 Vigo – Spain

Postal Address: EFCA - Apartado de Correos 771 - E-36200 Vigo – Spain

✓

photographed or his/her image not to be published on the EFCA website and social media profiles, his/her choice would be respected.

Present	Proxies were given for all agenda items from RO to BG, from EL to CY, from AT to SK and, within the EC Delegation, from Ms Veits to Ms Arena and from Mr Depypere to Mr Verborgh. The presence list is attached in Annex I.
Quorum	The Chair concluded that the 2/3 quorum was obtained (31 votes out of 34).

1. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT AGENDA

The Chair asked the AB members if they had any comment on the agenda. Following an EFCA request, it was agreed to bring forward the agenda point 10, which would be dealt with after agenda point 4 in order to allow adequate time to ensure a thorough discussion.

There were no additional comments on the agenda and it was adopted (Annex II).

The minutes are presented in accordance with the items' order as they were dealt with during the meeting.

2. INFORMATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The AB members were informed about the main issues that had taken place and were ongoing since the last ordinary AB meeting on 18 October 2017. *Inter alia*, the Executive Director (ED) informed the AB about the following:

- ❖ Advisory Board meeting held on 23 February 2018. The main topics discussed during the meeting were the landing obligation (LO), the international dimension, the contribution of EFCA to improve control and the fight against IUU and the new Advisory Councils participation (Market and Aquaculture).
- ❖ EFCA will deploy a pilot project in the Black Sea for the control of the turbot fisheries. The Commission, within the framework of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), aims to improve cooperation in the Black Sea. Through the pilot project EFCA intends to cooperate with the third countries involved in the fisheries area to improve compliance and fight against IUU. For the time being EFCA has been cooperating with Ukraine, Turkey, Georgia, Romania and Bulgaria. Several meetings have been scheduled, on 20-21 March in Ankara, on 11-12 April a training session in Constanta and on 29-30 May in Rome.
- ❖ Annual event of EMSA¹-EFCA-Frontex² in the context of the coast guard initiative on 11 and 12 April. The event is organised by EFCA, which is chairing the Steering Committee of the Tripartite Working Arrangement until mid-April 2018. An invitation has been sent to the AB members of the three agencies, the EC (DGs MARE, HOME and MOVE), the relevant European Parliament (EP) Committees, the Presidency of the Council, the German Chairmanship of the European Coast Guard Functions Forum and the French Presidency of the Mediterranean Coast Guard Functions Forum. At the request of the latter, EFCA will organise a workshop on 13 April in Vigo in advance of the Annual Conference scheduled in Marseille on 27-28 June 2018.

¹ European Maritime Safety Agency.

² European Border and Coast Guard Agency.

The objectives of the annual event are:

- raising awareness of the functions of the agencies;
- reporting on ongoing and completed joint activities of the agencies;
- obtaining stakeholders' feedback on the joint activities;
- identification of future joint activities.

- ❖ Budget. The execution of the budget in 2017 has been good. Further details would be provided under item 3 of the agenda, Annual Report 2017.
- ❖ Since the last AB meeting in October 2017 several communication activities have been carried out. Three press releases have been issued, on the deployment of the vessel in the Adriatic Sea, on the chartering of the new fisheries patrol vessel and on the pilot project in the Black Sea. Contacts with Galician and local authorities have taken place.
- ❖ The ED mentioned the list of meetings that EFCA attended with stakeholders and institutional partners.
- ❖ Procurement. A new threshold for open calls for tender of €144 000 has entered into force on 1 January 2018. The AB was updated on the main procurement projects in progress.
- ❖ European Court of Auditors. From 5 to 9 March EFCA has been audited for the 2017 Annual Accounts by an external audit firm. The visit of the Court of Auditors is scheduled from 19 to 23 March 2018.
- ❖ Following the Internal Audit Service (IAS) audit on IT governance and project management activities, five important recommendations have been issued. For each recommendation EFCA has drafted a comprehensive action plan and is doing a close follow-up.

The IAS has released a certificate stating that, in line with the international Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, the Internal Auditor confirms the organisational independence of the internal audit activity to the Administrative Board.

- ❖ European Parliament. The discharge for the financial year 2016 is ongoing; its adoption is on the draft agenda of the EP Plenary meeting in April 2018.
- ❖ Service Level Agreements (SLAs) were signed last year with EMSA and Frontex. EFCA is currently working on a new SLA with EMSA dedicated to accounting officer services. The aim is for the two agencies to support each other when one Accounting Officer is not available.
- ❖ Communication Policy. The Communication assistant underlined the following aspects:
 - The Communication Strategy Plan ensures that EFCA activities are well known by the target audiences and stakeholders.
 - The collaboration with both Frontex and EMSA, and the active participation of EFCA in multipurpose operations with those agencies, will have its reflection in the communication work.
 - This year, beyond the EU borders, the innovative contributions of the Agency will become even more apparent with the implementation of the cooperation project "PESCAO". Other main areas that will have its reflection on the communication work are the follow-up actions to the pilot project for coordinating control activities in the Mediterranean in the context of GFCM and the cooperation in the Black Sea.
 - To reach its public, the communication tools that the Agency is managing at the moment are the website and the two regular publications (programming document and annual report). Other forms of external communication consist of brochures for the general public or the media and press releases, as well as press conferences. The EFCA maintains a presence on social media channels.
 - The Agency participates in events organised under the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) and also organises and hosts events for the local public, stakeholders, etc. with the idea to bring the European Union closer to its citizens.

- The Agency will work together with the EC services in all aspects under the CFP.
- Special attention is placed on the interagency cooperation, under the Heads of Communication and Information Network (HCIN).
- EFCA staff being a key actor for EFCA, this year for the first time a specific Internal Communication Strategy will be developed.

- ❖ EFCA internal organisation. Following the resignation of a Head of Unit in the beginning of 2018, the organisation has been readjusted to three units since 5 February 2018 (the detailed organisational chart of EFCA was presented on the screen). The ED reminded the AB, that in accordance with Art. 29 of the founding regulation of EFCA, the Agency is compelled to adapt the organisation to the requirements of the work programme in order to make the best use of the resources to deliver the work. The ED conveyed that gender balance has improved since 2017 with the recruitment of several female staff and that the Agency is an equal opportunity employer.

The Chair opened the floor for comments.

The representative of the EC stressed the importance of the activities that are being carried out with the patrol vessel of EFCA. She highlighted that the operations performed this year in the Black Sea were as valuable as those carried out in 2017 in the Straits of Sicily. She pointed out that it was an important signal the EU would be giving at international level; the project will contribute to the fight against IUU fishing.

As regards the organisational chart the representative of the EC asked if it could be uploaded on the website of EFCA to be in line with the communication and transparency policies.

The representative of NL mentioned that it was important to present the Agency to the outside world, and that it was also noteworthy to look at the annual report from a communication point of view.

