



DRAFT MINUTES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ghent | 03 July 2024

1. Welcome and introductions

The Chair welcomed all participants to the meeting. No apologies were received in advance of the meeting. The Chair proposed to modify the order of the agenda and hold the ExCom Chair elections after the dialogue with DG MARE. Dirk Van Guyze agreed to postpone his presentation on the work of the MSG.

Action points from the last meeting (20 March 2024, online)

1	Review new position on JR on squid and evaluate if updated AC advice is needed Advice submitted on 29 April
2	Fishers of the Future -Secretariat to follow up regarding AC reaction potentially with other ACs in collaboration with Alexandra Philippe as NWWAC representative at this initiative Joint AC letter submitted on 27 May
3	Secretariat to carry out an evaluation of the anniversary event. Done, limited responses, overall satisfaction good
4	Secretariat to send reminder all members to contribute to drafting of the Year 20 Work Programme by 12 April Email sent 21/03
5	Secretariat to send reminder for NWWAC Chair nominations Email sent on 06/03
6	Management Team to discuss emergency measures should no nominations be received. CHARM 08 April
7	WG 2 to follow up on Celtic Sea whiting recovery In WG 2

2. Approval of action points from the Working Groups

Please see all action points from Working Groups on [these slides](#).

One action point to follow up on the Commission's response on the AC letter on technical measures in the Celtic Sea was added to the list for Working Group 2.

Patrick Murphy commented that he hopes that the Commission will take on board importance of considering environmental impacts on fisheries, since despite the good effort of fishers there seems to be other factors at play affecting fish populations and it is important that they are understood.



The action points from all Working Groups were approved.

3. Dialogue with DG MARE – Fabrizio Donatella, Director MARE C

The Chair welcomed Director Donatella who attended the meeting in person and expressed members' appreciation for his continued engagement with this AC. He mentioned a number of topics on which the AC would appreciate update and views by Donatella:

- Work carried out by DG MARE in relation to briefing the next Commissioner
- CFP evaluation, timeline and AC involvement
- Fishing Opportunities 2026 and preparation by DG MARE for the upcoming EU-UK bilaterals
- State of Play Marine Action Plan
- Fishers of the Future Initiative
- NWWAC anniversary event and report
- timeline for CFP evaluation and direct meeting with AC members as promised by Valerie Tankink during COM/Secretariats meeting

Donatella felt it is important to keep close interactions with the NWWAC and expressed appreciation for the work of the AC which is valuable and helpful for colleagues who benefit from advice and the exchange of views. He introduced Thomas Brégeon, Deputy Head of Unit C5, part of the team negotiating with Coastal States and Norway and new C5 contact point for the NWWAC and other ACs.

Donatella emphasised that the ACs are essential for DG MARE due to their wide range of experience and representativity, which makes these bodies unique. He added that the NWWAC presents a lot of activity and initiatives not just supporting the Commission in its work but providing important views about the future in terms of negotiations and management of very complex issues in the NWW area.

In relation to the preparation for a new Commissioner, Donatella explained that in the next few weeks more information should be available with confirmation of the new President of the Commission, the structure, etc. *“As far as we are concerned, aspects related to the CFP (ongoing evaluation, external dimension, blue economy content) and everything related to implementation of previous commitments is part of our preparation for the future Commissioner”* he said. The implementation of the CFP is at the forefront of every discussion. He explained that hearings at Parliament will likely take place at a challenging time for DG MARE, coinciding with fishing opportunities negotiations. He assured participants that once more clarity has been received on nominations and how the Commission will be structured, the ACs will be informed.

