



Board of Directors
Meeting Friday, 22nd January 2016, 10u30am

PARIS - France
Hotel Novotel Paris Montparnasse

Agenda

1. Welcome by the president
(Actual Situation at JadeDienst)
2. Approval of the agenda
3. Approval of the minutes of the meeting, held in Valencia, September 2016.
4. Future Structure
5. Port Regulation
6. Next steps in this matter - Position Paper - Contact with politicians and Organizations, etc.
7. IMO-Guidelines (Education and training)

Participants

M. **Jansen**, President; R. **Detienne**, Secretary-general; E. **de Neef**, Treasurer

M. **Dennis**, (*Blyth Boatmen UK*), J.L. **Desmars** (*SPLMNA, France*), C. **Groenewegen** (*Dutch Boatmen Association, The Netherlands*), J. **Heyse** (*Belgian Boatmen Association, Gent, Belgium*), J. **Farrugia** (*MB&MS, Malta*), Q. **Gutteriez** (*SPLMNA, France*), B. **Janssens** (*Belgian Boatmen Association*), M. **Mandirola** (*ANGOPI, Italy*), L. **Paolizzi** (*ANGOPI, Italy*), F. **Peleteiro** (*AEED, Spain*), M. **Rutili** (*ANLPP, France*), A. **Serra** (*ANGOPI, Italy*), Florent **St. Martin**, (*SPLMNA, France*), S. **Stuer** (*Belgian Boatmen Association*) A. **Van Gelderen** (*Belgian Boatmen Association*)

Apologized :

J.A. **Arrillaga** (*AEED, Spain*), M. **Arvidson** (*Swedish Boatmen's Association, Sweden*), G. **Chimenti** (*Union Boatmen of Santorini, Greece*) (During the meeting: 'on skype') G. **Kanakaris** (*Union Boatmen of Santorini, Greece*), M. Pavsic (*Koper INPO, Slovenia*), M. Lauriala

1. Introduction/Welcome by M. Jansen.

Michael thanks Quentin Gutteriez and Jean-Luc Desmars for their hospitality in the magnificent City of Paris and starts the meeting by explaining his situation at the Jade Dienst. Michael is convinced that he will win his 'legal' battle and will go to court to defend his position. Meanwhile he is working now 'ad interim' for issues related to mooring business of Kai Trenner (KSK) in Kiel and in the Kiel Canal and this as a non-commercial advisor.

He is convinced that he can keep his mandate as president of EBA until the next general meeting in Gent (where we will have the election of the new delegates), especially because he kept his position as President of the German National Association, an association that is representing all the German ports (10), where boatman activities are carried out.

*Board agrees that Michael remains President until the next General Meeting.

2. Adaption of Agenda

Pancho suggests to add the item 'IMO'.

*Then the agenda is adapted.

3. Approval of minutes of meeting of the board of directors :

°Valencia, 24th September 2015

*The minutes are approved.

4. Future Structure

Michael (MJ) refers to the statements, already prepared by Italy, Holland, France (N) and Belgium, distributed together with the agenda.

One of the discussion points concerns: the number of members of the board.

MJ thinks that it would be better to change/to reduce the number of board members, but the opinions of the board are very diverse and Pancho wonders whether it would not be better to keep the discussion more general.

Is EBA an international organization or a private club? Where does EBA set its priorities? Is it possible to draft a motion for the next general meeting and to define a budget for the goal set out? MJ is of the opinion: that EBA is an international organization which aims at realizing a better exchange of information and defending 'the professional mooring business', which surely also involves lobbying. Is there need for an extra budget to realize all that, or are our contributions satisfactory, perhaps is there is need to reduce costs, i.e. travel expenses?

Claire wonders whether it is a matter of money or of discipline and whether EBA really wants this international lobby? MJ is convinced that EBA has already achieved a lot, e.g. mooring services are internationally already recognized, but Quentin thinks that EBA has wasted too much time. E.g. in Antwerp, 5 years ago, it was already proposed to foresee a budget for lobbying. Both French associations have raised this budget issue! The General Meeting has objected to this idea. If an extra budget would have been made available at that time, EBA could realize something by now, whereas now it is clear that our European Association is not properly recognized.

