

## **Working Group 1: EU Production Minutes**

Tuesday, 22 September 2020

10:30 - 13:30 CET

Zoom online meeting

**Welcome from the Chair, Sean O'Donoghue**

**Adoption of draft agenda and minutes of last meeting (01.09.20): adopted**

Click [here](#) to access the Chair's presentation.

### **Action points of the last meeting**

- **State of play of the decisions made during the last two meetings (02.06.20 and 01.09.20) – information**
  - COVID-19 Pandemic:
    - Include on the agenda of the next meeting: Done
    - Aim to draft advice to the Commission and Member States: Ongoing
  - STECF:
    - Prepare advice on STECF data: Done
  - Landing Obligation:
    - Continue monitoring the implementation: Ongoing
  - EUMOFA:
    - Prepare reaction to Commission's reply: Done
    - Members to present COVID-19 suggestions: Done
  - Marketing Standards:
    - Include on the agenda of the next meeting: Done
    - Include on the Work Programme for Year 5: Done
  - EUMOFA:
    - Put forward the draft text to the Executive Committee under written procedure: Done
  - STECF:
    - Put forward the draft text to the Executive Committee under ordinary procedure



## Working Group 1's Priorities under the Work Programme for Year 5 (2020-2021)

- **Presentation**

The Chair provided an overview of the priorities, including Farm to Fork Strategy, EMFF, Marketing Standards, Biodiversity Strategy, COVID-19 Pandemic, collaboration with STECF, and other work. The other work will include a Focus Group on Brown Crab management with NWWAC and NSAC, plus monitoring the implementation of the landing obligation.

- **Exchange of views**

Pim Visser (VisNed), in relation to the marketing standards, highlighted that the Commission will be including sustainability indicators, which might require a specific discussion.

The Chair agreed that it should be part of the work programme.

## COVID-19 Pandemic

- **Exchange of views: impact and measures**

The Chair urged members to provide their views in relation to the mitigation measures taken by the Commission and the Member States as well as potential proposals by the MAC.

Pim Visser (VisNed) emphasised the role of fish products in boosting immune systems. With a strong immune system, there is less susceptibility to COVID-19 infection. They suggested promoting the consumption of fish, particularly EU-caught. The MAC should advise the Commission to undertake a constant promotional campaign at national or international level.

The Chair agreed with the suggestion. There needs to be a new concerted effort across the EU to undertake a large campaign. Some restrictions connected to EMFF also need to be considered.

Pim Visser (VisNed) highlighted that COVID-19 mitigation measures are using the existing EMFF funding, which impacts the available dedicated funding of the EMFF priorities. There should be separate eligible funding for fishery measures.

The Chair expressed hope that the future EMFAF will include funding for exceptional situations similar to the COVID-19 pandemic. There are risks of overly specific provisions. Measures to support the fleet during the current pandemic are needed.

Maria Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) agreed that it is important to undertake a promotional campaign for seafood products. They expressed disappointed that fishmongers were excluded



from the special mitigation measures of the EU, even though the sector was essential. All of the seafood supply chain provided an example of ensuring food security. Traditional fisheries undertook a large effort, including 45 days without protection, while ensuring supply. It was the favourite format of the Spanish consumers, but this was not recognised in the assistance. Companies have lost their revenue due to the closure of the HORECA business. Spain was one of the most affected countries by the pandemic. The administrations are taking action late and are not recognising the essential efforts of private companies and the non-profit business organisations. There have been huge efforts of information, communication, training, translating over 60 legislative measures into understandable language, creating an emergency office to coordinate with the rest of the supply.

The Chair suggested that FEDEPESCA could draft a paragraph on the role of the distribution sector to include in the future document.

Nicolás Fernandez (OPP72) emphasised the importance of taking into account the starting point and the experiences of each sector in the supply chain. In mid-March, all work plans were suddenly changed, leading to paralysation. They agreed with VisNed and FEDEPESCA on the importance of promoting seafood products. While some sector of the supply chain might not have been properly taken into account by the EU, there were prompt measures to support fishery producers, even though Member States have been slower. The sector has a large dependence of the HORECA channel, which has not recovered. There is a significant problem of prices. The sector had to reinvent itself. The use of disposable protection materials is also a problem. Producers had to work with fishmongers. Consumers must have the guaranty that products are of high quality, in order to maintain the price somewhat. OPP72 is working on the production of videos to promote the importance of seafood consumption to children. They are also producing a campaign against disposable protective gear ending up as marine pollution. It is important to continue working together with the EU institutions to face the impact of the face the pandemic.