Regarding the CFP evaluation timeline and AC input, Donatella explained that this is a key element in preparation of the new Commission. He added that DG MARE is launching an evaluation of the CFP regulation, linked to a number of ongoing initiatives, such ex-post evaluation of EMFF, mid-term evaluation of EMFAF, evaluation of the Landing Obligation. There will be a study in September to support the evaluation of the CFP. Everything ever produced or communicated on the CFP by the Commission will be taken into account in this study. He also referred to the Fishers of the Future study expected for the end of 2024. Donatella added that the Commission has also requested a study on the management of EU fishing capacity to understand the current state of EU fleet, drivers regarding its development and challenges. He encouraged the AC to organise a dedicated CFP session with DG MARE to have a dialogue on the topic.



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

Donatella then referred to the Commission's Communication on the state of the stock describing the approach to set fishing opportunities, as well as the preparation of the EU-UK bilateral discussions. *"We invite the NWWAC to share perspectives on the state of stocks and reply to the public consultation running until the end of August."* The fishing opportunities in the NWW are subject to consultation with the UK, with only 2 stocks in the West of Ireland that are EU only with a multiannual TAC. The EU-UK consultations are expected to start in the week of 21 October. A dedicated meeting is being organised on 23 September to confirm consultation dates. DG MARE has also set up a meeting on 05 July with all ACs to discuss the new ICES advice. Donatella commented on the extremely challenging situation in the Celtic and Irish Seas in terms of the scientific advice, which has decreased for many stocks. The Commission will push to use the flexibility provided by the multiannual plans, but this strategy might not always work with the UK. He also pointed out the high risk of chokes. *"We will have to see how to build on previous practices, such as the bycatch TAC, but the legal framework is evolving, and it needs to be taken into consideration."*

He mentioned the good results of the Specialised Committee on Fisheries due to very good interaction with the UK allowing to achieve positive outcomes. The SCF has a heavy agenda and wide range of commitments, becoming an extremely busy forum. *"We have proven that this is a well-functioning body with the need for permanent technical support and scientific elements. There is a great amount of energy and resources needed for the functioning of this body. We are discovering elements that had not been anticipated before that now need to discuss,"* said Donatella.

Regarding UK MPAs and FMPs, Donatella highlighted that AC advice on FMPs is crucial, as 43 are in the pipeline. Non-quota stocks fisheries have become increasingly relevant particularly following the implementation of these FMPs. *"We need to try and anticipate the work so we can be ready for this challenging situation. We need to have data and precise information about activities. We need dialogue to understand where activities are actually impacted."* The quality of information is becoming even more critical for management of MPAs.

The trilateral consultations with Norway, which are relevant for haddock and cod in the West of Scotland, are likely to start in early November and happen in parallel with the EU-UK consultations.

Regarding the Marine Action Plan, Donatella explained that the Commission organised the second meeting of the Special Group to discuss the roadmaps from MS. 10 roadmaps were received and are being analysed.

On the Fishers of the Future project, Donatella commented that this tries to provide an outlook of the sector until 2050, looking beyond current challenges and needs. The aim is to understand how the profession is likely to evolve and trajectory of fishing industry, operating in context of growing blue economy.

Dominic Rihan enquired about who will be taking over from Erik Lindebo, who was the DG MARE officer leading on the CFP evaluation and has left the team. He then asked about the Commission's views and calendar for the review of the TCA. Regarding the Fishers of the Future initiative and the Communication on the state of the stocks, he felt that there was an underlying agenda pitching big boats versus small boats. Rihan highlighted that this message is dangerous, the focus should be on the industry overall, which is facing many challenges.



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

Donatella replied that he would not be in a position to comment on Lindebo's replacement as the recruitment process is ongoing. Regarding post 2026, he said that DG MARE has been preparing actively to be aware of all activities in waters that might be involved in a change of regime with the UK from 2026 onwards, including work in terms of legal assessments and technical considerations. The Commission is not explicitly engaging with the UK on this due to election times in the UK and their request to temporarily pause detailed discussions, but the issue has been mentioned at political level. He expected work and discussions to start in the last quarter of 2024. He concluded that the point on the Fishers of the Future study will be taken into consideration.

