

Vigo, 14 October 2020

**MINUTES OF THE 34TH ONLINE MEETING OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
VIGO – 14 OCTOBER 2020**

0. ATTENDANCE

The Chair, Mr Reinhard Priebe (RP), opened the meeting at 09h00 by welcoming the Administrative Board (AB) members and all the participants. He started by explaining that this was an unusual meeting, as given the current situation, the meeting would be held online.

The Chair gave some technical information about the IT aspects of the online meeting, reminding that the votes would be carried out through a secured voting platform already tested for all the AB members who would vote.

The appointment of the following representatives was announced:

- **Belgium:**
Alternate: Ms Isabel Maene
- **Czech Republic:**
Alternate: Mr Jakub Mořický
- **Ireland:**
Alternate: Ms Susan Steele
- **Croatia:**
Representative: Mr Mario Skorjanec
Alternate: Ms Ivana Furač
- **Luxembourg:**
Alternate: Mr Marc Kreis
- **Malta:**
Representative: Mr Bjorn A. Callus
Alternate: Mr Marvin Seguna
- **The Netherlands:**
Representative: Ms Carian C. Meijjes

- **Austria:**
Representative: Ms Margareta Stubenrauch
Alternate: Mr Manfred Kislinger
- **Romania:**
Representative: Mr Marian Lixandru
- **Sweden:**
Representative: Mr Niclas Törnell
Alternate: Mr Martin Bjerner
- **European Commission:**
Representative: Mr Christos Economou (acting Director DG MARE A)
Representative: Ms Maja Kirchner (acting Director DG MARE C).

The Chair mentioned the proxies given for all the items in the Agenda subject to decision.

The 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.

Ms Susan Steele from Ireland notified that she would withdraw from item 4 of the agenda and would disconnect from the meeting for that point.

The Chair recalled that there was 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 European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA) that 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. The European Parliament is closely monitoring the application of the EFCA conflict of interest policy as part of the discharge procedure.

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 If anyone would prefer not to be photographed or that his/her image not to be published on the EFCA website and social media profiles, their choice would be respected.

The Chair commented about the gender balance among the AB representatives and alternates:

- AB representatives: men 69 %, women 31 %.
- AB alternates: men 68 %, women 32%.
- The Chair mentioned that in the Commission (EC) delegation: women 75%, men 25%.

| | |
|---------|--|
| Present | Proxies were given for all agenda items |
| Quorum | The Chair concluded that the 2/3 quorum was obtained (32 votes out of 33). |

1. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT AGENDA

With the agreement of EFCA Executive Director (ED) and AB members, the Chair informed that the item 11.b (KPI working group) would be addressed after item 6. The reason for this change was that it would be useful to discuss the key performance indicators (KPIs) before addressing them subsequently in the single programming document points, as they refer to them.

The Chair asked to all the members if they had any topics they would like to add under AOB of the agenda. The date of the next Board meeting has been added in the AOB item of the agenda. The agenda was adopted.

2. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR

The Chair apologised for not having been able to respect the rules of procedure for the election of the new chair, stipulating that the election should take place two months before the end of his mandate. He hoped that members would understand the exceptional circumstances.

According to the rules of procedure, the AB members were reminded by the Chair that they would proceed to a secret ballot via the voting platform.

The Chair also reminded that not only in accordance with the rules of procedures but also with the Art.34 of the EFCA regulation, the Chair should be elected from the EC representatives and the quorum for the election should be 2/3 of all members of the Board.

The Chair informed the members present that he had received a letter from the Director General of DG Mare, with the nomination as candidate for the election of the Chair of Ms. Veronika Veits.

The Chair gave the floor to Ms Veits, who briefly presented her most relevant experience for the position.

Ms Veronika Veits spent 25 years at the EC, including 10 at DG Agriculture and the last 15 years at DG Mare, occupying various functions. Since 2017, she was appointed as the Director of Directorate D of DG Mare dealing with Common Fisheries Policy, including the structural policy part and control part and also dealing with the implementation in the Mediterranean. Since 1st September 2019, she was appointed as Director for Directorate B for International Ocean Governance and Sustainable Fisheries and had continued to assume the position of acting Director for Directorate D for the last year (and should cessed by Friday). Ms Veits was proposed by the Director General for the position of Chair in her function of Director B. She assured she would be very pleased to get the AB members' trust as Chair, and she would occupy this position in a manner as impartial, fair and objective as the previous president.

The AB voted by secret ballot via the voting platform on the proposal to appoint the new Chair for the term from 16 October 2020 until 15 October 2023, or until the end of her membership, if she ceases to be member of the AB earlier.

The results of the secret ballot were 32 votes: 31 votes in favour; 1 vote abstention.

Ms Veronika Veits was appointed as new Chair for a three years term (from 16 October 2020 until 15 October 2023).

| 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 |

3. ELECTION OF THE DEPUTY CHAIR

The Chair recalled that the procedure for the election of the Deputy Chair would also be with a secret ballot via the voting platform.

The Chair informed that Ms Melanie Seibert, was candidate and asked if there were any other candidates for the Deputy Chair position. There were no other candidates.

Ms Melanie Seibert presented herself, recalling that she has been a member of the Board since March 2018, had a legal background, and work experience particularly in fisheries control.

The AB voted by secret ballot on the proposal to appoint Ms Melanie Seibert for another term from 16 October 2020 until 15 October 2023, or until the end of her membership, if she ceases to be member of the AB earlier.

The results of the secret ballot were 32 votes: 31 votes in favour; 1 vote abstention.

Ms Melanie Seibert was appointed as Deputy Chair.

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Proposed action | Election of the Deputy 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 |

4. ONGOING RECRUITMENT OF THE FUTURE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (EC 10H15-10H30)

a) Presentation on the ongoing recruitment of the future Executive Director

The Chair asked all members present at the meeting who might have a conflict of interest on this item of the agenda, to disconnect for this point. As announced, Ms Susan Steele, from Ireland, withdrew from this agenda item.

The representative of the EC began the presentation by giving the end date of the current Executive Director's contract which is expected to be at the end of August 2021. She recalled that the AB members were consulted on the draft vacancy notice by written procedure in April 2020 and thanked them for their contributions. The vacancy notice was published in the Official Journal JO(2020)C231A on 14 July 2020 with the deadline of 9 September 2020; due to a corrigendum of the vacancy notice in early September, the deadline for application was extended to 16 September 2020. By today, applications were received but for reasons of confidentiality rules, she was not in a position to give more details on this matter.