On information for the general public, the representative of NL pointed out that 2 videos were planned, one on coast guard cooperation and a second one on PESCAO, but he missed a video on the work of the JDPs, this being the core business of EFCA. He underlined the importance of addressing communication on the JDP activities.

The representative of ES stressed the need to strengthen coordination and collaboration, namely on the charter of means and the deployment of EFCA assets in the water under jurisdiction of ES.

The representative of BG expressed a positive opinion on the involvement of EFCA in the Black Sea and hoped for good results of the pilot project.

On communication, the ED noted that the annual reports are uploaded on the website of EFCA; a press release is issued after each AB meeting and a press conference is held the day after each AB meeting. He stated that the annual report is an important tool addressed not only to the AB but also to the European Institutions and general public. With reference to the videos, the ED mentioned that every day communication is mainly focused on the JDPs. Moreover, a new corporate video focused on JDPs was recently issued. He pointed out that new activities to be delivered in 2018, such as the annual event in the context of the coast guard initiative, the coastguard forum and PESCAO, would need a specific effort.

On the issue raised by ES, the ED stated that EFCA has deployed the Lundy Sentinel in the Mediterranean in close cooperation with Spain. There were Spanish inspectors on board and the Guardia Civil in the framework of Indalo. Permanent contact and sharing of information was maintained between EFCA MOC and Spanish operations centres. The intention was to carry out multipurpose operations and contribute to the Mediterranean JDP. The vessel has been recorded into the JDP framework and was notified as an asset.

With reference to the organisational chart, the ED mentioned that the updated version would be uploaded on the website.

The Chair highlighted the comments raised by the representative of NL on the annual report and invited the AB to reflect on how the annual report could be best used in terms of good communication.

There were no further comments and the Chair closed the item.

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

3. ANNUAL REPORT (AR) 2017

The ED presented the latest update on the draft AR 2017, where the amendments suggested by the EC had been taken on board. The importance of the AR, as an instrument for the discharge and to demonstrate that the taxpayer money was used in line with the rules and in the best interest of the Union, was underlined. The ED noted that the estimated cost of the Agency per EU citizen was €0.03. He added that an unqualified opinion had been issued by the European Court of Auditors for the accounts of 2016.

The ED gave the floor to the Head of Unit Resources and IT (HoU 1), who highlighted the challenge faced by the Agency, compared with previous years, to maintain the level of budget implementation at 99% with an Annual work programme of over €17 million in 2017; he reminded the benchmark of 95% set by DG BUDG.

Particular attention was drawn to the increase in the operational budget; the budget breakdown by activity and the methodology for distributing the cost were presented to the AB.

A reflection on the detailed data on gender balance of staff was presented, showing a majority of female staff in administration and male staff in the operational area; the HoU 1 mentioned that following the recent staff increase in 2017 the Agency attained the basic benchmark set by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) of 60 % 40 %, even though more progress is still to be made in different staff categories.

The Head of Unit EU Waters and North Atlantic (HoU 2) provided a snapshot of the ongoing JDPs and Operational Plan by area, showing a stable trend in terms of number of both inspections and suspected infringements; the vast majority of infringements detected were related to misrecording in the reporting of catches, followed by illegal gears.

References were made to the concept of year round JDPs and to the control effort being developed, remarking that the failure to comply with the landing obligation is still perceived as a high risk. The specific actions to be carried out in the framework of the risk assessment exercise were outlined.

The Head of Unit Programmes and Assistance (HoU 3) referred to the main highlights on assistance and expertise, the regional training and the promotion of the use of the e-learning platform, and the request received from the EC to support the cooperation with third countries.

Regarding the Mediterranean, focus was placed on the activities carried out in the context of MedFish4Ever Declaration, particularly those linked to the implementation of the pilot project in the Straits of Sicily, developed from March to September 2017. This project, comprising common implementing rules, training and exchange of information, proved the need for a joint scheme that was subsequently adopted.

The HoU 3 summarised the activities linked to the start of the implementation of the EU coast guard concept, such as the establishment of the first annual objectives in the framework of the Tripartite Working Arrangement with EMSA and Frontex, that allowed the sharing of information in their systems, as well as the identification of common training needs in 2017. He also pointed out that the

Service Level Agreement (SLA) for joint chartering of aerial and sea assets benefited the Agency in its mission to support Member States (MS).

The Chair opened the floor to comments.

The representative of ES mentioned that the adaptation of the MS to the new cross-sectorial framework required special coordination and an effort to streamline the approach. She emphasised that the administrative work to fulfil the reporting obligation of the JDPs could become overwhelming with the same amount of personnel and budget, noting an increase in the number of meetings. She suggested to set up a group of MS to cope with the new situation.

With reference to the activity of the chartered vessel Lundy Sentinel, the representative of ES underlined the need for a coordinated approach with MS. In this context, she suggested that EFCA could also charter national assets in the future.

Lastly, the representative of ES requested additional information on the use of drones, and expressed disagreement about the last haul as a tool to analyse the risk.

The representative of IE thanked EFCA for the presentations, affirming that the AR 2017 enhanced his confidence on the good use of the limited resources and the full engagement of the Agency.

On gender balance statistics, the representative of IE noted that they had similar issues in the national administration, trying to achieve an appropriate gender balance with the particularities of the technical fisheries area, and referred to the role of the EU education programmes.

With regard to the statistics presented on the detection of non-compliance, the representative of IE expressed concern about the high rate of misreporting offences. He stated that these represent a serious problem taking into account the remote sensing systems and the electronic reporting put in place by MS. A suggestion was put forward on foreseeing limitations within the legal framework in the MS to adapt to this new reporting era. He also called for the creation of a portal where learning could be offered to the MS or the EC for the benefit of the implementation of the policy.

On the EFCA chartered vessel Lundy Sentinel, the representative of IE considered that the investment done should bring tangible benefits and attributed a double value to EFCA having that contract:

- as a flag-bearer, the message of the improvement of compliance and a level playing field is transmitted in the MS waters, as well as the other principles the Agency is committed to;
- allows national authorities to focus on their work in a different way.

The representative of IE highlighted that the work of the Agency is starting a new era where partnership with Agencies is a keystone within the aims of the JDPs and other programmes becoming more ambitious. The effort would require to develop and improve the structures with MS to keep them fit for purpose.

The representative of IE concluded by referring to the EU Regulations on data management and data exchange as one of the major future challenges, and stated that each individual MS must work with the Agency to ensure good practise and compliance.

The representative of NL appreciated the effort of the Agency to produce the AR, and reflected on its importance from the point of view of communication to the outside world, including all the institutions and different stakeholders of the Agency. He considered the executive summary of the AR an improvement and acknowledged the limitations deriving from the structure of the programming document. However, he requested to consider an AR with shorter information and annexes and suggested differentiating internal and external communication. Furthermore, the representative of NL proposed to define specific KPI's for coast guard cooperation, to make the added value of that activity clearer to the external reader.