Commenting on the FMPs, John Lynch felt that even if these plans are still at an early stage with only minor adjustments implemented, they are already impacting fishers on the ground. He added that it is important to maintain EU selectivity ambitions but at the same time it is imperative that these are aligned with the UK as soon as possible. *"Having FMPs on one side and the CFP on the other is going to develop into a competition that could go very wrong. We should have a joint approach with the UK,"* said Lynch. Regarding the evaluation of the LO, he felt that an in-depth evaluation is really needed to make the most effective use of it.

Donatella replied that DG MARE is fully aware of the difficulties in operating with diverging technical measures and felt it is important to see where the implementation of the TCA can be different in the future. He agreed on the LO that an evaluation is needed of what is happening and how various fishing practices are affected.

Referring to VMEs, Jean-Marie Robert stated that work by STECF is ongoing and stakeholders are waiting for more information on what can be done and what can be managed. *"However, we also received information that some sites have already been closed according to the legal basis. In this case, if we could provide evidence showing that we could protect VMS, then we could revise the initial list."* He commented that many things seem to be in the pipeline, and clarification regarding the calendar and the methodology for dialogue is necessary, adding that some areas are now closed but the second ICES advice from 2023 says they could be reopened. *"This is a very sensitive issues for fishers involved and still waiting for the final decision."*

Donatella assured Robert that clarification on timeframe and methodology will be provided soon. Coming back to some areas being closed following the first implementation process that could potentially be reopened, he stated that the review is taking more time than expected. A more thorough socio-economic analysis is necessary to include more elements in order to envisage specific management measures for these areas. *"We will have to go through the MS Committee. Any kind of revision has to be taken through the process and we have to be sure that the potential new proposals would have approval by the Committee. We need to consider the interest and wishes of stakeholders."* In the meantime, if some cases/areas can be dealt with through joint recommendations, MS Regional Groups should work on that.

Commenting on the ICES advice and the cuts for next year, and specifically referring to hake, Murphy stated that the sector is facing a massive decrease in vessels and opportunities. Other severe potential challenges for the sector come from displacement from MPAs and ORE and from the renegotiation of the TCA. He urged Donatella to engage on the issue of the watchkeepers certification, as it is difficult for people to get trained. The future of fishers looks very challenging, with people that have invested huge amounts of money in vessels while it is becoming more and more difficult to make an income. *"There are more aspects we need to look at other than scientific*



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

advice when we consider the setting of fishing opportunities." The EMFAF programme needs to be discussed and he appreciated the mid-term evaluation exercise. He supported Rihan's point on the Fishers of the Future.

The Chair added that among the aspects to be reflected in the advice on fishing opportunities there is the recommendation for the Commission to look beyond the headline advice. He also felt that two of the items mentioned by Donatella, i.e. the evaluation of the EU fleet and the capacity management evaluation, should be kept on the AC agenda.

Donatella replied that certification is usually not an area DG MARE was traditionally very active in, but it is very important and the impact it can have on the ability of the sector to attract crew is essential. *"We need to guarantee we can do the maximum to secure the environment in which the sector operates in terms of regulation and protection, looking at how we can look ahead in terms of providing more security to the sector"*. He noted the point on the headline scientific advice, which remains the rule. However, he confirmed that the Commission will look into the content of the whole advice when preparing the negotiating strategy.

Durk van Tuinen referred to election time in the UK and to the plan of the Labour party calling for a full ban of bottom fisheries in MPAs. *"We need to prepare for 178 MPAs in UK waters to be closed, it will have a huge impact on EU fishers, and we need to act on that point already."*

Donatella confirmed that those elements are being examined. The Commission will have to establish a good working relationship with whoever will win the elections and that is what they are preparing for.