She explained the next steps of the process, starting with a preselection, organised by the EC. The preselection panel would be chaired by the Director General of DG Mare, Ms Charlina Vitcheva and other members of the EC with the possibility for the members of the Board to send an observer for this preselection process. The preselection process would take place until the end of this year. Subsequently, the preselection would lead to a shortlist of candidates that would have to go through an assessment centre by external consultants. Then, the candidates would need to go through the European Commission Consultative Committee on Appointments (CCA). The result of this process would be a shorter-short list of candidates which would be interviewed by Commissioner Sinkevičius. This process would be expected to take place from January to March 2021. Finally, the short list would be presented to the EFCA AB members at the next meeting, and they should select a candidate from the shortlist. Once the Board had decided, there would be enough time to establish the contract of the new Executive Director and have a smooth and seamless transition.

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

b) Designation of an observer from the AB members in the preselection panel for the recruitment of the Executive Director

The Chair informed he had received a letter from the Director General of DG Mare, Ms Vitcheva, proposing that a member of the Board should be designated as an observer in the preselection panel for the post of Executive Director.

The Chair explained the main tasks of the observer in the preselection panel. The observer could not be a candidate for the position of the Executive Director and would only participate in the preselection interviews. The observer would not have the right to ask any questions to candidates neither to take an active role in the deliberations made by the panel. The preselection interviews would take place in the 2nd half of November or December 2020 via videoconference. The observer should be available for 2 half-days of interviews. The observer would remain a full Board member, and this task would not deprive him/her of his/her right to vote on the Executive Director election at the next Board meeting.

The representative of the EC added that, according to the EC internal guidelines, the designation of an observer is a possibility and not an obligation, but it was strongly recommended both by the Director General of DG Mare and from the Human Resources.

The representatives of Germany, France, Portugal, Italy and Romania expressed their support to this idea.

The Chair asked for a volunteer:

Mr Carlos Ferreira, deputy representative from Portugal, volunteered to be the observer in the preselection panel for the recruitment of the ED. Other members of the Board warmly supported his candidacy (Spain, Cyprus, Ireland, Slovakia, Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany and France).

The Chair asked if any delegation was against the nomination of Mr Carlos Ferreira, deputy representative from Portugal as observer in the preselection panel. There were no votes against and no abstentions from the Board members.

Mr. Carlos Ferreira has been appointed as an observer in the preselection panel for the recruitment of the Executive Director.

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Proposed action | Designation of an EFCA Administrative Board representative member as observer in the Preselection Panel |
| Legal basis | Internal Commission guidelines |
| Decision | Mr Carlos Ferreira appointed as an observer in the Preselection Panel |

5. INFORMATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

EFCA Executive Director (ED) reminded that more comprehensive information had been provided in the related cover note and the following presentation complemented some aspects in the different areas of work:

- Update on the Advisory Board meeting of the 9 October 2020: A summary was provided on the state of play of the activities of the Advisory Councils present in the meeting in relation to fisheries control.
- EFCA response to COVID-19 pandemic: EFCA was well prepared for teleworking and started an initial phase of teleworking on 10 March, enhancing E-administration. After an action plan for a phased return to the office with the implementation of protective measures, following the deterioration of the situation in Spain in August, EFCA management decided to revert to full teleworking from 2 September 2020.
- Activities and impact by operational objective of the work programme (SPD 2020): EFCA and JDP Steering Groups (SGs) agreed to exchange and update operational situation impact by COVID 19. Following a request for assistance from the European Commission regarding the impact of COVID-19 a letter was sent to Member States (MS) by EFCA, proposing to extensively discuss with MSs and adapt the JDPs where needed. In view of the reduced control effort, SGs agreed to adapt specific actions / campaigns, with increased focus on data monitoring and analysis. A Virtual Coordination Centre (VCC) was set up by EFCA to run the coordination of the BFT purse seine campaign 2020 (26 May-15 July) with the MS.
- JDP inspections and suspected infringements data: The JDPs state of play in terms of inspections and suspected infringements was presented. The main conclusions highlighted the prevalence of the following suspected infringements: non-compliance with reporting rules, non-compliance with the landing obligation and non-compliance with conservation measures.
- Specific projects
 - International dimension highlights: The restrictions due to the COVID-19 implied cancellation of meetings and missions also related with the EFCA support to international dimension. Efforts have been redirected to continue the support in the preparation of international meetings and preparation of training material and delivery of dedicated training as IUU newcomers. In the framework of PESCAO, EFCA concentrated its activities in tasks that could be done remotely, specifically in preparation of training material and legal support. EFCA also started the preliminary work on future projects for West MED and Algeria.
 - TWA Coast Guard Chairmanship and relations with other agencies: From 28 May 2020, EFCA chairs for one year the Tripartite Working Arrangement Steering Committee with Frontex and EMSA. During this period, EFCA is initiating an analysis in order to explore and identify viable ways on how to further enhance the cooperation with a view to better support Member States. The three Agencies concluded, together with the MS nominated experts, the drafting process of the Coast Guard Handbook and submitted the first version of the document to the EC in June 2020.
 - Measures adopted as regards COVID-19 in operations – Lundy Sentinel procedures: The operational plan of Lundy Sentinel had to be changed and adapted. EFCA, in line with its current mandate, deployed its own staff to perform inspections in international waters under RFMOs, contributing this way to EU obligations. Also,

EFCA explored all additional tools and systems for remote monitoring and surveillance. EFCA also developed a specific procedure for the operations of Lundy Sentinel, as a sanitary precautionary approach in relation to COVID-19. The two main levels of measures included those for joining the OPV Lundy Sentinel and for inspecting fishing vessels.