The representative of DE raised three specific questions on the AR:

- required clarification regarding a key performance indicator on the attendance of regional trainings, page 24;
- asked for additional information on the request to EMSA about operational use of drones mentioned, page 52;
- asked whether a summary on the outcomes of workshops of inspectors with NAFO on discarding cited of the draft AR would be available, page 58.

The representative of CY congratulated EFCA for the work done through the 2017 Annual work programme, agreeing with IE that this is a new era for the Agency. He described as impressive the efficiency of EFCA when dealing with the new tasks and the pilot projects. He considered that the effectiveness of the budget increase would certainly be reflected in the outcomes of JDPs over the coming year, which should help MS to tackle their tasks and budget, multiplying its effect. Regarding the cooperation with the other EU maritime agencies, the representative of CY stressed the important challenge of keeping the focus on fisheries control.

The growing collaboration with neighbours of third countries, especially in the pilot project in the Straits of Sicily in 2017, was underlined by the delegate from CY, who declared it of great interest and worth further continuation in other areas. He emphasised the positive performance of EFCA and requested the continuation of the activity. He stated that it had increased transparency and open discussion on competency issues, and highlighted the idea of relevant guidelines being developed.

The representative of CY also suggested to make available the new organisational chart of EFCA on the website for the general public to better understand the current structure of EFCA following the reorganisation.

The representative of IT referred to the pilot project within the framework of the GFCM as very important and thanked EFCA staff and the ED for the information provided in the AR. As "food for thought", he commented that the fact that each MS administration has different scope and competencies could have led to certain inconsistencies, affecting the homogeneity of the figures in some cases.

The representative of the EC congratulated EFCA for the comprehensive and thorough AR, which was produced with a shorter deadline than usual due to the rescheduling of the meeting. She pointed out that amending the AR to be more a communication tool addressed to the public would require launching a reflection for the future. She indicated that the AR 2017 was based on the Programming Document 2017, which was structured along 15 objectives; some of the objectives partially overlap, therefore the information is spread in the AR, e.g. the JDPs and the actions related to the implementation of the LO were quoted as activities that correspond to several objectives, hindering the perception of their general outcomes.

The representative of the EC proposed to consider a streamlined future programming document with 4-5 strategic objectives. She suggested to include a specific technical part dedicated to the JDPs and to have a separate report to be distributed to the public with key messages.

The representative of DE suggested to make available on the website of EFCA the reports of the meetings and workshops organised, with the exception of confidential documents.

The Chair gave the floor to the ED, who welcomed the feedback and suggestions provided by the AB representatives.

The ED reminded the AB that the AR must strictly reflect the approved programming document and underlined that a significant change in the AR should be preceded by a significant change in the corresponding programming document. In that regard, he considered that the overall guidelines from the EC on the Consolidated Annual Activity Report leave the Agency room to reduce the number of objectives and to adapt the reporting on the JDPs. However, the ED reminded that, in order to ensure traceability, consistency should be maintained in line with the recommendations of the Internal Audit Service in 2014-2015, being the next auditing procedure of the Agency in 2020-2021. The ED

highlighted that the Agency should keep its objectives beyond communicating, so as to provide the budgetary authorities and the ECA with the assurance of an appropriate use of resources.

The Chair suggested to add a paragraph in the executive summary clarifying that the AR served several purposes while fulfilling the Agency's legal obligations, and to adjust the table of contents, or the executive summary to explain how the report reflects the 15 objectives embedded in the programming document.

With reference to the External evaluation section in the draft AR, page 101, the Chair pointed out that the table presenting the state of play on the AB's recommendations was too detailed and could give the impression that everything had been already implemented. As an alternative he suggested to move it to an annex, to delete it or to use some footnotes. He suggested including a sentence indicating that the implementation of AB's recommendations would be a common agenda point to be followed up in the AB meetings.

The representative of NL supported the suggestion of the Chair on the External evaluation section and appreciated the inclusion of a clarification stating that the structure of the AR is based on the programming document. He proposed to have two reports in the future, a more detailed report that would correspond to the programming document and another one for the outside world.

The ED underlined the interest of EFCA to meet the different needs of the MS and the EC. On the External evaluation section, he reminded the AB that it was agreed that the Agency should provide data on the state of play of the recommendations of the Five-year independent external evaluation at the end of 2017. He noted that the proposal could be taken on board as long as no further objections were expressed by the AB members demanding the inclusion of this important information in the next AR.

With reference to the different questions posed by the representative of ES, the ED made the following remarks:

- on the Lundy Sentinel: it was deployed in the Mediterranean in close cooperation with Spain, to carry out multi-purpose operations with Frontex and to contribute to the objectives of the Mediterranean JDP as a notified asset in the JDP framework;
- on the use of assets from the Member States: for the time being this option of reimbursing running costs of Member States is not provided for in the founding regulation of EFCA;
- on the number of meetings: these are mostly linked to the joint deployment activity; other categories are those not directly organised by EFCA, where the Agency's role is supporting MS. The ED welcomed the possibility to simplify the organisation of meetings managed by EFCA, e.g. merging steering groups with regional control expert groups, when possible;
- on the use of drones: the project, currently carried out by EMSA, is on standby while some legal questions are solved; the involvement and interest of EFCA on drones was underlined;
- on the last haul: it is part of a process which contributes to understanding fishing patterns and observing a possible discard pattern by type of activities to carry out more complete inspections.

The ED fully agreed with the appreciation of IE on the compliance situation. He expressed high concern on the proportion of suspected infringements related to misrecording and technical measures. In that context, he pointed out that the deployment of the patrol vessel of EFCA in the EU waters with inspectors from different MS should improve the standardisation of inspections and contribute to a level playing field. He reminded the EP report published in 2017 on the need of harmonisation.

In relation to the inspection report situation, the ED highlighted its importance for EFCA as they way of gathering nearly real time information of inspection. He recalled that the first application was provided in 2016 and work is in progress for encompassing additional services and moving to a new structure of the system.

Referring to the framework of the EUCG (European Union Coast Guard) and Frontex, the ED declared that a change in the management process has been completed with a positive result for the fishing community, considering the increased possibilities in terms of marine surveillance that has multiplied by ten the information level due to this cooperation (sightings, satellites, etc.). He concluded that, besides being resource saving, the sharing of this data is providing state-of-the-art solutions to improve fisheries control.

The Chair summed up the discussions and proposals from the delegates, recalling the recurrent remarks over the years on the structure of the report. He pointed out the divergent views and expectations, from a less detailed report that is readable to the public, to the inclusion of more technical details. He reassured the AB that all the points raised would be taken into consideration and recorded in the minutes, although not all of them could be immediately dealt with, and gave the floor to the ED to specify the amendments to the draft text of the AR 2017.