José Beltran referred to the many online surveys on different fisheries policies/management issues open to the public opinion where any citizen can participate. While it is granted that citizens need to have their voice, the general public's opinion needs to be weighted against the opinion of professionals who know exactly what the challenges are and how things work in the sector. Regarding the LO, he expressed his belief that the design was not correct from the start, the sector was not involved and as a result a very challenging situations arose, where it is almost impossible for fishers to comply with the LO. He felt reflexion on this is necessary and that changes need to be made accordingly. Beltran then mentioned the presentation on the Nature Restoration Law by DG ENV during the meeting of the Horizontal Working Group. In his view, this law has a very general approach and when addressing the marine environment most of the measures seem to evolve around the fisheries sector. Regarding VMEs, there are gears that can only be used in VME areas and they are not negative for VMEs. He added that there is no evidence that these ecosystems have been disrupted in the course of operations involving bottom set longlines. The closures proposed and adopted have created a set of circumstances leading to the fleet moving their operations elsewhere, their gears have changed and they are now focusing on areas where other gears are used, which could be negative for stocks in those areas as the fishing effort is increasing. Finally, he felt that the Fishers of the Future project does not address generational renewal properly and that, as things currently stand, there is no good perspective for the future of this profession and the sector as young people are not interested. *"It is difficult to continue operating in our companies even in the short term. We want to keep healthy habitats and ecosystems, we want a future for our industry, but it is increasingly difficult to continue working. We should rethink the sector and its importance to society"*, he concluded.

Responding on the VME topic, Donatella agreed that the concerns raised by Beltran and Robert need



to continue to be addressed. In order to propose a revision of the Implementing Act, a more precise picture of the current situation is needed. There is a very precise legal framework as a basis for this work, making no distinction between gears. *“We are doing our best in this revision work with scientists. We need to have all the elements before a decision can be taken,”* he concluded.

ACTION: Members to send questions related to Director Donatella’s intervention to the Secretariat for follow up with DG MARE

4. Election of the NWWAC Chair – Chair of the Evaluation Committee

Mo Mathies explained that, regarding the nomination of ExCom members, there is a rollover from last year in terms of members organisations, but there are changes in representatives for the next mandate for KFO, Nederlandse Vissersbond, CNPMEM and ANOP. Nominated members will be appointed by the General Assembly in September. The General Assembly will also appoint ExCom vicechairs.

The Chair explained that the Secretariat initiated the call for nominations for the position of NWWAC Chair in January. Three applications were received by the deadline in March. All three were ratified the members of the ExCom to go forward into the application stage.

An Evaluation Committee was subsequently approved by this ExCom consisting of the current Chair from Belgium, Irene Prieto, the Spanish ExCom Vice-Chair, Geert Meun, Dutch ExCom member, Conor Nolan, retired since 2018 from his position as NWWAC Executive Secretary, and Sean O’Donoghue, Chair of the Pelagic AC.

Following receipt of all applications, the Evaluation Committee reviewed in detail the responses and virtually met on 14 June to discuss not only the evaluation but various concerns which had been raised during this procedure.

- Appointment of Chair by consensus: This is a requirement under Annex 3 of the Common Fisheries Policy, Art 2 d: “Each Advisory Council shall designate a chairperson by consensus. The chairperson shall act impartially.”
- NWWAC procedure: The NWWAC procedure used was developed with this consensus requirement in mind, as well as taking into account that this is a paid position. Applications were assessment in line with procurement rules to evaluate the expertise put forward by the candidates as well as their financial proposal. This procedure also identifies that in the case where this Executive Committee cannot reach consensus, a new procedure must be initiated which must disregard all previous results.
- Geographic spread: a question arose regarding the geographic spread of NWWAC ExCom Chair, NWWAC President and seat of NWWAC Secretariat. When the AC was established in 2005, members needed to find their feet regarding collaboration and cooperation and at the time, various roles were spread across various Member States. Over the years, the AC has matured so that with the review of the Rules of Procedure in 2021, the roles of NWWAC ExCom Chair and NWWAC President were amalgamated into NWWAC Chair. Now coming into its 20th year of operation, members have grown to know and trust each other. The Secretariat operates neutrally in the interest of all members with its staff being German and Italian.