- JDP North Sea (NS) and Western Waters (WW) in case of UK withdrawal without UK – EU fisheries/access agreement: The agency recommended an increased control effort on high risk areas in NS and WW JDPs with the addition of two Offshore Patrol Vessels (equivalent 2 OPV x 300 sea days), the increase of aerial surveillance (240 flights), stronger coordination through a Virtual Network and the making of a Common Awareness Picture through enhanced data monitoring and analysis and increased control effort in ports supported by adequate training on anti-IUU fishing regulation and NEAFC regulation. This recommendation aimed at mitigating the risks identified in the outcomes of the risk analysis carried out by the agency in cooperation with the Member States and the Commission.
- Remote electronic monitoring (REM) and cooperation with regional groups: EFCA highlighted the work done in relation to REM, with the publication of the technical guidelines, the development of operational plans and the readiness to implement REM pilot projects in EU fisheries. Currently, there are REM operational projects being discussed with assistance of the EFCA REM WG in the North Sea, the MCS CS WG, the bluefin tuna and with the requests of Denmark and Cyprus.
- Support to the new technical measures regulation: EFCA has organised a series of workshops in cooperation with the MS and COM to clarify the application of different provisions of the new Technical Measures Regulation ((EC) 2019/1241) at inspectors' level
- Update on audits, internal control and corporate risk management: As for 2019, via the EU Agencies Network, DG Budget recommended the agencies to share their corporate risks and share the results with the parent DG and the Administrative Board. EFCA participated on the ENVI cluster together with EEA, EFSA, EMA, ECDC and ECHA, the risk registers were shared among the agencies and the outcome was a consolidated in the ENVI register (Annex II). EFCA risk register conveyed to the Single Programming Document 2021, reflecting a similar formulation among the agencies.

The representative of the EC thanked EFCA ED for the comprehensive presentation and commented on three points. Firstly, on the COVID measures, she acknowledged the significant and new challenges the COVID pandemic entails for everyone and praised EFCA for the quick and effective work on taking the right measures and try to minimise risks and impact.

Secondly, on REM, she very much welcomed the actions presented, including the support to the North Sea regional group pilot project, and the very positive outcome. She added they expect these initiatives to be continued in other regions. She also highlighted the practical application of the technical guidelines is the natural way of progressing in this area and expressed the full support to the advances of EFCA in this field.

Thirdly, on BREXIT, she stated that the outcome of the negotiations is not yet clear, and that they would continue pushing for a long-term agreement in fisheries. She thanked EFCA for showing its preparedness to face both possible scenarios, and welcomed the continuation of this work in cooperation with the EC.

The representative of the EC referred to the JDP inspections and infringements data shown in the presentation, and asked for a possible explanation on the significant increase of the infringement rate on inspections at sea from 2019 to 2020 in the framework of the NS and mainly WW JDPs.

The Head of Unit EU Waters and North Atlantic (HoU 2) replied that in general the number of inspections was reduced due to the COVID crisis in 2020. In WW, this pattern is not as noticeable mostly due to the increase of reported demersal fisheries inspections after the inclusion of these fisheries in 2019. He also mentioned Ireland as one of the main contributors in this increase.

He also indicated that, after just one-year analysis on the infringements rates, caution is needed in deriving any firm conclusions on the causes on what this may represent in terms of compliance. He clarified that the Regional Risk Assessment process has been improving in JDPs in general, with MS being more active in providing target vessels and directed inspections. Thus, such outcome may be due to an improvement on detecting infringements and not necessarily related to a change in compliance levels.

The representative of the EC further inquired about the number of inspections presented, and whether they were all joint inspections or included national inspections. The HoU 2 clarified that even though these inspections are not necessarily done by joint inspection teams, the figure refers only to inspections relevant to the JDP. Sharing information about all relevant inspections is of outmost importance for an effective coordination of JDPs.

The representative of the EC indicated that, even if not to be debated now, a distinction should be made between joint inspections under JDPs and other coming from MS.

The representative of Germany stated that the work of EFCA on the development of the REM technical guidelines was a very good basis for the work being done in this field. She also expressed full support to the REM pilot project being discussed under the Scheveningen regional group umbrella. Furthermore, she appreciated all the expertise provided by EFCA on different issues related to the Landing Obligation implementation. Finally, on the issue of BREXIT preparedness, she asked for clarification on whether two Offshore Patrol Vessels (OPVs) would be chartered.

EFCA ED responded that EFCA had highlighted the increased control effort recommended in the framework of the North Sea and Western Waters JDPs to mitigate the risks identified in the outcome of the detailed risk analysis done in cooperation with the Member States and the Commission. Nonetheless, he pointed out that the agency was not in capacity to reply the question raised by the representative of Germany.

The representative of the EC further clarified to Germany that the EC was exploring whether the BREXIT adjustment reserve might be a possibility of funding for Member States for fisheries control related to BREXIT.

The representative of Ireland inquired if EFCA had any arrangements or communication channels in place with the UK colleagues to manage what is coming in 2021.

EFCA ED answered that beyond the ongoing cooperation, mainly sharing data under the JDPs, EFCA does not have other communication with the UK in order not to undermine the discussions/negotiations taking place at the EC level. EFCA ED also clarified that once the agreement (or not) is reached, the situation would need to be assessed and the necessary arrangements would need to be put in place.

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

6. IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 30 OF THE CFP (INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION)

a. Working arrangement between DG MARE and EFCA as regards EFCA's international activities

The Head of Unit Coast Guard and International Programmes (HoU 3) explained that these revised working arrangements came from a recommendation of the last EFCA five years' evaluation. Last year, the Board discussed the need to update the existing working arrangements. This revised version was discussed and agreed between DG MARE DG and EFCA ED. It includes a multiannual strategy which is to be integrated in the EFCA SPD on a yearly basis. The working arrangements also describe the cooperation procedure for a better planning of EFCA activities. He concluded by indicating this revised document offered a good basis for the cooperation between the EC and EFCA on international related activities.

The Chair indicated the working arrangements need to be approved by the AB through a specific decision.

The Administrative Board approved by consensus the Working arrangement.

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Proposed action | Approval of the Working arrangements between DG MARE and EFCA as regards EFCA's international activities |
| Legal basis | Art. 32. Regulation (EU) 2019/473 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 March 2019 ¹ on the European Fisheries Control Agency |
| Decision | Approved by consensus |

b. EFCA / European Commission / EU Member States cooperation in the context of the International Dimension of the CFP and of the implementation of the EU IUU Regulation 2021

The representative of the EC presented an overview of the 2021 actions divided in five main areas, with few changes compared to last year:

1) Interventions in the framework of the Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and control working groups (WGs). This action encompasses NAFO, NEAFC, ICCAT, GFCM related activities.

