

Working Group 1: EU Production Minutes

Friday, 17 September 2021

14:00 - 18:00 CET

Zoom online meeting

Welcome from the Chair, Sean O'Donoghue

Adoption of agenda and minutes last meeting (31.05.21): 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 meeting – information**
- Marketing Standards:
 - Secretariat, in coordination with the Chair, to prepare a questionnaire to the members on sustainability criteria and data requirements
 - Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) and Christine Absil (Good Fish Foundation) to make a presentation at the next meeting on sustainability criteria and data requirements
 - Questionnaire circulated to members: 15 June – 12 July 2021
 - Answers, background and draft advice circulated: 1 September 2021
- Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet:
 - Chair and Secretary General to attend, as observers, the STECF AER II meeting, which will take place on 7-11 June 2021
 - At the meeting, Chair and Secretary General to highlight the recommendations previously approved by the MAC on data collection by STECF available
 - Chair and Secretary General participated and raised the MAC's recommendations
- COVID-19 Pandemic:
 - Secretariat to circulate the presentations of the EUMOFA Talk on COVID-19, once these are publicly available
 - Presentation on the upcoming Eurobarometer report by DG MARE representatives to be scheduled under the next meeting's draft agenda
 - EUMOFA Talk presentations circulated (16 June 2021)
 - Presentation of Eurobarometer report scheduled for 16 September GA meeting



- Joint MAC/NWWAC/NSAC Focus Group on Brown Crab:
 - Continuous updates on the next meetings
 - If agreed by the Focus Group, draft advice to be considered at the next meeting
 - Update by Norah Parke, FG Chair, scheduled
 - Draft agreed by FG circulated (3 September 2021)

Marketing Standards

- **Results of Secretariat's questionnaire on socio-economic sustainability aspects**

The Chair highlighted that a significant number of members replied to the questionnaire (FEDEPESCA, APROMAR, SPFPO, MSC, AIPCE-CEP, Europêche, CONXEMAR, EAPO, Oceana/Good Fish/ClientEarth/WWF/EJF). The draft advice brings together the views of the members, including the diverging ones. A background note, which summarises the different views of the members, was circulate. The aim of the text was to cover the three pillars of sustainability. The STECF report covered the environmental pillar significantly, slightly covered the social pillar, and did not cover the economic pillar. The WG1's draft focuses on the social and economic pillars, while the recommendations take a macro-level approach. The Chair highlighted that the European Commission is actively working on the revision of the marketing standards framework, so the MAC should work on the adoption of the advice. There will be further opportunities to produce advice on the topic.

- **Consideration of draft advice on incorporation of sustainability aspects in the marketing standards framework**

The Working Group proceeded to consider the draft text on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) thanked the Chair and the Secretary General for the high quality of the draft advice. The draft covers all the important points addressed at the previous meeting. It is a good summary of the members' views. Mr Robert stated that this advice would be a first step for future discussions, which will take place with stakeholders. It is important to respect the Commission's calendar. Discussions will be needed in the future on the availability of the data required for the proposed incorporation of sustainability aspects.

Pim Visser (VisNed) agreed with the previous member's intervention. Mr Visser argued that, besides the sustainability aspect, the MAC should not forget other aspects of the marketing standards framework. The marketing standards are business-to-business (B2B) standards. There is a great need for standardisation for all aspects included in the framework, including on the



sustainability aspects. The focus on the sustainability aspects should not lead to the practical and technical elements of the marketing standards being ignored, particularly in first sales.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) also thanked the Chair and the Secretary General for the preparation of the draft. The MAC is addressing aspects that are difficult for industry operators to integrate fully. The current framework is focused on harmonization of technical and practical aspects, which are particularly relevant for first sale, and are B2B focused. The framework is essential to regulate the market with practical approaches. The sustainability aspects and the scoring system proposed by STECF are more connected to consumer information. Mr Commère wondered if it would not be more appropriate for the sustainability aspects to be addressed in the consumer information rules, for example under the CMO Regulation, instead of under the marketing standards framework. The proposed sustainability criteria are not factual elements like the existing commercialization criteria. Sustainability criteria are more subjective and evolutive.

The Chair expressed his conviction that concerns expressed by Mr Commère were addressed in draft recommendation b). On the practicality, the Chair emphasised that the recommendations take a macro-level approach, so without focusing too much on the technicalities.