The ED showed on the screen the changes mirrored in the draft AR 2017:

- in the table of contents, page 3: references by number of objective were added;
- in the executive summary, pages 6 to 8:
 - addition of a sentence mentioning that the AR is based on the programming document;
 - addition of a sentence mentioning to whom the report is addressed;
- the foot notes on page 12: cross-references to the main text were added.
- the result of the performance indicators on the attendance of regional trainings was corrected, page 24;
- in the External evaluation section, pages 99 to 101:
 - deletion of the table detailing the state of play by 31 December 2017 on the AB's recommendations following the Five-year independent external evaluation of EFCA;
 - inclusion of a sentence indicating that the implementation of the AB's recommendations will be a common agenda point to be followed up in the AB meetings.

There were no further comments and the AR 2017 was adopted by consensus.

Proposed action	Adoption of the Annual Report 2017, including the analysis and assessment of the Administrative Board
Legal Basis	Article 23(2)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 768/2005
Decision	Adopted by consensus.

4. AMENDMENT TO THE PROGRAMMING DOCUMENT CONTAINING THE MULTIANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2018-2020 AND THE ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2018

The Chair informed that the point would be for information and gave the floor to the HoU 3.

The HoU 3 informed on the latest developments of the PESCAO project, which requires the signature of a grant agreement between the EU and EFCA. He explained that the process for the signature of the grant agreement was in the pipeline and that after the signature of the grant agreement an amendment to the Programming Document and Budget of the EFCA for 2018 would be required. Therefore, he proposed to launch a written procedure after the signature of the grant agreement.

The Chair asked if there were any comments. There were no comments and the Chair confirmed that, following the signature of the grant agreement, the written procedure would be launched.

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

10. ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING THE FIVE-YEAR INDEPENDANT EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF EFCA (2012-2016)

The Chair gave the floor to the ED to present the implementation of the AB recommendations following the Five-year independent external evaluation of EFCA (hereinafter the 'recommendations').

Concerning recommendation No 1, on the review of EFCA's legislative framework, the ED referred to the ongoing inter-service consultation on an EC proposal for an amendment of EFCA's founding regulation No 768/2005.

In line with recommendation No 2, EFCA should further develop e-learning; facilitate and promote the use of core curricula by the MS and support the creation and implementation of a sector-specific qualification framework for fisheries inspectors. The ED stressed the objective to improve standardisation and capacitation of EU inspectors. To contribute to ensuring a level playing field for all Union inspectors, he proposed to train all Union inspectors according to the same principles and to work towards a common certification of Union inspectors, which would lead to a more robust system. That way, and for the sake of compliance, EFCA could give assurance to the Council, EP, MS, and EC, that inspections are carried out following common standards.

The ED highlighted that the EFCA Core Curricula (CC) for Fisheries Inspectors could be one of the avenues of this approach, subject to the acceptance by the AB. He was very eager to seek the agreement of the AB to move to a common training content and to frame a little bit more the concept of Union inspectors.

On recommendation No 3, related to harmonisation of control methods, procedures and minimum inspection standards, the ED proposed as next steps to define what is an inspection and the standardised procedures for inspections. Furthermore, he added that the fisheries patrol vessel of EFCA, together with MS Union inspectors and EFCA coordinators on board, would contribute to promote best practices and unify inspection standards.

As regards recommendation no 4 on the possible extension of the JDP concept, the ED referred to the outcome of the Specific Control and Inspection Programme (SCIP) Seminar³ held in Tenerife during the week previous to the AB meeting. He pointed out that an important aspect was to explore to which extent the JDP concept could be used for moving the implementation of the IUU Regulation, which to a great extent is currently based on a certification check on paper, to a more operational approach.

With reference to the involvement of EFCA in the international dimension, recommendation No 5, the ED highlighted the benefit and utility of EFCA in both the internal and external dimension of the CFP. He proposed as next steps the involvement of third countries in the JDP framework, the analysis of a possible increased role of EFCA in the CFP international dimension through the different existing elements like RFMOs and IUU Regulation, and amending the founding regulation of EFCA to permit the sourcing by other public funding than the EC subsidy.

In line with recommendation No 6 on further enhancing the involvement of the AB, the ED mentioned several steps to increase the AB involvement and output legitimacy that would not require a legislative amendment. To reach new AB members and make them more familiar with EFCA activities, a welcome package would be made available in Fishnet. The discussion on strategic items is being considered in every AB meeting and AB members have been requested and are always welcome to send their suggestions.

Recommendation No 7 calls for better interaction between the Administrative and Advisory Board. The ED presented the objective to facilitate and foster AB and Advisory Board interaction. Amongst the steps to be considered not requiring legislative amendment, the publication of factual and neutral

³ See item 6 of the AB agenda, 'Specific Control and Inspection Programme (SCIP) Seminar the way forward'.

information was proposed, as well as the facilitation of an open dialogue. The ED also suggested to consider having the Advisory Board meeting the day before the AB meeting, once per year, to allow AB members to attend the Advisory Board meetings. Moreover, he referred to a request from the Advisory Board members to increase the representatives in the AB, a change that would require a legislative amendment.

On recommendation No 8, enhanced cooperation and exchange of best practices with other EU agencies, the objective to fully implement the EU Coast Guard initiative, 'Fisheries as a Coast Guard activity', was presented. The ED highlighted EFCA interest to provide additional capacity to MS.

The ED stressed the importance of adding to the founding regulation of EFCA a scheme similar to the one Frontex has for the chartering of MS control means. That could be used to facilitate the acquisition of means for areas that so require (i.e. emergency measures).

Recommendation No 9 foresees that there should be better methodologies for measuring the added value and the impact of EFCA activities, using a result-based approach and leading to a small number of effective strategic key performance indicators (KPI). The ED highlighted that this is a very important topic, linked to the discussion on the annual report and the programming document. He explained that in EFCA's internal management and monitoring, there is a scorecard with benchmarks and KPIs which are monitored all over the year. Part of that scorecard is used for feeding the annual report. He confirmed the interest of EFCA in improving and having KPIs which would clearly reflect the result and impact of the activities of EFCA vis-a-vis its objectives.

On recommendation No 10, concerning the further enhancement of gender balance, the ED emphasised that gender balance remains an important issue that could also be addressed by communication. EFCA is currently re-designing its website.

As regards communication actions to further reach out to stakeholders mentioned in the recommendation No 11, the ED announced that EFCA would organise some trainings, including an information training on how to use social media, with special focus on the management. The ED added that another aspect of communication was the access to documents. The European Data Protection regulation is in a process of significant changes and there will be a new regulation applicable to EFCA. That new regulation deals with personal data but also has a consequence on access to documents. The ED explained that the EFCA Data Protection Officer had been trained and was preparing that change. He assured that EFCA would be ready for that new environment.

The Chair thanked the ED for the presentation and opened the floor for discussion on the recommendations and points raised by the ED. He proposed not to discuss recommendation no 1, because of the ongoing reform of the Control Regulation.