2) Interventions in bilateral negotiations: The main activities in this area include the work undertaken under the Northern coastal states agreements and the EU-Norway and EU-Russia relations. This year, it also includes EU-UK relations (BREXIT) i.e. participation in possible future bilateral MCS fora, coordination of the workshops on risk assessment addressing BREXIT threats, organising and supervising future JDP patrols, assisting in the analysis and mapping of potential fisheries displacement and quota availability due to BREXIT.

3) Operational activities for the implementation of GFCM recommendations. This section groups activities with third countries in the international inspection scheme in the Strait of Sicily; a Multiannual Management Plan (MAP) for fisheries on turbot in the GFCM-GSA 29 (Black Sea), in particular contributing to the WG on establishing a catch documentation scheme; GFCM recommendations for MAPs in the Ionian and Levant seas through the development of control and inspection activities in cooperation with the relevant Member States; and GFCM recommendations for MAPs for small pelagic and demersal stocks in the Adriatic Sea - GSAs 17 and 18 (pilot projects).

4) Capacity building in the framework of Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements (SFPAs). The main activities in this area are those covered by the PESCAO programme: Participation of EFCA in joint control operations or in other relevant operations/missions approved in the context of PESCAO; specific capacity building in Gambia, Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau and Ivory Coast for inspectors (at sea and at port inspections, development of Standard Operating Procedures for Fishing Monitoring Centres/FMC). The strategy also prioritises missions for next year in the countries that have signed SFPAs with the EU. Besides, if resources are available, actions

¹ OJ L 83, 25.3.2019, p. 18.

could be carried out in Seychelles and Mauritius, as well as Madagascar; under the ECOFISH project.

5) Support to the fight against IUU fishing. This area covers the analysis of catch certificates from third countries, trainings of EU MS, capacity building in third countries, analysis of possible illegal fishing activities, direct interactions with third countries to assist the EC in dialogues with third countries. It also includes the involvement in FAO trainings on MCS / fight against IUU fishing in Third Countries in the framework of the PSMA. The PESCAO project is also included in the IUU chapter as well as the WestMed project “FIUUFRA” and the support to Algeria for the setting-up of a Vessel Monitoring System.

The representative of Ireland commented this was a very good and ambitious programme. He noted it was important to consider human resources available in EFCA to carry out these activities. In this regard, he asked how it was possible to determine priorities in case where EFCA was not in a position to reply positively to an EC request. The representative of the EC replied it had fair discussions with EFCA, and there has not been an issue in this regard up to now. If it was the case, it would be brought to the Board in a fair and transparent way.

The representative of Portugal pointed out that EFCA external actions should be undertaken under the authority of the Member States to avoid miscommunications problems and to comply with Article 5(5) of the Control Regulation. The representative of the EC replied it had no intention to “by-pass” MS on international relations. In contrast, the EC explained that MS were kept informed, in particular through this strategy document and the SPD.

The representative of Italy asked to modify page 2 of the document, concerning the involvement of third countries in JDPs. He proposed to replace JDPs by International Control Schemes. He underlined that JDPs were implemented by Member States.

The representative of the EC agreed with this comment, and confirmed the text would be modified accordingly.

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

7. ADOPTION OF THE SINGLE PROGRAMMING DOCUMENT CONTAINING THE MULTIANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2021 - 2025 AND ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2021 AND OF THE BUDGET AND THE ESTABLISHMENT PLAN OF THE EUROPEAN FISHERIES CONTROL AGENCY FOR YEAR 2021

EFCA ED presented the main features of the Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2021-2025 and Annual work programme for 2021.

The Chair clarified that all comments done by the EC have been reflected into the SPD, which was confirmed by EFCA ED, who presented its main features:

- A first draft version of the Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2021-2025 and the Annual work programme 2021 (hereinafter the SPD 2021) was adopted by the AB on 22 October 2019. The draft SPD 2021 was notified to the institutions in January 2020. The European Commission issued its written opinion on the EFCA's draft SPD 2021 on 30 June 2020.
- The SPD 2021 follows the multiannual priorities set up in the previous multiannual programming

- Following the European Commission written opinion, the Agency has amended the SPD 2021 accordingly. In particular, objectives 1 and 2 of the Annual Work Programme have been merged.
- A new chapter (30) has been added to the Budget structure of Title III. Taking into consideration the evolution of the expenditure in this Title, the ICT infrastructure costs have been moved under this chapter.
- The six strategic multiannual objectives were presented, as well as the four strategic areas and their relationship with the strategic multiannual objectives and the KPI.
- The operational objectives of the Annual Work Programme 2021 are:
 - Implementation of JDPs and assistance to the Member States and the Commission in EU and international waters
 - Promotion of a risk management based approach and compliance evaluation
 - Support the EU in the implementation of the external dimension of the CFP
 - To strengthen compliance through the implementation of EU international projects (e.g. PESCAO) as regards fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance
 - Improve capacities to implement fisheries control and support other coast guard functions
- The horizontal tasks of the Annual Work Programme 2021 are:
 - Promote a culture of compliance of the Common Fisheries Policy and foster the European Union values
 - Provide the EFCA Administrative Board with the capacity for achieving its responsibilities in governance and expertise
 - Ensure an effective dialogue at the level of the Advisory Councils through the Advisory Board
 - Ensure the Agency representation, cooperation, dialogue and transparency with other institutional bodies, EU agencies and third parties
 - Ensure the optimisation in the allocation and use of EFCA's resources in accordance with the principle of sound financial management and with the guarantee concerning the legality and regularity of the underlying transactions
 - Ensure the rationalisation, simplification, scalability and streamlining of EFCA's processes

There were no further comments and the SPD 2021 was adopted by consensus.