That said, the Evaluation Committee has unanimously found that John Lynch is the best candidate to take over as Chair come October. The Chair invited John Lynch to make a presentation to the assembled ExCom members.

Lynch thanked the Chair and the Evaluation Committee for their assessment and final decision. He recalled his first involvement with the AC in 2009 in Madrid, where he spoke about the management of skates and rays. Since then, he has remained committed to this work, demonstrating the Council's perseverance in addressing issues until effective advice is developed. Coming from a family fishing business, Lynch has spent nearly 40 years at sea and continues to own and operate a 22-meter whitefish vessel. His extensive experience at sea has given him firsthand knowledge of European and other legislation affecting fishing and the environment. He emphasized that understanding these regulations deeply impacts daily life for fishermen, making it crucial to bring this experience to the NWWAC. For 25 years, Lynch has been active in his local Producer Organisation and currently serves as its CEO. His involvement with the NWWAC spans 15 years, beginning with chairing the Skates and Rays Focus Group, and now chairing the Working Group 1 for the Irish Sea. Looking forward, Lynch aims to ensure the continuity of the AC's good work under its previous leadership. He emphasized the importance of maintaining a balanced and inclusive membership, representing all marine environment stakeholders, including fishermen, producer organizations, environmental groups, and recreational fishing organizations. Collaboration and consensus-building, based on solid scientific facts, will be his guiding principles if approved as Chair.

The Chair asked the members of this Executive Committee if there was consensus for the nomination of John Lynch.

Beltran mentioned that he usually participates in the ExCom as an observer but, in this case, he was acting as Jesus Lourido Garcia's proxy. Lourido Garcia had already expressed his opinion on the matter via email to the Secretariat. He expressed his concern regarding the evaluation of the candidates, acknowledging the presence of a team responsible for evaluating the three candidates based on criteria to which Beltran did not have access. He emphasised that ExCom members should have greater influence in such situations. They were given a decision without being informed about the decision-making process. Beltran noted that ACs Secretariats usually complement Chairs in terms of country of provenance, ensuring adequate distribution and representation in terms of MS. He felt that information was lacking at the ExCom level regarding the evaluation decision, which was presented as a result needing confirmation without evaluation details of other candidates. He questioned Sean O'Donoghue's involvement on behalf of the PelAC.

Bruno Dachicourt stated that it was his first time being involved in the election of an AC Chair with multiple candidates and agreed with Beltran on the need for more clarity in the process. He had expected candidates to introduce themselves at NWWAC meetings. He had agreed to the Evaluation Committee but anticipated more details on the evaluation conducted, making it difficult to form an opinion on the Committee's choice.

Pauline Stephan shared Dachicourt's position, expressing surprise that the Committee put forward only one candidate without consulting ExCom colleagues.

Murphy praised the presence of three candidates, noting that ExCom members were contacted to agree on the Committee to pick the candidate, following outlined procedures. He considered Lynch an excellent candidate and regretted the situation. He felt the Evaluation Committee did a good job



with three excellent candidates and found the procedures clear. He asked what changes others would like to see.

Alexandra Philippe thanked the Evaluation Committee for their work and emphasised the importance of gender balance in the Evaluation Committee in the future. She believed the Committee should rank the candidates and the ExCom should find consensus, expressing surprise at not being able to present her candidacy.

Gérald Hussenot questioned whether the General Assembly should question the Evaluation Committee's outcomes and suggested holding elections.

Irene Prieto concurred with Beltran, stating the process was not democratic and called for equal conditions for all three candidates, suggesting a change in election procedures.