The representative of NL referred to the future EFCA activities in Western Africa and multi-purpose missions, and suggested to launch a reflection on EFCA's involvement in that international dimension. Moreover, he highlighted the importance of strategic issues, like the number of infringements, the type of infringements and the reasons for non-compliance. He proposed to discuss those reasons and what to do about them in the AB. In addition, he mentioned the importance of new AB members and of their integration into the AB.

The Chair pointed out that with several new AB members, there was a unique opportunity to implement recommendation no 6.

The representative of the EC thanked the ED for the presentation. Concerning the general approach, she mentioned that it was not clear how EFCA wanted to tackle the recommendations. She wondered whether there could be a roadmap with specific objectives and targets on a yearly basis to assess progress over time.

Furthermore, the representative of the EC made the following remarks:

- that progress had already been made on some of the recommendations, e.g. No 3 and No 4. At the SCIP seminar in the previous week the idea had been expressed to set up

- a working group on a common definition of inspection. It was important to have an agreement reached in that working group on remote electronic management;
- under recommendation No 5, regarding EFCA involvement in the international arena, she announced that the EC would have the same approach as in October last year and inquired whether the established procedure met the requirements of the AB;
 - under recommendation No 6, she suggested to better align the programming document and the annual report;
 - under recommendation No 7, she asked to add a report from the representative of the Advisory Board to the AB meetings as a standing point on the AB agenda. Although the AB receives minutes from the Advisory Board meetings, it would be good to hear from the Advisory Board directly;
 - under recommendation No 9, if the programming document is reviewed, she asked to select a few strategic KPIs;
 - under recommendation No 11, she proposed to make an effort to communicate and make info publicly available, not only in the framework of working groups, but also on the website of EFCA; she stressed the importance of communication on how the Fisheries patrol vessel of EFCA could be deployed for future years. Considering it was the first year of deployment, she suggested that for next year and subsequent years, the planning should be communicated in advance to have a discussion.

The representative of the Advisory Board referred to recommendation No 7 on improving the interaction between the Advisory Board and the Administrative Board. He appreciated the proposal to have the Advisory Board meeting before the Administrative Board meeting. From a personal point of view, he considered it a good solution. Maybe it could help solving the problem that exists in the Advisory Board concerning the rotatory system, and thus improving the participation and implication of Advisory Councils.

The representative of NL supported the suggested back to back meetings of the Advisory and Administrative Board in October, as this would facilitate AB members to also attend Advisory Board meetings.

The ED welcomed all proposals and interventions made. He commented that the question of the rotation system raised by the representative of the Advisory Board is a consequence of the fact that there is a limitation in terms of the representative of the Advisory Board to the Administrative Board. That was mostly a legal issue already discussed in the past. He stressed that the representative of the Advisory Board had expressed his interest in having a back to back meeting with the Administrative Board.

In addition, the ED mentioned that it was difficult to separate the outcome of an EFCA's activity from a MS' activity, e.g. in the area of compliance. EFCA's activity is very much linked to the MS' activity, as EFCA is coordinating the MS activity. There could be KPIs based on benchmarks. However, that would also involve MS. That is why this approach needs to be studied very careful and with maturity. Another issue is whether MS are ready to agree on what is an inspection and to agree on specific actions for at sea, landing and on shore inspection, as some MS might consider that such definition does not fall under the framework of the SCIP. That brings back the question on performance, it must be seen whether the system is ready for this.

The ED further added that inspections should concentrate on compliance, catch opportunity and quota record. One option would be to do less but longer inspections.

The Chair concluded that the AB continued to agree that this agenda item should be a standing agenda point for future meetings. It would be treated under the point of improvement of working practices in order not to repeat or continue other discussions. He remarked that the ED had asked the AB members for suggestions before the meeting concerning recommendation No 6, but did not receive any suggestions. He emphasised that it would be helpful to receive suggestions from the AB.

The Chair pondered that it could become necessary to consider other points in relation to working practices that should be raised. Furthermore, he underlined that the state of play and the implementation of the recommendations needs to be discussed. He suggested to have a working document with elements of a roadmap to show what has been done and what is intended to be done and to mention also any possible difficulties EFCA may face.

The ED agreed to the conclusions drawn by the Chair. However, he inquired whether the fact that AB members had not reacted meant that MS supported the idea of having the Core Curriculum as a framework to be embedded in national training. In case the reply to this question was negative, the proposed steps for implementation of recommendation No 2 would have to be changed.

Concerning the issue of standardisation of inspections, as well as the question of benchmarks and KPIs, the ED queried whether no reply from the AB members meant that they were ready to consider this approach as a good one or whether they were against that idea.

The representative of IE remarked that if the proposal was that MS should adopt the Core Curriculum as a framework for national inspections, then the answer from Ireland would be yes. However, he mentioned the caveat that there may be reasons for a different approach in individual MS with differences in the legal framework.

The ED confirmed that they were on the same line. He acknowledged that evidently there was a national part of training outside EFCA's remit. However, he expressed that he felt uncomfortable with what is reported as an inspection and called for realism. He asked why the trend of infringement when it comes to inspections at sea was not changing and proposed having less inspections, but carrying them out according to a common standard, with common steps. At the same time of course, if an inspection is done according to the standard of a national inspection, some room of manoeuvre is required.

The representative of ES highlighted that these are inspections transmitted by MS.

The ED stated that he referred to inspections operated in the framework of a JDP in accordance with the JDP pattern, which are recorded in the JDP. He pointed out that a common definition of inspection and what falls under an inspection should be agreed.

The ED outlined the need for a common understanding of inspections. It would be more efficient if all Union inspectors had the same knowledge. Having the same knowledge would provide assurance on the way inspections are carried out and how those inspections are received by the industry.

The representative of CY referred to the common understanding and common training mentioned by the ED. On the proposed certification, he asked whether this would mean that if someone wanted to be a Union inspector that person would have to pass some tests under the Core Curriculum. He related to the applicable provision of the Control Regulation pointing out that it states clearly that it is the MS competency, and thus MS control Authorities, to assess if someone has the qualifications to be a Union Inspector and therefore decide who will be included in the list of Union Inspectors.

In response, the ED underlined that the question was how it could be ensured that a Union inspector is qualified for the job. Currently, according to article 79 of the Control Regulation this is the responsibility of the MS. He added that there was no obligation to proceed within one year and proposed a roadmap for the training and the certification. Moreover, that was not only an issue of training, but sometimes also an issue of the language.

The representative of SE expressed his confusion. He stated that the recommendation stating that EFCA should contribute to the development of Union inspector standards had already been decided. At that moment there was a discussion on how to reach those standards. However, first a written proposal was needed to be able to go further.

The ED responded that he wanted to test the idea to see if EFCA could work in the proposed direction.

There were no further comments and the Chair closed the item.