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Proposed action | Adoption of the Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2021-2025 and the Annual work programme for year 2021 of the European Fisheries Control Agency |
| Legal Basis | Art. 24, 32(2)(c) and 32(2)(d) of Regulation (EU) 2019/473, Art. 32 and 33 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. |

8. ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT SINGLE PROGRAMMING DOCUMENT CONTAINING THE MULTIANNUL WORK PROGRAMME 2022-2026 AND ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2022

The Deputy Head of Unit EU Waters and North Atlantic (DHoU 2) presented the draft Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2022 - 2026 and Annual work programme for 2022 (hereinafter the draft SPD 2022):

- The draft Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2022-2026 and Annual work programme for 2022 takes into consideration the Commission opinion on the draft Single Programming Document for 2021-2025 of 30 June 2020.
- The draft SPD 2022 acknowledges the new guidelines described in the Communication C(2020) 2297 for the year 2022-2026 and takes into account the results on key performance indicators of the Administrative Board Working Group and the recommendations expressed by the Internal Audit Service (IAS) on 21 December 2018.
- The Agency has enhanced the quality of the KPIs in limiting their number and reviewed and streamlined the objectives, results and outputs of both the Multiannual Programming as well as the Annual Work Programme.
- A direct link has been established between each multiannual objective and area of intervention.
- The objectives set in the Annual Work Programme were simplified.
- The multiannual objectives are
 1. Enhanced coordination of fisheries monitoring control and surveillance
 2. Promote compliance through an effective and harmonised application of Union inspection procedures
 3. Assist the EU in its international dimension in accordance with article 30 CFP Regulation
 4. Provide operational support to national authorities in Coast Guard functions
- The operational activities of the Annual Work Programme 2022 are:
 - Effective coordination of joint fisheries control operations
 - Development of methodologies and fisheries information systems in support of MCS activities
 - Development of methodologies and fisheries information systems in support of MCS activities
 - Support the EU in the implementation of the external dimension of the CFP
 - Strengthen compliance through the implementation of EU international projects as regards fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance
 - Support to fisheries control and other national authorities working in the field of Coast Guard functions
- The horizontal activities of the Annual Work Programme 2022 are:
 - Promote a culture of compliance of the Common Fisheries Policy and foster the European Union values
 - Ensure the smooth and secure functioning and availability of administrative and operational applications
 - Ensure sound management and efficiency in key governance and administrative processes

The representative of Spain requested additional explanation regarding the sustainable developments goals (SDG) referred to on page 8 of the draft SPD 2022.

EFCA ED explained that these goals are coming from the United Nations and were embedded since 2018 in the objectives of the EC. They are an overarching set of principles and concepts, of which EFCA has selected the more relevant ones for the Agency.

Additionally, the Spanish representative raised another point regarding the EU Cooperation on Coast Guard commenting that for them was very important that the actions taken by EFCA on this domain are coordinated with the Secretaría General de Pesca before taking contact with other national authorities, like the “Guardia Civil”.

The representative of Portugal intervened to agree with Spain and to reiterate that the actions particularly in regard to Coast Guard must always be articulated with the unique authority of Member States to avoid internal problems and to comply with article 5 point 5 of the Control Regulation.

EFCA ED thanked Spain and Portugal and fully agreed with both comments. The ED referred that this has been EFCA practice, as the Agency never took initiative without referring to both national

authorities, namely Direção-Geral de Recursos Naturais, Segurança e Serviços Marítimos (DGRM) for Portugal and Secretaría General de Pesca for Spain, which included specific meetings on Coast Guard cooperation.

There were no further comments and the draft SPD 2022 was adopted by consensus.

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Proposed action | Adoption of the draft Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2022-2026 and the Annual work programme for year 2022 of the European Fisheries Control Agency |
| Legal Basis | Art. 24 and 32(2)(c) of Regulation (EU) 2019/473, Art. 32 and 33 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 |

9. STAFF REGULATION IMPLEMENTING RULES

The Head of Unit Resources (HoU 1) explained that EFCA proposes to apply by analogy COM Decision C(2020) 1559 of 16 March 2020 amending Decision C(2013) 9051 of 16 December 2013 on leave. The purpose of this decision is to cater, in the light of developments in reproductive medicine, laws on procreation and parenthood and the societal context, for some cases of parenthood where the conditions for maternity or adoption leave to be granted were not met when a newborn child arrived in a household.

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

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Proposed action | Decision on the adoption of General implementing provisions to the Staff Regulations |
| Legal Basis | Art. 28 and 32(2)(h) of Regulation (EU) 2019/473 Art. 110 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union and the Conditions of employment of other servants of the European Union |
| Decision | Adopted by consensus |

The HoU 1 also introduced the following decisions that will come up for adoption soon:

- Model decision for agencies on conduct of administrative inquiries and disciplinary proceedings.
- Application by analogy of Commission decision (as amended) on transfer of pensions rights.

Both decisions are to be adopted either by written procedure or during the next AB meeting.

The following decisions are under development and the Board will be informed in due time of the related actions required:

- Prevention of harassment
- Absences as a result of sickness or accident
- Teleworking: this is especially important due to the experience with the pandemic.

The HoU 1 concluded by communicating that the agency is also working on the review of the EFCA conflict of interest policy for staff.

10. Next IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan

- a) Including exchange of views with the Internal Audit Service (IAS)

Mr Van der Zee, Director at the IAS, presented the next IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan 2021-2023, which was divided in three aspects:

1. IAS Risk Assessment Methodology

In 2020, an in-depth risk assessment was performed by IAS in conformance with the International Standards for the Professional Practise of Internal Auditing. As result of the risk assessment an audit plan was established for the period 2021-2023.

The IAS risk assessment focussed on seven auditable entities, covering both the administrative, financial and operational activities:

- Procurement and grants
- Financial management
- ICT
- HR management
- Administration and support
- Governance and strategic planning and programming (including monitoring and reporting)
- Communication and stakeholder relations.

The IAS work was performed in April 2020 and in line with the new methodology in force in IAS the audit plan is focused on the main inherent risks, with high impact and likelihood, taking into account that a risk likelihood may also decrease if robust controls are in place.

2. IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan 2021-2023

Based on the desk review and interviews held with the Agency's management, IAS selected the following three audit topics based upon the identification of the underlying high inherent risks.

- Cooperation between EFCA and DG MARE on activities related to Article 30 of the CFP (external dimension)
- Procurement and contract management
- Human Resources management and ethics

Depending on the results of the annual risk assessment update and taking into account the main risks faced by EFCA, as identified by the IAS, the 2021-2023 strategic internal audit plan may be adapted at that time by either planning additional audit engagements or by replacing one of the prospective audits. Considering the abovementioned high risks, the IAS identified the following reserve audit topic:

- Cooperation between EFCA and DG MARE in the operational resilience area

3. Status of past IAS audit recommendations

The representative of the IAS, Mr Ilian Komitski, presented the topic and mentioned there were no open very important or critical recommendations for EFCA.