Katrin Poulsen (WWF), in relation to the marketing of seafood products, cautioned that, according to the last FAO State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture report, the level of fishing has increase and there is a significant level of overfishing. The EU is already the largest market for fish products. The EU is also world leader in consumption per capita. They argued that it was better to look into ways to optimise catches and value, particularly added value, instead of looking for an increase.

The Chair agreed with the previous speaker, but highlighted that there was a problem of prices. It is not a matter of increasing consumption, but exiting a situation of 30 to 35% price reductions. The EU has made huge strides in sustainable fisheries. According to the CFP, fleet segments must act in accordance with the available resources. If there is a permanent reduction of prices, the only option will be massive decommissioning schemes. Therefore, it is important to assess how the industry can be rebooted to the pre-COVID-19 levels.



Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) agreed with WWF, cautioning on the need of an appropriate use of taxpayers' money. Therefore, commercialisation should only focus on species that are at MSY-levels, avoiding a negative impact on future catches as well as overfishing. The recovery measures can be an opportunity for improvements in EU fisheries, through support for local fishers and stronger traceability. They drew attention to two documents with NGO advice on this: [Setting the Right Safety Net](#) and [Turning the Tide](#).

The Chair agreed with the purpose of increased added-value.

Maria Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) highlighted that there was not only a decrease in prices. The costs have increased enormously. Customer service outside of the shop setting, for example online, means that double of the time is needed to serve the clients. Products must be transported to the consumers' house. Due to health concerns, costumers preferred to pay later and through bank transfers, instead of paying directly in cash. There are also costs with the increasing use of protective material as well as other protective measures.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed that the Secretariat would prepare a draft advice covering a series of recommendations, taking on board the comments made by the members. The Chair suggested the organisation of a special WG1 meeting to go through the draft.

## Marketing Standards

- **Update on the Commission's public consultation (second semester 2020) by Commission representative**

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) explained that the Commission is planning to prepare an impact assessment. A contract with an external contractor is being concluded, which will support the Commission services on the impact assessment study and on the consultation activities taking place in the upcoming months. In that process, the contractor will contact the MAC and its members. In terms of timeline, the open public consultation is planned for October. The consultation period will last for 14 weeks. For the revision of the marketing standards, there are two main policy options: restrict the revision to technical adjustment of the existing markets or incorporation of new elements that would contribute to sustainability. In this second option, the key challenge is to identify suitable criteria and indicators to be incorporated into the standards. The Commission is organising a dedicated expert group under STECF. The expert group would meet for a full week in November to discuss suitable criteria and indicators. DG MARE will maintain the MAC updated on the launch of the public consultation.



- **Future work: Development of draft contribution to the public consultation**

The Chair wanted to know how the external contractor will be contacting the MAC, particularly if it will be in a virtual meeting or in written format, plus the expect time for this.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) explained that those details were not set yet, since they are concluding the contract. In terms of consultation activities, besides the open consultation, there will be targeted consultations, so the contractor will reach out to the MAC Secretariat and to the MAC Chairs. It should go beyond written contributions and include also telephone interviews.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA), regarding the work of the expert group and the criteria to be investigated, wanted to know if it will include the work on environmental footprinting developed under the Farm to Fork Strategy and how the indicators will be used.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) replied that it is a very complex endeavour. The Commission does not have the ambition to address all aspects of sustainability through the marketing standards. The objective is to select some criteria and indicators that would seem particularly relevant as well as relatively simple. The concept of simple means indicators based on data that is not complicated and can be easily assessed. The objective is not to develop something similar to the private certification schemes. The experts will look at sustainability broadly, but the focus will be on environmental sustainable, since it is an initiative undertaken under the Farm to Fork Strategy. Environmental sustainability can imply many potential criteria and environmental footprint is one of them, so it will be considered by the expert group.