Pim Visser (VisNed) suggested that, under the introduction section, there should be a reference to the B2B nature of the marketing standards framework.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) disagreed with Mr Visser's suggestion. Ms Vulperhorst argued that members are aware of the nature of the marketing standards framework and can consult the documents prepared by DG MARE. Otherwise, the introduction section would also need to reflect that the Commission identified a gap in the coverage of sustainability aspects.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) stated that the marketing standards set the conditions for the sale of fisheries and aquaculture products. The marketing standards is not merely an instrument of description, but also of action. Mr Pastoor provided an example: the stock of the North Sea cod is low at the moment. If that was covered by a marketing standard, it would be possible to catch North Sea cod, but not to sell it to the market. He expressed concern with the connection between sustainability aspects and the marketing standards framework.

Frangiscos Nikolian (DG MARE) clarified that two of the three marketing standards regulations are of a B2C nature, namely the ones on sardines and bonito tuna. Mr Nikolian disagreed with Mr Pastoor's example. The sustainability aspects would not prevent the sale of the product, but merely provide information to the consumer how the product scores versus the established criteria.



The Working Group proceeded to consider the draft recommendations.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE), in relation to draft recommendation a), suggested the replacement of the word “covered” with the word “assessed”.

The Chair emphasised that the aim is to refer to the concept of sustainability as provided by the Common Fisheries Policy, so that the word “sustainability” in cases that only one of the three pillars is addressed.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) suggested the inclusion of a recommendation on ensuring coherence with other policies and legislation, including between fishing opportunities and the marketing standards framework.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) highlighted that, according to the background note, several members, including the NGO members and Europêche, do not necessarily agree that social and economic elements need to be covered. Therefore, Ms Vulperhorst wondered about the relevance of draft recommendation a), suggesting that perhaps the draft text should instead refer to the different views of the members regarding the inclusion of socio-economic elements.

The Chair clarified that the aim of draft recommendation a) is to provide a general reference to the concept of sustainability in the Common Fisheries Policy. When the word “sustainability” is used in the marketing standards framework, it should be in line with the concept provided by the Common Fisheries Policy. If only one of the pillars is being covered, then this specialisation should be specified. As for the different views on the inclusion of socio-economic elements, the draft text does not state that socio-economic elements should or should not be included. The draft text merely recommends that the Commission assess the relevance of their inclusion.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) suggested the deletion of the second sentence of draft recommendation a), in order to avoid misunderstanding that the MAC is recommending that the socio-economic elements must be covered.

The Chair suggested the use of an alternative formulation: “if the word «sustainability» is used, then the three pillars must be assessed”.

Jennifer Reeves (MSC) drew attention to the upcoming proposal on sustainable food systems, which will establish common definitions, principles, and requirements. Therefore, it is important to ensure coherence amongst the different policy initiatives.

The Chair highlighted that the marketing standards framework is part of the Common Fisheries Policy, so the reference should be the concept provided there.



Frangiscos Nikolian (DG MARE) agreed that the revision of the marketing standards framework is under the Common Fisheries Policy and the CMO Regulation. The expectation from DG MARE is that the Marketing standards proposals will contribute to the initiative on sustainable food systems. DG MARE is working in cooperation with DG SANTE. There will be labelling aspects under the sustainable food systems initiative.

Javier Ojeda (APROMAR) noted that the Common Fisheries Policy does not provide a definition of sustainability, but merely a concept. Mr Ojeda highlighted that authorisation to sell products on the market is a separate issue from the information provided to consumers to assist in their choices.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) argued that, despite footnote 6, that draft recommendations a) and b) should change order, in order to reflect their importance. Mr Commère proposed the inclusion of a reference to the need to consider the difference between the existing technical objectives elements from more subjective elements.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) emphasised that the purpose of the advice is also to inform the Commission and other institutions of the positions of the members. In Ms Vulperhorst's view, the formulation in draft recommendation b) did not sufficiently reflect the views of the members, since some members are against the inclusion of socio-economic elements.