From 2018 audit on planning and budgeting, three recommendations are submitted and are ready for review. One recommendation is open, it was due in 2nd quarter 2020 and has been extended to the end of 2020. All these recommendations are rated important.

From 2019 Audit on Implementation and Assessment of Joint Deployment Plans, one recommendation is implemented. Three recommendations are open and the implementation date has not elapsed.

The representative of the EC alluded to the audit plan related to the external dimension of EFCA activities, and enquired the representative of the IAS what he meant by core operations. She highlighted that, from the EC's perspective and legal situation, it is clear that the external dimension is part of the core operations of EFCA. She also quoted the scope of the CFP and the fact that control fisheries system applies to the entire EU fleet, including fleets operating in external waters. In addition, Articles 3 and 4 of EFCA's founding regulation provide a very strong external dimension. She referred to the working arrangements between DG MARE and EFCA for external dimension, which showed the potential scope for cooperation in the international dimension and added that requests are always discussed on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration the specific constraints of the agency. The representative concluded that in the EC's view, the external dimension is part of the cooperation and is reflected in EFCA's budget allocation.

The representative of Ireland agreed with the EC as to there is a solid legal basis for the work that is being done with regard to external fisheries. He remarked that at the AB level the debate along the years has been the impact it has on the resources available to the agency, particularly when the agency was classified as a "cruising speed" agency. The AB has been trying to support the good functional of the agency. He clarified there was no doubt on the mandate of the agency to do the entire complex work, but the concern is the capacity issue.

The Chair commented that the issue of international activities of EFCA has been a recurrent subject of discussion in the AB meetings. The planning for the months ahead take into account the IAS assessment that there is a potential risk in this area. Considering the basic regulation of EFCA, it is clear that the mission of the agency includes both internal and also international activities. The tasks in both, the first and the second articles of the founding regulation are tasks for the agency, with the effect that an arbitrage has to be constantly made on what assignments the EFCA should focus on. The Chair added that it would be an erroneous supposition to think that international activities are not part of the core tasks. He concluded stating that following up the work EFCA is doing is not a major problem and underlined the importance of having outside eyes examining what they are doing.

The representative of the IAS, Mr Van der Zee, apologised if he misrepresented the situation and clarified that what he meant was that international activities are part of a different part of the core business. He reported that it is undoubtedly the task of EFCA and DG MARE to identify how to allocate resources the optimal way. The function of the audit is to examine how this allocation and the planning are carried out. He felt comforted that the issue had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

The representative of the IAS, Mr Ilian Komitski, further added that the risk assessment is meant to identify the areas where there are high risks, so that the EFCA and the AB get assurance. At the time of the audit the auditors have an extensive preliminary service to define the scope in an appropriate way and believed that this topic would be an important source of assurance for the AB.

The Chair thanked the representatives of the IAS for their participation in the meeting and closed the agenda item.

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

11. Administrative Board's recommendations following the Five-Year Independent External Evaluation of EFCA (2012-2016)

a) State of play of the recommendations implementation

The HoS P&C presented the general status of each of the 11 recommendations showing the degree of implementation through different actions:

The representative of Italy commented on Recommendation n° 4 ("Ways should be explored to extend JDPs in context wider than applied currently") and specifically on the paragraph reading "due to the current situation linked to the COVID'19 situation, it is not possible to involve third countries in JDPs". He observed that the reference should be made to pilot projects, not to JDPs.


The representative of Ireland remarked the good progress made on the recommendations and questioned if they had the effect and the impact that it was hoped for.

The Chair commented on the pertinency of the observations made and reminded that the whole purpose was to make things better. He pointed out that, since the current 5-year evaluation is coming to an end, in one of the next AB meetings members, a reflection should be made on what improvements have taken place, if the feedback is positive or if they think there is no added-value.

b) KPI Working Group

The Deputy HoU 2 presented the outcomes of the work done by the AB KPI Working Group (WG), which was established in February 2020, in relation to recommendation 9 "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".

The purpose was to establish 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 (KPIs). The methodology proposed is based on metrics. The multiannual KPIs developed are based on the main areas of EFCA intervention aligned with the SPD 2022-2026:

- 
- Operational coordination
 - Assistance to cooperation
 - International dimension
 - Cooperation in Coast Guard

Under each area of intervention, several sub-indicators are proposed addressing the main activities (elements) of each area. The KPI of each area is the result of the outcomes of the sub-indicators of the respective area. When possible, the proposed sub-indicators address activities that mainly express EFCA performance, although there are a few sub-indicators of which the outcome reflects Member States' performance. She further explained that the KPIs should be used for a yearly monitoring of the evolution and be presented in the Annual Report. The working group recommends to reassess the sub-indicators in case there is a change in EFCA's mandate or if there are other external factors.

The DHoU 2 finished her intervention by thanking the rest of the WG members for their contribution and engagement.

The representative of the EC also thanked the WP colleagues, and added that the KPIs have been the subject of discussion for years. The working group started to work in February 2020 coinciding with the start of the pandemic, making necessary the use of IT tools to communicate, and continued during the Summer.

The representative of Ireland endorsed the EC comments. He commented that the WG tried to have quantitative data for an evaluation and that part of the discussions focused on trying to imagine what it would be like if the agency did not exist, recalling the times where there was no framework for dealing with infringements. He felt there is a huge added value from EFCA's work, support and technical competences and invited the delegates to reflect on how good the fisheries world is with the agency in place.

The representative of Denmark conveyed it was an interesting document and requested more details on the compliance evaluation. It has been said that it would not depend on the performance of Member states and enquired how it can be avoided when you have to compare compliance and aim at a level playing field.

The DHoU2 concretised that it was said that, as far as possible, they would try not to be dependent on MS. In the particular case of the sub-indicator on "compliance evaluation", the element to be measured is to conduct a compliance evaluation, not the result of it. The sub-indicator aims to reflect the added value of having on the "EU table" the information on what is the state of compliance in relation to a given threat.