Roberto Carlos Alonso (ANFACO-CECOPESCA) expressed surprise with the procedure taken on this file, from the perspective of ANFACO and the European processing sector. The Commission undertook a report, which included interviews with many actors, that concluded that the marketing standards framework works properly. After this conclusion, the Commission decided to open the issue again under the Farm to Fork Strategy. If the Commission will open the topic anyway, they wondered why the Commission was spending money developing reports. The canning industry wants the marketing standards framework to be maintained as it stands. Sustainability is not a marketing standards issue, but a food issue. They also wanted to know how the experts will be selected, particularly experts from the processing industry.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) explained that the first part of the revision is connected to the existing technical standards. In that part, the evaluation demonstrated that there are not many issues that require improvement. The evaluation report also said clearly that there is a sustainability objective in the CMO Regulation, in particularly for the marketing standards, which is not addressed at all. This is a gap that needs to be addressed. In terms of how to address it, the Farm to Fork Strategy has a broad action plan, including numerous initiatives that could also address



the issue of sustainability for fisheries and aquaculture. Still, there is an element missing in marketing standards framework to meet the sustainability objective in the CMO Regulation. The Commission hopes to build on the work of the CFP and see how it can be translated into the marketing standards. Regarding the expert group, there will be an open call for interest by STECF.

Pim Visser (VisNed), in relation to the Farm to Fork Strategy's focus on sustainability, emphasised the importance of fair pricing for food production. There are huge demands for safe and sustainable food, but consumers are not willing to pay a fair price. The pricing mechanism for primary producers should be considered by the Commission. Regarding sustainability standards, they called for caution. For example, MSC started as a straightforward system of sustainability and it developed into a highly bureaucratic system. Therefore, if the Commission wants to move ahead with sustainability indicators, these should be smart and simple. EAPO is willing to engage on these discussions.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) highlighted that the MAC's advice on the inception impact assessment on the marketing standards framework included differences of opinion among the players. The NGOs are very willing to explore how the EU can use its market power to provide sustainable seafood for European consumers and improve fisheries management globally.

## European Fishery Statistics

- **Presentation on Commission's public consultation by Commission representative**

Click [here](#) to access the presentation.

Óscar Gómez-Prieto (EuroStat) provided a presentation on the public consultation on European Fisheries Statistics and its context. There is an ongoing public consultation until 23 November 2020. The representative urged members to reply to the consultation and circulate it.

- **Exchange of views**

The Chair encouraged active members to fill out the questionnaire. The Chair also asked the members, if they believed that it would be useful for the MAC to fill out the questionnaire, adding that individual replies would likely be more useful.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) replied that it would be more appropriate for the MAC not to participate. The AAC attempted a reply, but it is quite difficult and time consuming to reach a consensus. Regarding option 4 under the consultation, wanted to know how feasible it would be, since it is a complex matter and the framework will be different for aquaculture products, which is why the existing data is not satisfactory.



Óscar Gómez-Prieto (EuroStat) replied that the question posed was also being asked by the Commission services, which is why they want contributions. The data sources for wild caught fish and aquaculture products are completely different, but the market is demanding for the products to come together. Therefore, there is a need for different frameworks but also for the products come together.

The Chair proposed for the Secretariat to circulate the public consultation and ask members to individually contribute, but the MAC would not try to reach a common contribution.

## **Brown Crab Management**

- **Presentation by Norah Parke, Chair of NWWAC's former Focus Group on Brown Crab**

The Chair explained that the NWWAC and NSAC have worked on the topic of brown crab management. NWWAC has contacted the MAC to work together on the brown crab marketing issues through a joint Focus Group.

Norah Parke, Chair of NWWAC's former Focus Group on Brown Crab, explained that the work by the NWWAC's Focus Group on Brown Crab had just finished. It became clear that market is paramount on the management of brown crab fisheries. In terms of background, ten years ago, the demand for brown crab was falling rapidly, the price was collapsing, while the price for fuel was increasing. In a meeting in KFO, it was suggested to contact fishers in the Scottish coast, which was the first vision of improved management, building a strong relationship between partners. Afterwards, they looked into funding to investigate certain issues. A very comprehensive INTERREG Atlantic Area project was set-up. The project had 16 partners from the three producing countries: Ireland, UK, and France, as well as market countries: Spain and Portugal. The project provided a comprehensive assessment of the stock and its management, including waste management. The project also looked into the existing market format, potential new markets and an economic analysis of the industry.

The project was not able to reach alignment of measures in the three producing countries. France had strict licensing tailored along the coastline. France and the UK were not able to take the same approach at that time, but are working on that direction. The Focus Group was established because, at the end of the project, there was no conclusion on the management. The entire environment for brown crab fisheries was also changing. It was both an inshore and offshore fishery, so the vessel size was quite different. As for routes the market, there was live, which was more valuable, more vulnerable to changes, and seasonal, as well as processed. At the moment, prices have had a 50% reduction compared to the beginning of the year, so urgent measures are needed.