The Chair explained that draft recommendation b) was meant to be a compromise between the different views in the MAC.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) expressed concern with the addition suggested by Mr Commère on the coexistence of technical criteria with other types of criteria. Objective criteria can be used to assess sustainability. For example, in reference to environmental sustainability, if the mortality rate of the stock is below FMSY, the value is not subjective. Mr Robert expressed hopes that the scoring for social and economic sustainability will also be based on reliable data. He highlighted that draft recommendation b) was focused on the regulatory approach for the marketing standards framework, not on the technical specificities.

Carla Valeiras (EuroCommerce) expressed concern with the use of the word “communicate” in draft recommendation b), since, in her view, marketing standards should have a B2B perspective, while the recommendation could be read to imply communication to consumers. Ms Valeiras emphasised that coherence is needed between the marketing standards framework and other policy initiatives, particularly the sustainability food systems initiative. Therefore, the MAC should call for coherence and consistency with upcoming initiatives.



Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) recognised the effort to achieve a compromise position in draft recommendation b), but argued that it might be better explicitly delineate that there are two groups amongst the membership: those who believe marketing standards could be an appropriate legal instrument to measure and communicate on sustainability and those who believe that other legal instruments would be more appropriate to provide consumer information.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) underscored that not all members agreed that the marketing standards framework should be B2B. Ms Vulperhorst agreed with Mr Pastoor that the text should make clear to the European Commission that there are two perspectives amongst the membership. She suggested including part of the background note prepared by the Secretariat as an Annex to the advice.

Carla Valeiras (EuroCommerce) stated that, since there were members that believe that the framework should be B2C, she would not oppose the reference to “communicate”.

Christine Absil (Good Fish) agreed with Ms Vulperhorst to include some parts of the background note as an Annex to the advice, as it could help the Commission understand the different views of the membership.

For draft recommendation a), the working group agreed on the following wording: “Taking into account the concept of sustainability provided by the Common Fisheries Policy, assess whether the marketing standards framework is the most appropriate legal instrument to measure and communicate on sustainability or whether an alternative instrument would be more appropriate to reach the objectives of the CMO Regulation. In this assessment, consider the different nature of existing technically measurable standards and potential new criteria dependent on evaluation”.

For draft recommendation b), the working group agreed on the following wording: “Respect the concept of sustainability in the Common Fisheries Policy (Art. 2.1) which covers the three pillars of sustainability: environmental, social and economic. If the word “sustainability” is used, then the three pillars must be assessed. In case the European Commission chooses to focus on one of the pillars of sustainability, the choice should be specified (e.g., “environmental sustainability”) and avoid using general references to “sustainability””.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) expressed support for the new draft recommendation c). Mr Keller suggested a reference to coherence with the Common Fisheries Policy.



Jennifer Reeves (MSC) suggested the inclusion of a reference to the initiative on substantiating green claims and to the initiative to empower consumers for the green transition.

Javier Ojeda (APROMAR) suggested the inclusion of a reference to the EU taxonomy regulation and the technical environmental screening criteria. The screening criteria for wild caught fish is expected to be published soon. Criteria for aquaculture fish has not yet been developed.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) expressed agreement with the inclusion of a reference to the EU taxonomy regulation.

Jennifer Reeves (MSC) suggested the inclusion of a reference to the sustainable governance framework initiative. Ms Reeves wondered about the relevance of draft recommendation e), since the matter is already tackled by the DG JUST initiative on empowering the consumer for the green transition.

For draft recommendation c), the working group agreed on the following wording: “Ensure coherence and consistency with the Common Fisheries Policy, existing legal instruments and other policy initiatives, such as the upcoming legislative proposal on sustainable food systems, EU taxonomy and technical screening criteria, the initiative on substantiating green claims, and the sustainable corporate governance framework”.

Carla Valeiras (EuroCommerce) stated that, if an Annex is included that demonstrates the different views of the membership on communicating to consumers, then there is no problem with draft recommendation e).

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) argued that draft recommendation g) should be deleted, since it is a detailed recommendation, while the aim was to provide recommendations at the macro-level.

The Secretary General explained that draft recommendation g) was based on Europêche’s reply to the questionnaire.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) agreed with the deletion, since the main point is to avoid disproportionate administrative burden for the operators, which is covered by draft recommendation f).

Juan Manuel Trujillo (ETF) stated that he agreed with the original draft recommendation g), but that, if Europêche does not oppose the deletion, then he would not oppose it either.



