



# LDAC performance review, interim reflexions

LDAC Executive Committee, Madrid, Monday 3 december 2018

Benoît Guerin, BG SEA CONSULTING

# Data & information

## Interview with LDAC members

Beatrice Gorez	CAPE
Marc Ghiglia	UAPF, CNPMEM
Julio Mojon	OPAGAC
Maria-Jose Cornax	OCEANA
Despina Symonds	EBCD
Antonio Suarez-Llanos	ARVI
Juan Manuel LIRIA	CEPESCA
Jane Sandell	NFFO
Michel Goujon	ORTHONGEL
Raul Garcia	WWF Spain
<i>Gerard von Balsfoort</i>	PFA
<i>Ivan Lopez</i>	AGARBA
<i>Frédéric Le Manach</i>	Bloom
<i>Roberto Carlos Alonso</i>	ANFACO
<i>Juan Manuel Trujillo</i>	ETF
<i>Lithuanian or Estonian organization</i>	

## Interview with EC civil servants

Ernesto Peñas-Lado	Principal adviser, CFP policy development
Isabelle Viallon	Policy Officer, DG DEVCO
Stefan Depypere	Ex Director International Ocean Governance and sustainable fisheries
John BRINCAT	International relations officer
Pascale COLESON and Amalia De Diego y Vega	Policy Officer for AC
Veronika Veits	Ex Head of Unit, regional fisheries management organisations
Angela Martini	International relations officer
<i>Anders Jessen</i>	Acting Director International Ocean Governance and sustainable fisheries

# Findings

- Main motivations to participate to LDAC's meetings
  - **LDAC members:** bridge the gap between sector & NGOs, for some only advices and influence on legislation
  - **EC:** use the LDAC as an effective information channel
- Organisation of the WG
  - **Positive aspects:** general satisfaction about logistics and agenda preparation
  - **Margins for improvement:** additional preparation would be useful, NGOs proposing few topics
- Running of the meeting
  - **Positive aspects:** growing trust between members
  - **Margins for improvement:** facilitating debate including on contentious issues

# Findings

- LDAC advices
  - **Positive aspects:** few but qualitative advices
  - **Margins for improvement:** systematic presentation of divergent opinions
- Influence of LDAC advices
  - **Positive aspects:** international matters, NAFO
  - **Margins for improvement:** the value of consensus should be given priority
- Transparency
  - **Positive aspects:** general satisfaction
  - **Margins for improvement:** selection of topics and working priorities

# Findings

- **Strategic approach for LDAC's input**

**Writing better advices:**

- International matters (international governance, IUU, SFPA ...)
- Horizontal technical issues regarding fisheries management on a longer term (Harvest Control Rules, VMEs, Fisheries Aggregated Devices) Vs delivering annual advices

**Contributing to a more coherent EU international policy:** the LDAC may probably help to bridge the gap between the different policy areas

**Organizing high profile international conferences, side-events** to promote EU standards internationally and raise awareness about the external dimension of the Common Fishery Policy.

# 3 main recommendations

## **Reset LDAC's core work priorities**

through an extensive consultation of the General Assembly members focusing on the three main areas of work of the LDAC (advices, coherent EU international policy, international events) and select fewer priorities

## **Increasing the preparatory work through the establishment focus groups**

4-5 members with legitimate interest and genuine knowledge on one topic. Include also 1 appointed scientist and inviting the EC services' focal point.

## **Convincing the European Commission to follow a 2 steps' consultation**

targeted consultation limited to the LDAC at first step; broader (public) consultation extended to individual organisations to submit their contributions at second step

# 4 secondary recommendations

## **Follow-up of advices on a systematic basis**

Precisely identify their influence and track the contributions in the legislative proposals discussed and/or adopted by the European Institutions.

## **Independent facilitator hired for WG meetings**

More emphasis should be brought on enabling and facilitating debate, especially regarding conflicting issues.

## **Advices should be formalized**

Main author and contributors, number of versions produced and date of adoption and minority or diverging positions (where relevant).

## **Deadlines for providing documents or agenda items**

The absence of deadlines may, in some cases, hinder proper coordination and preparation of the members in advance of the meeting.

## **Secretariat's correspondant in other Member State ?**