As the original Focus Group progressed, the industry changed drastically. The focus used to be on the English Channel, but the largest vessels started to move, due to days at sea limitation, moving their operations to the North Sea. The NWWAC FG also adapted as time went by. The FG identified that there were new drivers in the fisheries: price and demand, but also an increase in effort by the vessel and new entrants. There were fears that the new activities were due to the landing obligation. The FG looked at new factors such as certification and fisheries improvement projects. There were also developments on data collection. The scientific advice should take into account the differences in the fishing areas, while still providing certainty to the industry.

The conclusions of the NWWAC FG were that there were extraordinary changes, including the Brexit and COVID-19 pandemic causing uncertainty. There was a lot of uncertainty due to the Chinese market, which is the main consumption driver, but where there are different legislations on heavy metals, most importantly cadmium levels. The levels of cadmium are exactly the same, but there is a different level of acceptance, due to the calculation in the brown meat of the crab. It appears that the Chinese government is planning to launch a public consultation on the level of acceptance of cadmium in brown crab. If the public consultation is launched, NWWAC hopes that the MAC will assist in developing a good case to improving the limits, in order to open the markets.

The individual segments of brown crab fishery cannot be deal separately. Management measures to tackle the current issues are needed. Strategies are needed to protect stakeholders when unforeseen situations affect the industry. The advice sent to DG MARE was for the establishment of a FG between NWWAC, NSAC, and MAC. There are draft Terms of Reference, which will be sent to the MAC Secretariat. Ms Parke invited members to express interest in joining the new Focus Group, so that it can organise a first meeting in the next following three weeks.

- **Way forward: potential joint Focus Group with NWWAC and NSAC**

The Chair stated that, taking into account the status of the management, the key issue was marketing. The Chair proposed to take this issue to the Executive Committee, in order to form a joint Focus Group with NWWAC and NSAC. The Chair proposed for the FG to be established under Working Group 1. The MAC will need to assess the draft Terms of Reference prepared by NWWAC, to determine if amendments were needed.

## EMFAF

- **Summary of the key MAC recommendations**

The Chair provided an overview of some of the key MAC recommendations under the MAC Advice on the EMFF's proposal (2019). In general, the recommendations have been taken on board by the European Parliament, except on the mandatory financing of the PMPs.



- **Presentation by MEP Gabriel Mato, EP PECH Committee Rapporteur**

Gabriel Mato MEP, EP PECH Committee Rapporteur, explained that his team tried to include all suggestions from the MAC. On the change from “EMFF” to “EMFAF”, MEP Mato underscored the importance of taking into account and investing in aquaculture. There is one significant challenge for everyone in the seafood supply chain: sustainability. There should be a balance between the three pillars of sustainability. The seas should be full of fish, but also full of vessels and industries working. Another challenge is the generational change. The current situation is worrying in some aspects. There are old vessels, sometimes even dangerous, with polluting engines, reduced space, while also asking the sector to become greener in accordance with the Paris Agreement. The sector is also asked to improve labour conditions and to contribute to biodiversity. There are many obligations imposed on the sector, such as the landing obligation, MSY goals, and technical measures, while the necessary assistance is not provided. An increase of the funds is needed and the Parliament has requested it.

The EMFF needs an ambitious agreement to allow to fish better, not more. The sector should be able to invest in better conditions, safety, wellbeing, greener engines, and generational renewal, while also avoiding overcapacity and overfishing. There should be less bureaucracy to access funds, without jeopardising transparency and accountability. In the negotiations, all EU institutions agreed on these objectives, but there are nuances in their focuses. The Commission takes a more cautious approach, particularly on the gross tonnes of the vessels. Mr Mato does not want to increase fishing capacity, but better labour conditions. Bureaucracy should not increase for Member States. The Parliament wants transparency, control and accountability. For example, it should be possible to verify engines. Public administrations should provide detailed reports on the use of the funds, while avoiding too much bureaucracy. There have been positive developments among the co-legislators to reach a simplified EMFF framework, while taking into account the smaller operators and potential modernisation of the fleet, which will be a topic of discussion the September trilogue meetings. The October meetings will focus on aquaculture and marketing measures. Normally, both the Commissioner and the EP PECH Committee Chair are present. The co-legislators have worked together to face the COVID-19 pandemic, including the continuation of the mitigation measures into 2021.