The Chair stated that the issues raised were discussed in the Committee, which followed the rules of procedure and kept ExCom members informed. He mentioned the possibility of changing the rules but not during an ongoing process. He clarified that O'Donoghue was nominated by the Secretariat and approved by ExCom, due to being an active Chair and understanding the demands on this position, as well as his intensive involvement in the NWWAC. Lacking consensus, he suggested restarting the procedure and considering an official request to review and amend the rules of procedure.

Robert noted the unprecedented situation of having three candidates simultaneously and emphasised the need for everyone to express their opinions. He suggested allowing the three candidates to present themselves before the ExCom made a choice.

Mathies added that all necessary information was provided, and the rules of procedure clearly stated that the Evaluation Committee makes the decision, reverting to the ExCom for designation. She highlighted that the position is paid and thus falls under EU procurement rules, requiring a tender procedure.

Stephan mentioned the seven-day consultation rule for important information under Article 37 of the rules of procedure, noting she had not received information on the candidate.

Mathies clarified that this Article refers to advice/document approval and that this was a designation, not an election, as stated in the CFP.

Dachicourt referred to article 34, seeking more details on the evaluation criteria and the weight of each criterion. He expressed his need for more information on the grading system and candidate presentations, feeling unprepared to make a decision without the necessary information.

Lynch felt confident that the Committee followed the rules, but if the ExCom believes these are not appropriate, the process should start again or should actually be changed.

In Robert's views, there could be a third option. *"Instead of starting the procedure again, or changing the rules of procedure, we should respect our history and do what we did for previous Chairs."* In the past, ExCom members were confined to a room until they agreed on and nominated a single candidate. Robert suggested that this method might be effective for future selections. He shared that



everyone should have an opportunity to voice their opinions. Restarting the search for candidates might be unnecessary, as the issue lies in the selection methodology. Robert proposed organizing a specific committee and meeting to manage this process. He emphasized that three candidates should be allowed to present themselves. Afterward, the candidates should leave the room, allowing the ExCom to choose one, which he believes represents a democratic approach.

Mathies replied that from a Secretariat perspective, all necessary information had been provided. According to the Rules of Procedure, the Evaluation Committee makes decisions and refers them to the ExCom for endorsement, a process communicated in January. She mentioned that the appointment of the Evaluation Committee was communicated to all members and approved unanimously. If there were any questions, members had two weeks to respond, but no queries or comments were received during that time. Mathies clarified again that this is a paid position within the AC, subject to EU procurement rules, which necessitate a formal procedure, including a detailed evaluation based on a point system. If the entire ExCom were to participate in this evaluation, each application would need to be reviewed by every member. To streamline the process and comply with procurement rules, the Evaluation Committee was appointed. Mathies reiterated the importance of following these rules and clarified that this procedural detail might not have been fully understood.

Murphy acknowledged the concerns of everyone present but stressed that the focus should be on selecting a new Chair. Drawing from his experience with job selection procedures outside the AC, he noted that selection committees typically set criteria for uniform evaluation. He questioned whether there was a uniform set of criteria for all ACs and emphasized that once the selection committee was agreed upon, no objections were raised regarding their decisions. He agreed with the suggestion to consider gender balance but reiterated that everyone knew who was chosen to make the decision and no issues were raised at that time. Finally, Murphy expressed his embarrassment for the chosen candidate, noting that the current situation reflects poorly on the AC. He highlighted that the procedures were followed meticulously and that the focus should return to recognizing the three excellent candidates for the job.

The Chair pointed out that rules of procedure had been changed in 2021. At the time when he was the only candidate, the ExCom asked him to step forward informally. *“The Evaluation Committee is there exactly to select a candidate and avoid issues with election, because we need to reach consensus. The only way to start this again with the same procedure is to have only one candidate”*.

Robert felt that ExCom members should get together and get consensus on one candidate before the evaluation process starts again.

In Murphy’s views, this is a dangerous procedure with a high risk of internal divisions happening in the AC. He felt that the only way forward would be to change the rules of procedure.

ACTION: Secretariat to restart the procedure for Chair designation and ask NWWAC members for Chair nominations.