Bob : EBA has to proceed. Does EBA need a dedicated lobbyist, : who can represent the association, someone like Florent, who represents France? In case all members agree to the idea, a global jobdescription has to be elaborated.

MR : we have to talk about the objectives, instead of ' putting the cart before the horse' !
EBA has no centralized information exchange , which is crucial to be able to have an impact on decisions.

Pancho refers to similar discussions a year ago. EBA has been able to already define a number of problems (such as facing the IMO and defining a common position on minimum standards). During many months it was thought that EBA was not working properly, because the GM and the Board had the same participants. We need to be able to act jointly, to have a common position, to have a attractive and up-to-date website, a newsletter,...

In fact : it is not a question of how many delegates participate but it is more a question of well-functioning .

Lorenzo thinks that the main problem is to define the goals. This is something we experienced already during the discussions about the Port Regulation. The main problem is not the number of the members of the board, but the definition of objectives. Lobbying can only start when common positions are reached.

About the composition of the board, the following opinions were noted:

The Netherlands (Erik):

- 6 BOD - members (minimum 4) (and no need to change the by-laws)
- 3 month-frequency (tele- or video-conference)
- Working-group for special purposes

France (Quentin) :

- Prefer to keep the by-laws the way they are, therefore: no maximum
- 3 month-frequency
- Draft proposal before every meeting of the board.

France (Marc) :

- Board : no special opinion about min/max) (To have a treasurer/President/vice president/SG and 2 extra (rotation): this especially for the sake of efficiency and for financial reasons...
- 3 month-frequency; tele- or video-conference might be ok.
- Working-group for special purposes

Belgium:

- Board : 6 max (minimum 4), although Alain prefers to keep it open for everyone
- 3 month-frequency ok but tele- or video-conference = difficult for important issues

- UK:
 - UK follows the majority, but prefers the idea of having one BOD, open to all
 - 3 month-frequency, a maximum is ok, Tele-or video-conference = possible
 - Working-group for special purposes
- Germany:
 - Prefer a maximum in the BOD;
 - Minimum 2 or 4 persons (depending on the subject of the agenda)
 -
- Malta (Joseph)
 - No formal opinion without national consultation in Malta
 - Very concerned about the representation of 'smaller countries' and hopes to never be denied in a meeting. .
 - Meetings and how to get there are too time-consuming ...
 - Each country should have the possibility to bring an advisor assisting him/her.(this is common (legal) practice)
 - Idea : Minimum one BOD with all the EBA-Member-Countries once a year
- Italy:
 - No need to change the by-laws : the actual version of the by-laws is ok and allows the president to define the amount of the members... It is up to the president, who has the power of taking the final decision about the composition of the board.
 - Minimum 6 members (According to Italy : this is the correct interpretation of the actual by-laws.) this is the interpretation of Italy and
- Spain(Pancho)
 - Pancho does not agree : we have been confusing the GM and the BOD and to have the same composition in each of them cannot be the case!
A board needs to be limited (6 according to the bylaws)
 - Spain (with 600 mooring men!) has no problem if it is not a member of the board.
 - The following is of main importance for Spain : Limited, effective and rotation of mandates!!
 - And about the frequency : If the group is limited : you meet in case of need !

Ronny compares it with EMPA-board (the European pilots association), where there are 22 members and a board that consists of 5/6 persons. Joseph stays very concerned and prefers to be present at any time, because to his opinion, there is a difference between reading the minutes and participating in the meeting. If we do not write down our objectives, how can we agree on the number of

members and if some members are not participating in the board: how will they get informed about the decisions?

MJ : this is exactly the reason why we need to slim down, to work more efficiently, to facilitate things... but other members, such as Marc (MR) do not want to give a “carte blanche” to a limited group ! .