On the issues identified by the MAC, a major issue is simplification. There are difficulties in the spending due to the excess of bureaucracy and text interpretation. The premise for the new fund is “if it is not explicitly forbidden, it is allowed”, which provides greater flexibility to the Member States and less bureaucracy for everyone. The Council supports the decrease of bureaucracy for operators, but is hesitant to simplify payment mechanisms, since it is a national competency. The Rapporteur expressed confidence that a compromise will be reached, which will benefit the smaller operators. EMFAF should be more holistic, providing support for all segments of the seafood supply chain, while providing special attention to small-scale operators. The Parliament has pushed for the Council to take into account the specific needs of small-scale coastal fisheries.



In the future fund, aquaculture should be supported through subsidies and financial instruments, in order to support the expansion of the sector, since the EU market remains dependent on imports. The processing sector should be able to receive financial support, even though the Commission is against.

Mr Mato provided an overview of specific marketing measures. On storage aid, the Parliament wants to maintain these measures, even though the other two institutions do not agree. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the importance of this measure. It should be allowed, at least, in situations of market disturbances. On PMPs, the Parliament changed the language to “may”, instead of “shall” support PMPs. It maintains the premise that “if it is not explicitly forbidden, it is allowed”. Member States cannot be obliged to support PMPs. On regional solutions, the Parliament supports these. Besides a national plan, Member States should be able to develop regional plans. The latest revision of the CFP included a regional character, so the EMFF should follow the same logic. The Commission and the Council do not seem favourable to this change, due to concerns with excess administrative burden. The Parliament will continue to argue in favour of this focus.

There have been over 40 bilateral meetings on the EMFF to bring positions closer. Mr Mato expressed surprise with the recent comments by the German Fisheries Minister, according to which the German Presidency would not be able to close the EMFF file. The Rapporteur is confident that it will be possible to close the file. The final goal is common. There are also some doubts in some positions. The Parliament wants better fishing, not more. The Rapporteur expressed openness to discuss with the MAC.

- **Exchange of views on the latest developments on 2021-2027 proposal**

The Chair drew attention to the common position adopted by the MAC and urged members to focus discussion on the topics under the competence of the MAC. The Chair recognised the work done by the Parliament and that a significant part of the MAC’s advice was taken on board by the Parliament.

Maria Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) emphasised the importance of a global perspective that considers the entire seafood supply chain, including the retail sector. The EMFF should support the training and qualification of this sector, so that the market works better and in a more sustainable matter. There should be generational renewal. In Spain, there was a 23% reduction of employment, since the sector is no longer attractive. When producers become commercialisation agents, it is important that they also comply with retail legislation. For example, the retail sector was excluded of the COVID-19 pandemic measures, despite the work to maintain supply, including through the development of home deliveries.



Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA), on the aquaculture points under discussion, particularly subsidies and financial instruments, wanted to know what was the timeframe to address these issues. Operators are planning national plans for grants and investments. These will change significantly depending on the results of the trilogue negotiations. They also drew attention to the importance of the discussions on market intelligence and PMPs.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne), concerning article 24 on funding of PMPs, emphasised the paramount importance of this tool, which is the cornerstone for trading. They understand the rationale and the simplification objectives. Still, if the funding is not mandatory, some Member States will not include funding for PMPs, leading to inequalities in the EU. Therefore, they insisted on the importance of the mandatory character of this tool.

Gabriel Mato MEP, EP PECH Committee Rapporteur, agreed with FEDEPESCA. Commercialisation has been included in the four priorities agreed upon and Article 24 covers marketing. Regarding the question by EMPA, Mr Mato emphasised that nothing is closed, until everything is closed. Therefore, it is not possible to state the exact dates. There are monthly trilogue meetings planned. Between formal trilogue meetings, there are many technical meetings. The Member States already have an idea on the architecture of the national plans. On the comments by Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne, Mr Mato explained that it will already be difficult to include “may”. There is no room to make the funding mandatory. Each Member State will have to face its sector.

Nicolás Fernández (OPP72) underscored the importance of PMPs to implement the CFP. Making the PMPs discretionary for Member States would be a mistake.

Roberto Carlos Alonso (ANFACO-CECOPEPESCA) emphasised the importance of support for the processing industry. SMEs need this support to continue innovating. On the upcoming trilogue meeting, they asked Mr Mato to provide more information. On innovation, they underscored that the sector needs to innovate and that the future fund should allow this. On the new premise, they expressed full support, still they wondered if individual Member States would need to discuss their plans with the Commission.