The Chair pointed out that ExCom should prepare beforehand and agree on one candidate informally if they wish. However, the Secretariat cannot be involved.

Mathies specified that the Secretariat will ask for nominations, but it is up to ExCom if they want to nominate only one candidate. Members can also propose to change the rules of procedure.



5. Dialogue with NWW MSG – Dirk van Guyze, Flemish Government, Agency for Agriculture and Fisheries

Before giving the floor to Van Guyze, the Chair gave an overview of the topics on which the NWWAC sees cooperation with the MS Group.

- Brown crab
- Technical measures in Celtic Sea/ Irish Sea
- Scallop
- Evaluation of CFP/Landing Obligation
- Spurdog
- Hake
- Directed fishing definition
- offshore renewable energy developments
- UK MPAs

Van Guyze announced that the first meeting of the MS TG will be on 10 July. The intention is to discuss the work programme and follow up on certain points before the summer break, then discussions will continue in September. He added that MS will try to improve collaboration with the ACs especially in terms of consultation deadlines for joint recommendations. Overall, the main topics on the Belgian presidency work programme include:

- Joint recommendation amending the Discard Plan, especially to continue the work started on lemon sole.
- Technical Measures. The Commission is working on an Implementing Act and the MS will discuss if any joint recommendation is needed to amend, supplement, repeal or derogate from technical measures.
- Follow up/discussion on NWWAC advice:
 - Possible Joint Recommendation on advice NWWAC/NSAC/MAC on Brown Crab
 - Possible Joint recommendation on NWWAC's advice on management of the red mullet fishery
 - Possible discussions/interactions on King Scallops
- Follow up UK Fisheries Management Plans and upcoming consultations.
- Fishing effort issues as a consequence of Brexit, in relation to the difficulty to land in the UK.

He concluded that a calendar with provisional meeting dates has been shared with the Secretariat.

ACTION: Members to send topics to be put forward to the NWW MSG at the upcoming meeting on 10 July to the Secretariat.

6. NWWAC Work Programme and Budget overview Year 19 & 20 (Secretariat)



See [these slides](#) on meetings, work programme and budget.

Mathies presented a proposal on meetings locations for 2025, in particular: Paris for March meetings and Vigo for July meetings, both in person. She asked for approval by ExCom of these new meeting venues. The meeting venues were approved without objections.

7. AOB

There was no AOB.

8. Summary of actions agreed and decisions adopted by the Chair

1	Members to send questions related to Director Donatella's intervention to the Secretariat for follow up with DG MARE
2	Secretariat to restart the procedure for Chair designation and ask NWWAC members for Chair nominations.
3	Members to send topics to be put forward to the NWW MSG at the upcoming meeting on 10 July to the Secretariat.

Participants

NWWAC members	
José Beltran	OPP-7 Burela
Emiel Brouckaert	Rederscentrale
Bruno Dachicourt	ETF
Falke De Sager	Rederscentrale VZW
Gérald Hussenot Desenonges	Blue Fish
John Lynch	ISEFPO
Geert Meun	VisNed
Patrick Murphy	ISWFPO
Alexandra Philippe	EBCD
Corentine Piton	France Pêche Durable et Responsable
Irene Prieto	OPPF4
Dominic Rihan	KFO
Jean-Marie Robert	Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Pauline Stephan	CNPMEM
Durk van Tuinen	Nederlandse Vissersbond
Arthur Yon	ANOP
Experts and Observers	
Thomas Brégeon	DG MARE
Fabrizio Donatella	DG MARE
Manu Kelberine	CRPM de Bretagne
Suso Lourido Garcia	OP Puerto de Celeiro



Aodh O'Donnell	IFPO
Dominique Thomas	OP CME MMN
Dirk van Guyze	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
NWWAC Secretariat	
Mo Mathies	Executive Secretary
Matilde Vallerani	Deputy Executive Secretary

DRAFT