To conclude this ‘brainstorming session’ Michael proposed the following ideas :

- The composition of the BOD should consist of e.g. a maximum of 6 persons.
- The president takes the final decisions.
- Only the members of the boards receive financial compensation for their cost of travelling. (One night maximum)
- The board should meet every 3months.
- If possible : the meetings of the board will be held in a tele/videoconference
- For special issues: working-groups will be installed. accordingly.

Following goals to be pursued :

- collect information related EBA;
- share information (internally) (including communication of internal and external news)
- monitor events and news for EBA
- organize lobby, especially within the different groups of stakeholders, that effect our business
- have an up-to-date Web-site / internet
- have a good internal and external information-structure
- Contributions/cost saving

MJ underlines again that the basic idea was ‘ to reduce the travelling costs, and to create more efficiency’.. Italy thinks that this debate is still constructive and refers to the by-laws : we do not have to change the by-laws, if a minimum number of 6 persons is guaranteed. It worries MJ that there are so many different opinions and that there is room for interpretation, but Pancho states that it is all about ‘trust’

**Seen all these different opinions and considerations, the board did not come to a final conclusion and agrees that it will be necessary to learn the point of the view of every member, especially of those who could not attend this meeting.*

5. Port Regulation:

Florent St. Martin gives information about the actual situation.

Next Monday, the 25th January, the Transport Committee of the European Parliament will vote on the Fleckenstein-Proposal. Florent has seen a draft and it will be send to all the members.

Many members of the EP are worried. Most likely, the compromise will be adopted, 95% of the text will be accepted. The exclusion of the mooring services will NOT pass and will NOT be put to the vote. The Fleckenstein proposal will be put to vote. Firstly they will vote on the compromise and if the compromise is accepted, the single amendments fall out. Then a vote on the mandate of Fleckenstein will follow and afterwards the negotiations start with the council. (Next deadline 7th June). The PR will include towage/mooring...

(On the 25th January, the Transport Committee of the European Parliament has expressed its support (29 in favour, 13 against, 3 abstentions) for the compromise reached by MEP Knut Fleckenstein and the TRAN shadow rapporteurs on the proposal for a port regulation adopted in May 2013.)

During the meeting it was however decided that EBA was not going to be present in Brussels. .

Whether or not, the EBA is going to have a press release after the vote or a letter to the MEP's, was not clarified during the meeting of the board, but brought the discussion on the website (and the importance of sharing information back on the table.

The website of the European Commission/European Parliament is a good tool and we need to share all valuable information. There is no doubt that this important duty of sharing/sending information is part of the Secretary's job, using the website of the EC for the purpose of getting all the information, could be a good idea in order to be able to follow up on the parliamentary discussions etc...

But Florent makes the remark that "if you stay behind your screen, you will miss a lot." There is more to it than only the official documents! You collect basic information through the website. But EBA has to do more such as contacting the persons in charge. In order to be able to do so, EBA needs someone within the organization because this is extremely time-consuming. There are technical working groups, internal meetings... and EBA is not represented in these meeting groups, therefore lacking information.

It is suggested to either draft a resolution about this 'European Lobbying', to bring on the agenda of the next General meeting or to hold an extraordinary general meeting? Including the discussion of the topic of an extra budget in order to be able to lobby.

Erik suggests to do it step by step. It would be best to first start by collecting all the information of the MEP's, then share it and afterwards we can evaluate whether or not to take a lobbyist. Otherwise EBA will lose a lot of money.

Jean-Luc: different members can start to collect the information and we could come together in an EBA- working group, but often EBA runs behind the facts.

Quentin: We have to look forward, not backward! We need information and we need this at any time."

Florent mentions that quite good results were achieved in the working group, e.g. in the WGPR. This proceeded smoothly and allowed us to reach a common position. But we need to defend the EBA point of view as well. MJ states EBA needs someone to take the lead, because working on a voluntary basis will not have the results wanted, someone needs to have the responsibility. It takes time, it needs to be organized.