Katrin Poulsen (WWF) expressed regret that the Parliament and the Council are planning to reintroduce certain types of harmful subsidies, since these hamper CFP and SDG targets. They do not believe that the proposed safeguards are sufficient or effective to prevent or control an increase of capacity by the fleet, particularly on first acquisition of vessels, modernisation measures, and engine replacements. This could result in an increased risk of capacity and effort, leading to overfishing. It would also have repercussions at the global level, including in the WTO negotiations on fishing subsidies. It goes against the SDG targets.

The Chair explained that the MAC did not deal with the topic of fisheries subsidies, since it is a competence of other ACs.



Daniel Voces (Europêche) welcomed the balance approach of Mr Mato to fisheries management. The Commission's communication on the status of the stocks demonstrated that there has been a reduction of fishing efforts. There is progress in the development of sustainable fisheries. Year after year, there is a reduction in the number of fishing vessels and fishers. There is an ageing of the average age of the workforce and of the vessels. It is fundamental to support innovation in fishing vessels, in order to increase attractiveness of the sector and generational renewal. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that some measures continue to be essential, such as storage aid. They wanted to know how the recovery package will work with the new EMFF.

Gabriel Mato MEP, EP PECH Committee Rapporteur, underscored that no one wants overcapacity or overfishing. Discussions should not only be about physical tonnes, but also about social tonnes. Mr Mato does not agree with the premise of harmful subsidies. The fact that someone might use these in a negative way does not mean that these should be abolished. It is important to support the development of the sector and generational renewal. There are less vessels and less fishers in the sector, while there is good news on the status of the stocks. There needs to be a balance between the three pillars of sustainability. The Rapporteur agreed with OPP72 that PMPs are fundamental, so the objective is work in that direction. Regarding the questions by ANFACO-CECOPECA, the MEP explained that the 24 September meeting will be a formal trilogue meeting. The new EMFF covers support for innovation, including promotion of skills, knowledge and capacity building. National plans need to be sufficiently flexible. There will always be interpretation issues, but the new premise should facilitate measures. Mr Mato expressed hope that the new fund will be more accessible for operators.

- **Way forward**

The Chair thanked Mr Mato for taking on board the MAC's recommendations and expressed willingness to continue dialogue. The Chair proposed for the MAC to continue monitoring developments on the EMFAF.

**AOB**

None.



## Summary of action points

- COVID-19 Pandemic:
  - Secretariat to prepare a first draft document
  - Special meeting dedicated to the consideration of the draft to take place in November
- Marketing Standards:
  - Follow developments on the European Commission's public consultation and targeted consultations, while taking into account the potential development of sustainability criteria and indicators
- European Fishery Statistics:
  - Secretariat to circulate the public consultation, so that members can submit individual contributions
- Brown Crab Management:
  - Proposal of establishment of a joint MAC-NWWAC-NSAC Focus Group to be put forward to the Executive Committee by the Chair
  - Secretariat to circulate the draft Terms of Reference prepared by NWWAC, allowing for potential amendments
- EMFAF:
  - Continue monitoring legislative developments



## List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Andreas Lazar	European Commission
Angeles Longa	EMPA
Annelie Rosell	Swedish Pelagic Federation PO
Bruno Guillaumie	EMPA
Catherine Pons	FEAP
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Cristina Fernández (observer)	United Kingdom (Seafish)
Daniel Voces	Europêche
Daniel Weber	European Fishmeal
Emiel Brouckaert	EAPO
Gabriel Mato MEP	European Parliament
Gaël Laviaille	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Gerd Heinen	European Commission
Guillaume Carruel	EAPO
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie
Haydeé Fernández	Conxemar
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Jens Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association
José Carlos Escalera	Federación de Cofradías de Pescadores de Cádiz (FECOPESCA)
José Basilio Otero Rodríguez	Federación de Cofradías de Pescadores de Cadiz (FECOPESCA)
Katarina Sipic	AIPCE-CEP
Katrin Poulsen	WWF
Konstantinos Kalamantis	European Parliament
Laurène Jolly	European Commission
Maria Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA



Representative	Organisation
Massimo Bellavista	Copa Cogeca
Matthias Keller	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgroßhandels e.V.
Mike Turenhout	Visfederatie
Nicolás Fernandez Muñoz	OPP72
Norah Parke	NWWAC
Patrick Murphy	IS&WFPO
Pedro Luis Casado López	OPP80
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council
Pim Visser	VisNed
Purificación del C. Fernández Alvarez	OPPC-3
Roberto Carlos Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPECA
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche
Sean O'Donoghue (Chair)	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation Ltd
Sergio López García	OPP LUGO
Stavroula Kremmydiotou	Market Advisory Council
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana

