



MINUTES

Focus Group CFP package

Virtual meeting

Monday 22 May 2023, 10:00 – 12:00 CET

1. Welcome and introductions

The Chair Alexandra Philippe and Vicechair Manu Kelberine welcomed all participants to the meeting. Apologies from Aodh O'Donnell and Anais Mourtada before the meeting. The agenda was adopted as drafted.

2. Discussion and agreement of draft Terms of reference

The Chair introduced the draft Terms of reference which were shared with members in advance of the meeting. She explained that two options could be considered in terms of outcomes of the Focus Group:

- Option 1 would be to prepare one single piece of advice on the action plan and the CFP (communication + Staff Working Document)
- Option 2 would be to first focus on the action plan and then work on a separate piece of advice on the CFP

The Vicechair expressed himself in favour of option 2, as it would be more effective and allow to prioritise the work on the action plan. This should also be articulated with the development of the nature restoration law.

Franck Le Barzic agreed that it is vital to react quickly to the action plan. He proposed an "option 3", which would be to focus on the marine action plan only and develop advice on a very short amount of time. However, he felt it was very positive to set up this FG on the CFP package and members should look into the topics that are not dealt with by other existing FGs. He specifically referred to the FG Landing Obligation and highlighted the need to ensure there is no overlap.

Emiel Brouckaert agreed with option 3 as proposed by Le Barzic. He proposed to focus the work on what is requested and suggested to the MS. The main deadlines seems to be March 2024, but an expert group seems to be starting in June. In his opinion, it would be urgent to ask the Commission for clarification on how stakeholders, and ACs specifically, will be involved. He then asked to the Secretariat if other ACs have been working on the same topic and if opportunities of collaboration had been investigated or should be considered. Finally, he suggested that the content of the communications on the action plan and on the CFP should be reviewed in comparison to the recommendations produced by the NWWAC in 2021/2022 on both the action plan and the functioning of the CFP.



John Lynch agreed that following option 1 would be too long and complicated, missing the target. Option 2 would be better in his opinion as well. He agreed that the production of advice on the CFP communication can be easily guided by the NWWAC response to the CFP consultation. In this way, it will be possible to measure the success rate of the advice and respond on the items that weren't taken into account.

Mo Mathies replied to Brouckaert regarding possible joint work with other ACs and explained that the Secretariat had already contacted all of them. Everybody agreed that working on a joint advice would be a very heavy exercise from an administrative point of view and also pointed out at the regional differences and issues in terms of CFP implementation. She proposed to first see how the NWWAC FG will develop and then possibly consider joint-ACs collaboration. The Chair agreed, as collaboration with other ACs could be appropriate when addressing governance issues, but sea basins characteristics should be dealt with individually by each AC.

Kelberine pointed out that option 2 and 3 do not necessarily contradict each other. The action plan should be dealt with as a priority, while the CFP communication can be considered more in the mid-long term. The Chair agreed that, with MS preparing their roadmap on the action plan implementation by March 2024, it is important to ensure the AC delivers on the action plan. Then, she added that there are several policy aspects of the CFP than no other NWWAC FG is working on.

Brouckaert asked for clarification on the progress of the nature restoration law. The Vicechair replied that the draft needs to be examined by the Council next month, then it will be examined at the Parliament plenary. Mathies added that DG ENVI has been invited to present on the law to the Horizontal Working Group meeting in Ghent.

Regarding the letter to the Commission on the special group on the action plan, participants agreed on the urgency of the request and therefore not to involve other ACs in the drafting to make it a quick submission. Other ACs will be informed once the letter is sent. The letter will be approved through fast track procedure.

ACTION: The Secretariat will draft a letter to the Commission regarding the special group on implementing the action plan, including a request to share the template to be used by MS for developing roadmaps.

Mathies informed the participants that there have been discussions ongoing with the PelAC on the re-establishment of a joint FG on wind energy/MSP/spatial squeeze. The first meeting will be in the autumn and the ToR of the FG CFP will be considered to make sure there is no doubling up of activities.

Le Barzic reiterated the importance of making sure that this FG work is not clashing with the FG landing obligation. Brouckaert suggested to discuss on the comparison of the two ToR in Ghent if needed.

ACTION: The Secretariat will circulate the excel table summarising the items and actions from the action plan and ask members for their input on which of those should be addressed by the NWWAC.



3. Next steps & closing of the meeting

ACTION: The Secretariat will share an updated version of the ToR with members who will have two days for review. Then the ToR will be sent to the Horizontal Working Group and will be approved by the Executive Committee via fast track procedure, to ensure the FG can start its work swiftly.

Participants agreed to meet again on 19 June, 10:00 to 12:00 CET, to discuss the preparation of advice on the action plan.

Action points from the meeting include:

1	The Secretariat will draft a letter to the Commission regarding the special group on implementing the action plan, including a request to share the template to be used by MS for developing roadmaps.
2	The Secretariat will circulate the excel table summarising the items and actions from the action plan and ask members for their input on which of those should be addressed by the NWWAC.
3	The Secretariat will share an updated version of the ToR with members who will have two days for review. Then the ToR will be sent to the Horizontal Working Group and will be approved by the Executive Committee via fast track procedure, to ensure the FG can start its work swiftly.

4. Participants

Name	Organisation
Emiel Brouckaert	Rederscentrale
Gerald Hussenot	Blue Fish
Manu Kelberine	CRPMEM de Bretagne
Franck Le Bazic	Cobrenord
Olivier Lepretre	CRPMEM Hauts de France
John Lynch	ISEFPO
Anais Mourtada	CNPMEM
Aodh O'Donnell	IFPO
Alexandra Philippe	EBCD
Irene Prieto	ARVI
Dominique Thomas	OPCMEMMN
Arthur Yon	FROM Nord