The representative of Italy corroborated the reasonings of the members of the WG and clarified that it is a live document to be improved and all comments and proposals from the AB are welcome.

c) Next five-year independent external evaluation of the EFCA

EFCA's Accounting Officer (AccO) recalled the principles laid out in Article 48 of EFCA Founding Regulation. This article presents two aspects:

- The Administrative Board shall commission an independent external evaluation:
 - ❖ Within 5 years of the creation of the agency and;
 - ❖ Every five years thereafter. Consequently, even though not specified at which moment within the five years, the first evaluation sets the clock for any following evaluation.
- The Administrative Board shall issue specific terms of reference in agreement with the EC, following consultations with the parties involved.

As regards the next five-year evaluation (2017-2021), the AccO explained that EFCA had planned to start the drafting of the terms of reference (ToR) in 2020 and to present it to the AB still in 2020. The EC stated they considered it important to take into account year 2021 fully. The EC believed that adopting a ToR in 2020 would be premature and proposed to sign the contract with the new evaluator not earlier than the 3rd quarter of 2021, which means the ToR would be adopted beginning of 2021. He further mentioned that adhering to the proposal of the EC might be perceived as a deviation of the timelines of the previous evaluations and as not complying with Article 48. If nonetheless it is decided to follow the deviation, then the AB should endorse it. A decision is needed as soon as possible in order to plan the internal processes for the procurement.

The AccO presented the schedule followed for the previous evaluations and the two timelines for the next evaluation proposed by the EFCA and by the EC. Going along with the timeline proposed by the EC would delay the holding of the AB seminar to the last quarter of 2022.

The ED reiterated that if there is a deviation of Article 48, it has to be endorsed by the AB and it has to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

The Chair commented that there were relatively slight discrepancies in the planning of the work of the new evaluation. He called for the need to find a reasonable timetable to organise the work and to agree at an early stage on a timetable to avoid misunderstandings and unnecessary delays.

The representative of the EC stated that there were different points of view on how things should be scheduled. It had been agreed that the evaluation should cover a period of 5 years. Considering that the last evaluation covered years 2012-2016, the full five years should cover 2017-2021. The EC fully agreed that the evaluation should be commissioned in 2021 but they would like to ensure the ToR allow to cover the data of 2021, in which case, the call can only be possible after the end of 2021. It is possible for the EC to start working in the ToR before the end of 2020 but the ToR should be an item for discussion in the next AB meeting. The representative of the EC further added that, if the AB decides on the ToR, the contract could be signed during 2021 and the consultant could start working in 2021, making sure that all data for 2021 is processed. She continued by stating that it is in the interest of all parties to have an evaluation report of high quality and, consequently, the contractor needs sufficient time to process and analyse all data relevant for the report. The representative of the EC concluded that it was possible to find a schedule that also caters for the legal requirements.

EFCA ED stated that the issue signified a potential deviation from the rules and, in such case, it fell under the responsibility of the AB. Nevertheless, he remarked that the agency would try its best to encompass 2021 year exercise and would start drafting the ToR so it is ready for discussion during the next AB meeting.

The Chair commented that with either proposal, EFCA's or EC's, he did not see a contradiction with Article 48. He observed that none of the parties wanted to delay the start of the process. He fully understood the position of the EC. As for the timetable, it should not be so tight when it comes to the finalisation of the report, to avoid the risk that the last of the five years is not as diligently covered as the previous four years.

The Chair suggested the following approach:

- First presentation of the ToR: 1st quarter 2021
- Adoption by the AB during the AB meeting: 2nd quarter 2021
- Signature of the contract: 3rd quarter 2021
- Draft final report: 3rd quarter 2022
- AB Seminar: October 2022

The EC agreed on this schedule.

EFCA ED commented that his concern was to avoid any issue arising in the discharge of EFCA's budget for 2020 and 2021. He considered it was good to have had the discussion and to have the timeline decided by the AB.

The representative of Germany stated that she would like the matter to be discussed by the AB in April 2021. She questioned about the two quarters gap between the final adoption of the ToR and the signature of the contract and asked if this was related to the call for tender.

The AccO replied that the gap of the two quarters is because the ToR have to be finalised before launching the call, this will imply a minimum of 3 months that could go to 4-5 months for the internal preparation.

There were no other comments. The Chair read again his suggested timeline and closed the agenda item.

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

12. IMPROVING WORKING PRACTICES

a. Remote Administrative Board meetings

EFCA ED commented that the item is to offer reflection to the AB and to collect their feedback on how this type of meeting can be improved. He mentioned that, for instance, at this meeting, the voting platform was only used for the election of the Chair and Deputy Chair but it would be possible to use it extensively if the AB so decides. Their rules of procedure allow to hold the AB meeting online and maybe, depending on the feedback of the AB, there can be more online AB meetings in the future.

The Chair remarked that due to the worldwide situation in 2020, the April's meeting was cancelled and it was chosen instead to carry out written procedures. As regards the October meeting, it was decided to hold it online. He reflected that doing only written procedures is not the ideal practice. Online meetings are a possibility and felt positively surprised on how smoothly the meeting went. However, the Chair was of the opinion that it is important, and in the spirit of the Founding Regulation, as a general rule, that the meetings take place at the seat of the agency, in Vigo.

The representative of Ireland pointed out that today's meeting turned out to be a success, with nice side-dialogue from the AB members. He praised the support received from EFCA Service desk and the pre-meeting training, which went very well. Still, to his belief, the online meeting is second best, as it cannot replace the benefit of meeting people and exchanging views with them. In his experience as member of the working group he would like to underline the value of on-line systems. The representative concluded by stating that, in terms of technology, it was a good day both for the AB and for the agency.

The representative of Germany supported the comments of the Chair and the representative of Ireland and added that, having the gathering in Vigo, gives an important opportunity to have discussions during the meeting breaks.

The Chair acknowledged the work of EFCA IT team and complimented them for their support and patience during the organisation of the meeting to make sure the meeting runs smoothly.

b. Access to AB documents (observers)

EFCA ED stated that the rules of procedure consider mostly the AB members, the alternates and the observers. It has been noticed that, considering the workload of AB members, sometimes they would have appreciated to have another person to prepare the documents and facilitate their work. Therefore, the ED suggested to offer the possibility to access the documents by an assistant, i.e. someone working closely with the AB member or alternate (a civil servant working in the same department) and bound by the principle of need-to-know basis and secrecy linked to the documents of the AB. EFCA ED added that if the AB agrees, the rules of procedure might be amended to encompass this possibility and concluded mentioning that, while the rules of procedure are not amended, an endorsement of the AB could be possible.

