

Copy of e mails sent to Reine J. Johansson from:

Fra: W. (Pim) Visser[SMTP:WVISSER@VISAFLAG.ORG]

Sendt: 3. maj 2010 18:02:05

Til: ann.bell@aberdeenshire.gov.uk

Cc: Michael Andersen; Sally Clink; Alexandre Rodriguez Rodriguez; Aukje Coers; Gerard van Balsfoort; Barrie Deas; Deutscher-Fischerei-Verband; Niels Wichmann; Dunn, Euan; c.absil@noordzee.nl; mni@yrkesfiskarna.se; jhs@yrkesfiskarna.se

Emne: RAC's in the CFP

Videresendt automatisk vha. en regel

Dear Ann,

During the course of the La Coruna conference, it has become clearer and clearer that RAC's have not such a good press in general. This hinders the possibilities for enhancement of the role of the RAC's we are looking for.

The RAC's operating will suffer under the negative press of some others.

In order to present the positive 'track record' of those RAC's and present an improvement requirement list 'for after 2012' I suggest to join forces with colleague RAC's to prepare a position paper and to present this paper directly to the new commissioner.

This is a matter of urgency and would have to be done pretty quickly.

I suggest we discuss this further when we meet coming Friday to discuss the NSRAC/EAFPA Peterhead September meeting.

I cc this message to (some of) those who attended La Coruna and with whom this was discussed, as well as other stakeholders

Met vriendelijke groet,

Pim Visser

mob 06 53 146 220

Fra: Dunn, Euan[SMTP:EUAN.DUNN@RSPB.ORG.UK]

Sendt: 4. maj 2010 15:51:34

Til: ann.bell@aberdeenshire.gov.uk; W. (Pim) Visser

Cc: Michael Andersen; Sally Clink; Alexandre Rodriguez Rodriguez; Aukje Coers; Gerard van Balsfoort; Barrie Deas; Deutscher-Fischerei-Verband; Niels Wichmann; c absil; mni; jhs; Christien Absil; giles.bartlett@wwf.org.uk; Hugo.andersson@lio.se; a.hawkins@btconnect.com; Jan Willem Wijnstroom

Emne: RE: RAC's in the CFP

Videresendt automatisk vha. en regel

Dear Pim and Ann

Firstly I apologise, Pim for our snatched conversation on this yesterday just as I was rushing from La Coruna for my plane. I didn't grasp what you were saying at the time but, now that I see your email, I am clear what your view is and I have to say it is different from mine.

We were both in the same working group (Governance), as were Barrie, Christien, Aukje, Reine, and Hugo Gonzalez, and I have to say that I thought the RACs generally came out of it rather well. There is a clear hierarchy of RAC performance and most of the interventions came from the better functioning end of the spectrum - North Sea, Baltic, Pelagic, NWW and Long Distance. I felt it was acknowledged, including from the chair (Deben), that these RACs are a major driver of change and are doing well for such young organisations. There was clearly more concern about the dysfunctional state of the Mediterranean RAC in particular.

Of course participants at the meeting raised genuine concerns but I thought the dialogue was constructive and that the Commission was listening, e.g. on the need for capacity building (including increased funding). As was clear from the first day of La Coruna, the Commission also see the RACs as playing a key role in any new governance structure for the CFP. Generally, I thought the RAC community had a 'good La Coruna', judging from the number and quality of their interventions, and the profile they collectively raised for the role of the RACs.

From my notes, Deben's conclusions at the end of the Governance workshop were (when below he says 'we' he means Commission-led reform):

1) The role of the RACs is "positive" to date (and he even felt optimistic about the Med RAC!)

2) In terms of reform, we need to think about how to improve:

- Performance
- Representation
- Coordination with ACFA

3) We want a better internal balance and legal status (which is currently ad hoc at Community level)

4) We need to improve the working capacity and current financial arrangements of the RACs (and are willing to analyse the contributions Member States make in this regard)

I absolutely agree with you that the RACs should put their heads together to address these issues (or, if they can't do it together, it should happen unilaterally) and take advantage of the opportunity for feeding directly into the Commission, and I think your suggestion to do that is excellent. However, I think it would be a mistake to do this from a defensive posture. I may have missed something (have I?) but I don't perceive (at least from La Coruna) that "it has become clearer and clearer that RAC's have not such a good press in general" or that "The RAC's operating well suffer under the negative press of some others."

If there are negative elements out there (and, as I say, I'm not aware of them), I think we could deflect our energies if we focus on reacting to them. Better to just respond the Commission's agenda.

All the best

Euan

PS: I have copied in a few others relevant to taking this forward