The Administrative Board took note	of the information provided in writing as well as orally, at the meeting.
Agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- to keep in each Administrative Board agenda the item "improving working practices";- to prepare a roadmap for the recommendations;- to prepare a written proposal on the future development of Union inspection standards.

5. COMMISSION INITIATIVE TO REVISE THE FISHERIES CONTROL SYSTEM: STATE OF PLAY

The representative of the EC reminded that a revision process on the EU fisheries control system has been launched. The intention is to adopt a proposal by May 2018. In the past month's consultations with Member States and stakeholders have taken place. In the consultation three options were outlined:

- status quo, no change, continue with the implementation of the current control system;
- targeted amendments to the Control Regulation;
- amendment of the EU fisheries control system, i.e. amendments of the Control Regulation plus specific amendments of the EFCA founding regulation and of the IUU regulation.

The consultations showed a preference for option No 3.

The EC representative explained that the general idea is to go along the specific objectives outlined in the consultation documents.

The first objective is to remove all obstacles that would hinder the development of a culture of compliance and the level playing field of operators. The EC is reviewing the chapters on sanctions in the Control Regulation and in the IUU regulation.

The second objective is to attempt to simplify the legislative framework, trying to streamline as much as possible the rules on vessels in order to limit the categories of vessels to two. The EC will go for digitalisation of all sorts of data, including also digitalisation of the catch certificate in the IUU regulation. Given that the regulation may not be in place before 2021, and in a spirit of simplification, the EC is addressing a number of derogations in the current Control Regulation that render control more difficult and inefficient.

The third objective is to improve the reliability, availability and completeness of fisheries data and information. This important point was raised by the report of the Court of Auditors published in May 2017. There will be a complete set of fisheries data in the future, including all vessels, and novelties on recreational fisheries and general improvement of data quality. Focus is also given to the optimization of the rules on data exchange involving EFCA, in this sense the European Data Protection Supervisor has also been consulted on the new Control Regulation.

The fourth objective is to breach the gaps with the CFP. The EC is strengthening the provisions for the control of fishing capacity, which is one of the key requirements in annex 2 of the CFP.

The initial aim of the EC, and following the recommendations of the AB, is to try to limit the modifications of the EFCA founding regulation to the minimum.

The Chair opened the floor to comments. There were no comments and the Chair closed the agenda item.

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

6. SPECIFIC CONTROL AND INSPECTION PROGRAMME (SCIP) SEMINAR THE WAY FORWARD

The representative of the EC explained that this exercise was launched this year and is part of the work programme of DG MARE for 2018. Except for the Med SCIP, all the other existing SCIPs (North Sea, Baltic and Western Waters) will expire at the end of 2018. There is the possibility to extend the SCIPs keeping their current format. However, since 2012 a series of developments have taken place, including the reform of the CFP with the introduction of the Landing Obligation (LO), and a number of amendments have adapted the SCIPs to some of the evolved scenarios, with the risk of undermining the objective of ensuring a level playing field.

The EC would like to explore the possibility of new SCIPs and has started the discussions that would be pursued throughout the year. The objectives of this exercise are to reduce the administrative burden of EC/MS, widen the scope of the SCIPs, add the current NAFO and NEAFC areas under the SCIP umbrella and bridge the gap with regards to the control of the LO.

On the first objective, would be to combine the four existing SCIPs into one single Decision with regional annexes to reduce the administrative burden. The referred SCIPs have a similar structure, with the main differences being in the regional annexes where the benchmarks and fisheries are defined. A similar attempt to streamline the process could be envisaged for the JDPs and if this is not feasible, the annual JDPs reports could be merged into a single document.

On the second objective, to widen the scope of the SCIPs, the future SCIPs could define general principles for the scope leaving to the JDPs the definition of priority fisheries. There is a gap (demersal fisheries are not covered) to be filled in the Western Waters SCIP and other critical stocks (e.g. eels) would need to be included in the SCIPs. The representative of the EC recalled that during the seminar in Tenerife, MS were keen on the idea of enlargement of the SCIP scope but MS also stressed the fact that they have limited resources and therefore priorities need to be identified through risk assessment.

On the third objective, the purpose is to cover the NAFO and NEAFC area consistently with what has been done for ICCAT in the GFCM within the Med SCIP. Regarding cooperation with third countries, it was concluded that the SCIPs provisions are only addressed to MS and not to third countries but that a more effective cooperation could be established in the framework of the JDPs.

Concerning the fourth objective, of bridging the gap regarding the control of the LO, the representative of the EC explained that the LO will come into force fully from January 2019 while the new Control Regulation would not be adopted until perhaps 2020. The SCIPs could be modified to include mandatory measures at regional level, including the setting of specific targets and benchmarks since traditional monitoring tools are not effective for the control of the LO. Another important aspect is the possible inclusion of mandatory measures in the SCIPs for the introduction of remote electronic monitoring (REM) on specific fleets on a risk-based approach; this means that decisions on camera footage and how footage shall be accessed by or exchanged with other MS could have to be taken. This is very important because it will have implications for the work of EFCA.

The representative of the EC summarised the key outcomes of the SCIP/JDP Workshop that took place in Tenerife on 6-7 March 2018:

- there was general agreement with the idea to move forward to a single SCIP with regional annexes and to explore ways to extend the scope of this SCIP;
- to improve cooperation with third countries;

- to define compliance indicators at regional level to facilitate the introduction of result-based benchmarks in the future;
- on the LO, the majority of MS generally welcomed the idea of including mandatory measures on the use of REM in the SCIPs.

With reference to the timeline, the representative of the EC informed that a technical meeting with the MS and EFCA is scheduled on 10 April and the adoption is foreseen to take place in November or December 2018.

The HoU 2 pointed out that a new SCIP would cover a wider range of fisheries and could introduce adequate measures for supporting the implementation and enforcement of the LO. The JDPs would define priority fisheries on a risk-based approach. He highlighted that the Regional Risk Management methodology needs to be adapted to be used as a preliminary step to define priorities. In addition, a new Western Waters demersal & Med/Black Sea JDP is likely to start in 2019; this needs to be considered in 2018 JDP planning.

On the risk assessment, the HoU 2 indicated that the achievements on the exchange of information in the context of JDPs were very well received. He mentioned that there are areas for improvement in the exchange of inspection information. Electronic exchange, as a potential way forward, is in process. In relation to the exchange of target vessels, there is a need to improve the scope. EFCA is requested to be more proactive on the exchange of best practices at national level. In relation to the move to a more result based approach, and a focus on measuring compliance, there is a need for a regional framework and methodology to support possible compliance benchmarks, this is a challenge for EFCA in the coming months.