The Chair agreed that some delegations have other people working with them to prepare the documents and there have been requests for some of them to access documents. He felt uncertain that this topic would require a big discussion or change in the rules of procedure.

The Chair subscribed to the idea put forward by EFCA ED to have an understanding in this issue so that access to documents to observers should not be excluded, with only one reserve: this flexibility should be exclusively open to people who support the delegates in the preparation of their work and belong to the same administration.

There were no further 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. |
|------------------------------------|---|

13. **AOB**

- Date for next AB meeting: the Chair recommended EFCA and EC to agree on a date.
- Annual assessment of the ED: following the nomination of Ms Veits as Chair of the AB, a new EC member for the annual assessment of the ED has to be designated; in case of timing constraints, this could be done through a written procedure.

Coming to the end of his Chairmanship, the Chair thanked everyone for the excellent cooperation, interesting discussions and tolerance towards him during his Chairmanship. He alluded to the challenge it means to be at the head of the AB and to strike the balance between supervising and giving freedom to people to do their work. He commented there can be a degree of friendly and constructive tension between the agency and the mother DG, which is natural and has been dealt effectively each time.

The representative of the EC complimented the Chair for the role he assumed flawlessly throughout the six years of his Chairmanship. She praised his truly outstanding and dedicated function of Chair, marked by his neutrality, objectivity and fairness. She concluded her intervention by saying he had been the perfect Chair and will be missed in the years to come.

The Chair closed the meeting by thanking the ED for his constructive cooperation along the years and EFCA staff for their tolerance and patience dealing with his requests and for the good organisation of the meetings.

ANNEX I

List of participants to the online meeting of the Administrative Board of the EFCA Vigo, 14 October 2020

| | Members | Alternates |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (BE) Belgium: | Mr Geert DEVOGEL | - |
| (BG) Bulgaria: | Mr Dimitar VALKOV | - |
| (CZ) Czech Rep.: | - | Mr Jacob MORICKY |
| (DK) Denmark: | Ms Nanna MØLLER | - |
| (DE) Germany : | Ms Melanie SEIBERT | - |
| (EE) Estonia: | Mr Indrek ULLA | - |
| (IE) Ireland: | Mr Andrew KINNEEN | Ms Susan STEELE |
| (EL) Greece: | Ms Theoni PAPADOPOULU | - |
| (ES) Spain: | Mr Juan Ignacio GANDARIAS SERRANO | Mr Borja VELASCO TUDURI |
| (FR) France: | - | Ms Bérengère LORANS |
| (HR) Croatia ² : | Mr Mario SKORJANEC | Ms Ivana FURAC |
| (IT) Italy: | Mr Riccardo 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 A. CALLUS | Mr Marvin SAGUNA |
| (NL) Netherlands: | Ms Carian POSTHUMUS MEIJES | Mr Albert A. 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: | - | - |
| (SK) Slovakia: | Mr Jan SUKOVSKY | - |
| (FI) Finland: | Mr Harri KUKKA | Mr Ali LINDAHL |
| (SE) Sweden: | Mr Niclas TÖRNELL | - |
| <u>European Commission:</u> | | |
| | Mr Reinhard PRIEBE (Chair) | - |
| | - | - |
| | Ms Veronika VEITS ³ | - |
| | - | - |
| | - | - |
| | Ms Francesca ARENA ⁴ | Ms Manuela MUSELLA |
| | | Ms Marta MOYA DIAZ |

Advisory Board representative:

Mr José Manuel FERNANDEZ BELTRAN (PEL AC)

Observers:

Ms Sarah R. VITIELLO-FERRARA (European Commission)

² Proxy from Slovenia (SI)

³ Proxy from Commission (Mr C. Economou)

⁴ Proxy from Commission (Ms M. Kirchner).

EFCA⁵:

Office of the Executive Director

Mr Pascal SAVOURET (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 Eva MADARIAGA (Administrative Assistant Accountancy)

Unit Resources and IT (Unit 1)

Mr Niall MCHALE (Head of Unit)

Ms Rieke ARNDT (Head of Sector HR and Legal)

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 Fabio CAROCCI (Head of Sector - Risk Management and Evaluation)

Unit Coast Guard and International Programmes (Unit 3)

Mr Pedro GALACHE (Head of Unit)

Mr Vytautas LUKAS (Deputy Head of Unit)

Mr Alexandre KEMPF (Head of Sector - Training and IUU)

⁵ Staff attending all the agenda items.

ANNEX II



Administrative Board

Agenda of the 34th meeting of the Administrative Board of the EFCA on 14 October 2020

09h00 – 13h30
15h00 – 17h00

(D=decision; I=Information)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Approval of the draft agenda | D |
| 2. Election of the Chair | D |
| 3. Election of the Deputy Chair | D |
| 4. Ongoing recruitment of the future Executive Director | D |
| a. Designation of an EFCA Administrative Board (AB) representative member as observer in the Preselection Panel | |
| 5. Information from the Executive Director | I |
| a. Including discussion on JDP NS and WW mitigation measures | |
| 6. Implementation of Article 30 of the CFP (International Dimension) | |
| a. Working arrangements between DG MARE and EFCA as regards EFCA's international activities | D |
| b. EFCA / European Commission / EU Member States cooperation in the context of the International Dimension of the CFP and of the implementation of the EU IUU Regulation 2021 | |
| 7. Adoption of the Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2021 - 2025 and Annual work programme for 2021 and of the Budget and the Establishment plan of the European Fisheries Control Agency for year 2021 | D |
| 8. Adoption of the draft Single Programming Document containing the Multiannual work programme 2022-2026 and Annual work programme for 2022 | D |
| Lunch break | |
| 9. Staff Regulation implementing rules | D |

10. Next IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan

I

- a. Including exchange of views with the Internal Audit Service

11. Administrative Board's recommendations following the Five-Year Independent External Evaluation of EFCA (2012-2016)

I/D

- a. State of play of the recommendations implementation
- b. KPI Working Group
- c. Next five year independent external evaluation of the EFCA

12. Improving working practices

- a. Remote Administrative Board meetings
- b. Access to AB documents (observers)

I/D

13. AOB

Reinhold Paul