Christine Absil (Good Fish) stated that the text of draft recommendation i) should be coherent with previous recommendations. Therefore, it should not read “should cover the three pillars of sustainability”.

The Chair suggested replacing the word “mandate” with the word “request”.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) highlighted that it will be the Commission who defines the terms of reference of the STECF’s work. STECF should be encouraged to work on the three pillars of sustainability.

For draft recommendation i), the working group agreed on the following wording: “i) Request STECF to proceed with the development of an initial scoring system, which respects the concept of sustainability, in line with recommendation b)”.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), in relation to draft recommendation k), disagreed with the explicit reference to a pilot scheme, since that could delay the revision for several years. The reference should be instead to “a properly tested system”.

For draft recommendation k), the working group agreed on the following wording: “Before the implementation of a scoring system, ensure that the system is adequately tested, guaranteeing its reliability, efficiency and robustness”.

Daniel Voces (Europêche), in draft recommendation l), expressed disagreement with the reference to “data deficient fisheries”, since these do not necessarily mean unsustainable. There can situations of data deficiencies, but where scientists still recognise the stock as sustainable.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) highlighted that the system proposed by STECF would not label products as “sustainable” or “unsustainable”, but instead provides a scoring. Products with “A” and “B” scoring are the most sustainable, products with “C” and “D” scoring are of medium performance, and products with “E” and “F” scoring are the least sustainable. As for data deficiencies, Mr Robert drew attention to the sensitivity of the matter. There are stocks for which it is very difficult to assess mortality. It is also important to take into account the application to imported products.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) argued for the full deletion of draft recommendation l). It could be difficult to explain to consumers why there is a scientific body issuing proposals on catch limits, while at the same time there is a scoring on data deficient fisheries and overfished stocks. It is necessary to ensure coherence.



Christine Absil (Good Fish) stated that it was important to ensure that data deficient fisheries do not receive a high (“green”) scoring on sustainability. There should not be misleading of consumers. Products that fail to meet minimums on environmental sustainability, but that meet minimums on other sustainability pillars, should not be able to qualify for a high final scoring.

Jennifer Reeves (MSC) recalled that her organisation’s response to the questionnaire highlighted the difficulties in having an overall rating that reflects the three pillars of sustainability. There is a risk of lowering the bar on environmental sustainability, if a product meets high economic and social standards and is allowed to receive a high final score.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) agreed with the full deletion suggested by Mr Keller, since draft recommendation l) because it is referring exclusively only environmental aspects, while the advice is focusing on social and economic elements.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) highlighted that the wording in draft recommendation m) was quite imprecise.

The Secretary General corrected the sentence to read “clarify the relationship between the proposed scoring system and existing private auditing schemes and inspection schemes by public administrative authorities”.

For draft recommendation l), the working group agreed on the following wording: “Ensure that only products with sufficient and verifiable sustainability can receive a high (“green”) positive score”.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE), in relation to draft recommendation s), stated that the economic criteria were more focused on companies, so it would be difficult to reflect these on products. Mr Commère argued that “aquaculture” undertakings should also be covered by the draft recommendation.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) thanked the Chair and the Secretariat for the very complete draft. Ms Álvarez wondered whether criteria on the position of operators within the chain, as it was developed in Spain and in the EU, could be covered under the economic criteria.

The Chair suggested the deletion of the examples of economic criteria.

For draft recommendation s), the working group agreed on the following wording: “Assess the relevance, appropriate criteria and data requirements of developing economic criteria for fisheries and aquaculture undertakings”.



Jennifer Reeves (MSC), in relation to draft recommendation t), wondered if it was possible to add wording to reflect the short-term perspective of socio-economic criteria in comparison with the long-term perspective of environmental criteria.

For draft recommendation t), the working group agreed on the wording “Assess the potential negative trade-offs caused by economic criteria for environmental and social objectives, including long-term and short-term differences, while taking into account the best available science on the matter”.

The Chair wondered if the previously mentioned reference to data deficient fisheries was more appropriately covered under the environmental criteria section.