Concerning control procedures, the HoU 2 stated that stronger and more specific SCIP measures could set a better basis for the implementation of standardised control procedures. The introduction of REM systems to ensure compliance to LO may be envisaged at SCIP level on a risk-based approach. EFCA has been requested to create a working group to facilitate the exchange of best-practices and the definition of technical requirements, and it was also discussed that EFCA could be a central point for exchange/repository of REM/CCTV data. A first draft concept note has been circulated on how the above working group could function. EFCA has received a similar request from the Scheveningen and North Western Waters Control Expert Groups. The objectives of the REM working group would be to facilitate the exchange of best practices, explore the solutions provided by the different pilot projects, identify relevant sensors for REM shipborne systems, define technical requirements, define data collection and exchange and develop detailed methodologies for the potential implementation of REM/CCTV in selected fisheries.

The ED highlighted that, in order to improve the efficiency of the monitoring tools on the LO, EFCA is committed to support the MS and the EC on the REM approach.

The representative of ES raised a question on whether it would be possible to apply an exception within the 12 miles; she reckoned the complexity of these kind of exceptions but it would considerably reduce the workload of MS.

The representative of the EC replied that at first sight it did not seem to be a simplification and it would be difficult to justify it, but commented that the EC is ready to explore possible solutions with MS during the meeting in Brussels on 10 April.

The representative of SE enquired on the CCTV in the context of SCIP, if it was legal to introduce the CCTV as obligatory tool to the SCIP decision or if it has to be done through the Control Regulation.

The representative of the EC replied that in the future Control Regulation the plan is to introduce provisions on control of the LO with reference to the SCIPs. Provisions in Art. 95 on SCIPs are very wide and according to the lawyers, there is a legal basis. Last year there were multiple requests from MS asking to define mandatory measures and the EC considered the best would be to address the issue through the SCIPs.

The representative of IT expressed that the general SCIP was a good idea and he would propose specific areas such as the Med to have one single SCIP but, taking into account that they have different fisheries and species, the exercise could not work. He disagreed on the extended use of CCTV not only for data protection but also for practical reasons. He recalled that during the Council meeting for the new CFP Regulation the MS had been given the faculty to decide on the use of CCTV. He further commented that for some fisheries it is not cost-effective and could not accept it as general rule but was ready to collaborate to find the most appropriate way to monitor fishing activity as far as the LO is concerned.

The representative of NL expressed his support to the SCIPs. With reference to the CCTV, he was in favour of its use but commented that the SCIPs do not provide the legal basis for making the use of CCTV mandatory and that this should be decided at Council level.

The representative of CY agreed that the use of CCTV should be decided by a regulation, albeit for some kind of fisheries CCTV is the only way to ensure control. He added that some vessels cannot have REM, some can have REM but only simple systems and others can have very complicated systems, therefore they should not all be at the same level.

The representative of PT supported the interventions of previous MS on the use of CCTV. He mentioned that Portugal was considering the different CCTV technological options; there are several types of installations according to the vessel, the electric power on board and the objective control. Depending on the type of installation the control cost will vary.

The representative of UK mentioned that some countries were very experienced in the use of that technology and asked when the implementation of REM would be effective if the new SCIP is published in November.

The representative of UK also referred to the impressive footage shown in Tenerife from the programmes held in Scotland, and underlined that the critical success factor in most of the Scottish experiences was that there was a positive incentive (in the form of additional quota) for the fishermen to make the initiative work. He observed that without positive incentives there is the risk of creating a whole set of offences of interfering with the equipment.

The representative of the EC reassured the participants that the ideas expressed would be taken into consideration. The objective is to set the basis for a decision to be taken at regional level. She highlighted the need to think about the SCIP practical implementation for 2019, also considering the progress EFCA can make with the REM working group.

The representative of the EC stated that the EC is open to suggestions and to alternatives to CCTVs, if they are not the best cost effective method for the control of the LO.

The representative of IE highlighted the benefit of CCTV systems in terms of security and monitoring.

With regards to the LO, the representative of IE pointed out that that there has been an open pathway for the fishing community to offer compliance by recording discards which they have not taken despite the efforts made to persuade them of the value of doing so. He mentioned that from an enforcement perspective this could be considered as a failure and drew the attention of the AB to the need to find a balance.

There were no additional comments and the Chair closed the agenda item.

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

7. DRAFT PROGRAMMING DOCUMENT CONTAINING THE MULTIANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2019-2020 AND THE ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2019

The ED reported on the state of the draft Programming Document (PD) 2019. He summarised the main changes in the draft PD 2019 since the last AB meeting in October 2017, inter alia 2017 human resources and budget execution data have been inserted and the name of one activity has been reviewed (Harmonisation and standardisation has been rebranded Planning and evaluation).

Considering the discussion on the Annual Report 2017 structure, the ED pointed out the need to reflect at EFCA level on a new structure of the PD embedding the AB comments.

The Chair recalled that the draft PD 2019 was discussed and adopted in the AB meeting of October 2017. He informed that the PD 2019 would be submitted to the AB for adoption in October 2018.

There were no additional comments and the Chair closed the agenda item.

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

8. REVISED RULES FOR SECONDED NATIONAL EXPERTS (SNEs)

The Chair opened item 8 and gave the floor to the HoU 1.

The HoU 1 explained that, during the course of last year, linked to the pilot project in the Straits of Sicily and the subsequent chartering of a vessel, a standby scheme was put in place. The standby scheme covers certain operational staff of the Agency that have to remain on alert to deal with any urgent issues that may come up in relation to the duties they are performing in a short space of time during their non-working time. SNEs are not covered by the current rules.

Following discussions with DG HR and DG MARE, the solution proposed was to add a new article to the specific rules of the Agency for Seconded National Experts so that they may be granted a stand-by duty allowance when performing these duties.

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

Proposed action	Adoption of the amendment to AB Decision No 09-I-07 of 19 March 2009 concerning the Revised Rules for SNE's
Legal Basis	Article 19(3) of Regulation (EC) No 768/2005
Decision	Adopted by consensus.

9. STAFF REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING RULES

The Chair opened item 9 and gave the floor to the HoU 1.

The HoU 1 made an introduction on the procedure for the adoption of Implementing Rules (IR) under article 110 of the Staff Regulations

He added that 5 decisions are proposed for adoption. The first two decisions on the framework for learning and development and on temporary occupation of management posts are based on model decisions. The third decision on the EC Guide to missions is proposed to be applied by analogy and will come into force on 28 March 2018. The fourth decision relates to a request for non-application of the EC IR on engagement and use of Contract Agents. There will be a model decision adopted by the EC in the future. Finally, the guidelines on whistleblowing are also to be adopted following a

model decision. He emphasised that it has taken much time since the original guidelines were submitted by EFCA to the EC for agreement under article 110 of the Staff Regulations in 2015.

The Chair mentioned that this process looked bureaucratic, but underlined the importance to adopt the rules for EFCA and opened the floor for questions.

The representative of ES inquired on how many EFCA staff members were affected by the request for non-application of the EC Decision on engagement and use of Contract Agents. She also wanted to know why the non-application was requested.