We always talk about sharing/collecting information, but almost nobody (except e.g. France and Spain) gives information to the Secretariat.

Joseph informs what actions EMPA takes in connection with lobbying. Ronny explains that EMPA does not want a lobbyist and is almost working the same way as EBA does, namely a 'limited' board, consisting of only 5 people and just a few members, giving each other the information they collect. EMPA seems to be able to defend its points of view and to have the required information at hand.

Ronny is of the opinion that EBA needs someone in Brussels, which will require a budget. Therefore it should be considered to increase the contributions, because until now, nobody has ever asked fees for the input of their own lawyers. Johan wonders whether the Port Regulation is almost finalized, but Claire and Ronny are of the opinion that there always will be issues on the European level.

Gianluca (skype) fully agrees to use more technology, website (also the IBLA-website needs input from all the member countries!) About the European events, they are convinced that EBA needs to participate (physically) in all these events. EBA has to define new goals, EBA needs to be more active and needs to move forward !

Michael replies: EBA needs to focus on defining goals and taking decisions, rather than only expressing ideas . Pancho stresses that all members should be regarded equally and that decisions should be supported by all. Concerning the cost for lobbying, he is convinced that cancelling reimbursement for travel expenses, could create enough budget for lobbying. Erik urges all members to change their attitude as to reimbursement of costs.

Monitoring the information and sharing the information, these are the keywords.

Ronny thinks that elaborating websites (although useful) will not have enough results. MJ states that it is important to collect and to share information. Bob is of the opinion that it can be very useful to learn from each other, to know how everybody is organized, to visit the professional area where everyone is working, etc....

**Ronny takes the following initiative: Since the main issue (for the moment) is the European Parliament, Brabo will pay someone to defend EBA in Brussels and hopefully this will enable EBA to get more adequate information on all relevant topics. BRABO offers to try this out, until December 2016. This will make it possible to evaluate the situation in September (GM). In the meantime the secretariat stay the way -it is.*

6. IMO

Pancho explains the actual situation. In the beginning of April, there is a meeting of the IMO-FAL Committee about the minimum professional standards of the mooring men.

IBLA/EBA had to put down a draft before the 31st December and to look for co-sponsoring. Italy is co-sponsor and Sweden tried to contact the national representative, but she was not in favour.

But, it was quite astonishing to notice that the Nautical institute (IMO member) together with IFSMA and IHMA had also submitted a proposal before the 31st December, containing some amendments to the guidelines on minimum training and education for mooring personnel. (On the 9th January, Lorenzo has sent this document to everybody)

This means that there at present are 2 draft texts and it is not quite certain who is behind all this and why.

Marco Mandirola adds that the matter will be looked into with Ismael Cobol and with Admiral Aliperta Aliperta. Marco explains that he had been in London at the IMO, till yesterday, dealing with the conditions of the mooring and the safety of the mooring lines. One document was proposed by the European Union, the other by Japan. The European Union-document was about the dock workers: all the people working in the port, including the boatmen. Marco could however clarify the difference and could achieve a modification of the document. (In Item 7 : the mooring men have been added) Today there will be a final meeting and it will be confirmed that the mooring men are the ones, dealing with the mooring lines, which means a little victory for the IBLA, namely a recognition of the profession of the boatmen.

Pancho asks further information : when was the meeting held and why was it not mentioned earlier. Marco explains that he himself had been informed just a few days before the meeting and that on first sight, nothing seemed to affect boatmen !

Pancho wonders how to go ahead and suggests to meet members of these three institutes, to get to know their real reasons. Ronny/Alain know Dirk Vernaeve, Harbourmaster in Gent (and member of the IHMA) and will contact him already to get some further information.

**IBLA should discuss the strategy in view of the meeting of the IMO/FAL in London, that is going to be organized on 4-8 April. The support of each permanent national representative would be most welcome.*

Meeting closed at 15u00