The HoU 1 explained that currently there are 10 Contract Agents at EFCA. The request for non-application is made to avoid that those rules will automatically apply to EFCA within 9 months following the notification. The EC Decision is not suitable for agencies, as the EC deploys a different category of CA than agencies. In particular, at the EC, the maximum contract duration is only six years, while at the agencies contracts can possibly become indefinite. That is why it must be avoided that the EC Decision is adopted by analogy. Furthermore, he pointed out that there is already an agreement with the EC to develop a specific model for agencies in this domain. The basic principles will be the same, but there will be some variation due to the different categories of Contract Agents deployed.

In addition, he mentioned that notifications from the EC on the model decisions on Middle managers and Function of Adviser had been expected to be received on time for the Administrative Board meeting. However, they were not ready yet and expected to come soon.

There were no comments and the Decisions were adopted by consensus.

Proposed action	Adoption of the Staff Regulation Implementing Rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Framework for learning and development;- Temporary occupation of management posts;- Guide to missions, and authorised travel;- Request for non-application of the EC IR on engagement and use of Contract Agents;- Whistleblowing guidelines.
Legal Basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Articles 19 and 23 (2) of Regulation (EC) No 768/2005- Staff Regulations of Officials of the European and the Conditions of employment of other servants of the European Communities in their version of 1 January 2018, in particular Article 110(2) thereof.
Decision	Adopted by consensus.

AOB

The Chair announced that the next meeting of the AB would be held on 10 October 2018. He acknowledged his unprecedented request to change the initially scheduled date of the AB and thanked EFCA for having speeded up its preparation to be ready a week ahead.

Regarding the first meeting of next year, 20 March 2019 was suggested as a possibility, although it was noted that the final date was still to be fixed and that a farewell to the UK representative would also be taken into consideration.

The Chair concluded acknowledging the fruitful and lively meeting, emphasising that the AB had fully assumed their role to control, make suggestions and give useful feedback to the Agency.

The ED made a tentative proposal to hold the next AB meeting in October in the headquarters of EFCA, which would allow all AB members to visit the building and appreciate the results of the refurbishing effort that is being made. He thanked the Spanish government for enlarging the space of the Agency with the renting of the first floor.

There were no further comments from the AB members and the Chair closed the meeting.

The Administrative Board took note

of the information provided orally, at the meeting.

Next Administrative Board meetings:

- 10 October 2018;
- 20 March 2019.

5

ANNEX I

List of participants to the meeting of the Administrative Board of the EFCA Vigo, 14 March 2018

Members		Alternates
(BE) Belgium:	Mr Jean-François VERHEGGHEN	-
(BG) Bulgaria ⁴ :	Mr Dimitar VALKOV	-
(CZ) Czech Rep.:	Mr Roman HEIMLICH	-
(DK) Denmark:	Ms Mariya KRESTYANSKA	-
(DE) Germany :	Ms Melanie SEIBERT	-
(EE) Estonia:	Mr Indrek ULLA	-
(IE) Ireland:	Mr Andrew KENNEEN	-
(EL) Greece:	-	-
(ES) Spain:	Mr José Luis GONZALEZ SERRANO	Ms Teresa MOLINA SCHMID
(FR) France:	-	Ms Pauline POTIER
(HR) Croatia:	-	Mr Mario SKORJANEC
(IT) Italy:	Mr Riccardo RiGILLO	-
(CY) Cyprus ⁵ :	Mr Yiannos KYRIACOU	-
(LV) Latvia:	Mr Miks VEINBERGS	-
(LT) Lithuania:	-	Mr Tomas KAZLAUSKAS
(LU) Luxembourg:	-	-
(HU) Hungary:	-	Mr Janos GABOR
(MT) Malta:	-	-
(NL) Netherlands:	Mr Leon R. M. LOMANS	Mr Gerrit A. LAM
(AT) Austria:	-	-
(PL) Poland:	-	Mr Stanislaw KASPEREK
(PT) Portugal:	-	Mr Carlos FERREIRA
(RO) Romania:	-	-
(SL) Slovenia:	-	Mr Slavko SISKO
(SK) Slovakia ⁶ :	Mr Jan SUKOVSKY	-
(FI) Finland:	Mr Harri KUKKA	-
(SE) Sweden:	Mr Ingemar BERGLUND	-
(UK) United Kingdom:	-	Mr Cephas RALPH
<u>European Commission:</u>		
Mr Reinhard PRIEBE (Chair)		-
-		-
-		-
-		Mr Jaques VERBORGH ⁷
-		-
Ms Francesca ARENA ⁸		-

Observer:

Mr José Manuel BELTRAN (Advisory Board Representative)
Ms Sarah R. VITIELLO-FERRARA (European Commission)
Ms Nicoletta DE VIRGILLO (IT) Italy

EFCA:

Mr Pascal SAVOURET (Executive Director- ED)

⁴ Proxy from Romania.

⁵ Proxy from Greece.

⁶ Proxy from Austria.

⁷ Proxy from EC (Mr S. DEPYPERE).

⁸ Proxy from EC (Ms V. VEITS).

Mr Niall MCHALE (Head of Unit Resources and IT - Unit 1)
Mr Mario LOPES SANTOS (Head of Unit EU Waters and North Atlantic – Unit 2)
Mr Pedro GALACHE (Head of Unit Programmes and Assistance - Unit 3)
Mr Marcel DEDIC (Accounting Officer – OED)
Ms Rieke ARNDT (Head of Section HR and Legal - Unit 1)
Ms Marta RAMILA (Data Protection Officer – OED)
Ms Gregoria CUESTA (Assistant to the ED – OED)
Ms Rosa FUENTES (Executive Assistant – OED)
Mr Miguel NUEVO (Desk Manager, Desk JDPs and Regional Cooperation – Unit 3)
Mr Neil ANSELL (Desk Manager Mediterranean Sea and International Waters – Unit 3)

✓



Administrative Board

Agenda of the 30th meeting of the Administrative Board of the EFCA
on 14 March 2018 in Vigo

08h30 – 13h00

14h00 – 17h00

(D=decision; I=Information)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Approval of the draft agenda | D |
| 2. Information from the Executive Director | I |
| 3. Annual Report 2017 | D |
| 4. Amendment to the Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2018-2020 and the Annual work programme 2018 | D |
| 5. Commission initiative to revise the Fisheries Control System: state of play | I |
| 6. Specific Control and Inspection Programme (SCIP) Seminar the way forward | I |
| 7. Draft Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2019-2020 and Annual work programme for year 2019 | I |
| 8. Revised Rules for Seconded National Experts (SNEs) | D |
| 9. Staff Regulation implementing rules | D |
| 10. Administrative Board's recommendations following the Five-Year Independent External Evaluation of EFCA (2012-2016) | I |
| 11. AOB | |

T-
W

W