Christine Absil (Good Fish) agreed that it is covered by the STECF report, but highlighted that STECF is only providing advice. The MAC should indicate to what extent it agrees with the STECF’ advice. Nevertheless, in the draft advice under consideration, the MAC should not express full agreement with the environmental criteria suggested by STECF, since it requires further discussion amongst the membership. Ms Absil called for the inclusion of a draft recommendation making clear that, if a product is not sustainable under one of the pillars, it should not receive a “green” scoring on the package.

Jennifer Reeves (MSC) wondered if there should be a reference to auditability of indicators

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) wondered whether draft recommendation j) was not pre-empting the points made in draft recommendation k). Mr Commère reaffirmed his views on the importance of mentioning the different nature between technically measurable standards and potential new more subjective criteria under draft recommendation b).

The Working Group agreed on the amendments described above. For the draft recommendations not expressively mentioned, the wording of the draft prepared by the Chair and the Secretariat, which was circulated ahead of the meeting, was maintained. The Working Group also agreed to put forward the draft advice for consideration by the Executive Committee under written procedure.

Joint MAC/NWWAC/NSAC Focus Group on Brown Crab

- **Update on the work by Norah Parke, Focus Group Chair**
- **Consideration of draft advice on production and marketing of brown crab in the EU**



Norah Parke (KFO) thanked the MAC, NWWAC and NSAC Secretariats for their assistance. The engagement of the brown crab industry started in 2009 when there was a steep decline in price and an increase of expenses. The UK, Ireland and France established the ACRUNET project, which covered many problems faced by the fishery. At the end of the project, there was still one outstanding issue: lack of agreement on similar management due to different regulatory backgrounds. Therefore, a focus group was established in the NWWAC. Eventually, a joint focus group was established between the MAC, the NWWAC and the NSAC.

Ms Parke explained that the traditional producers are Ireland, France and the UK. There are also new entrants. The Netherlands is a major hub for exporting and is looking into the expansion of their fishery due to loss of fishing grounds caused by offshore windfarms. Denmark has a significant bycatch from gillnet fishing, but without a sufficient market outlet. Germany is also affected by the expansion of offshore windfarms, so it is looking for fisheries that can work in the same space. Poland is looking into crab fishery as an alternative for fishers displaced in the Baltic.

Ms Parke further explained that brown crab was always closely monitored. Recent scientific data shows a significant decline in landings. This requires further investigation, in other to raise awareness among new entrants. The market remains in a good shape despite ongoing difficulties. China is a very important market for live and frozen crab, but there are difficulties connected to the use of different health certificates for different exporting countries. Due to these restrictions, the UK no longer exports live crab to China. Ireland's health certificate is accepted by China, but there are restrictions imposed by the national administration, so the Irish industry is not directly exporting crab to China. Hong Kong is also traditionally a good market, but there are different administrative requirements.

The testing limits for cadmium is a major obstacle for the EU industry. In China, the entire meat of the crab is tested, while, in the EU, only the white meat is tested. In China, there is an ongoing consultation process to increase the cadmium limits. COVID-19 had a significant impact on the industry. Ms Parke recalled that the MAC recommended to DG MARE the undertaking of an EUMOFA study on the impact of COVID-19 in the supply chain. The study provides very detailed and useful information. Brexit is also a major problem due to supply and logistical difficulties. Ireland was dependent on the UK's land bridge to export to continental Europe.

The draft advice was presented to the NWWAC on 13 September and is expected to be approved at the 21 September Executive Committee meeting. NWWAC proposed one additional amendment: a footnote under recommendation b) on sharing of best practices to ensure that brown crab pot gear is identifiable to reduce "ghost" fishing and plastic pollution.



The Working Group proceeded with the considered of the draft recommendations and agreed with the draft text as proposed.

Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet

- **Presentation of STECF 2021 Annual Report by Raúl Prellezo, Principal Researcher, AZTI**

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

- **Exchange of views**

Taking into account that the annual report had not yet been officially published by the European Commission, the agenda item was postponed to the January meeting.

Economic Report of the Aquaculture Sector

- **Presentation of STECF 2020 Report by Jordi Guillen, European Commission**

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

Jordi Guillen (STECF) provided an overview of the data call, the contents of the report, the economic performance of aquaculture in 2018, the main species by weight and value, the production by subsector, the economic performance by subsector, the first analyses of algae production, the nowcasting, the impact of COVID-19 in 2020, and the social (demographic) data.

- **Exchange of views**

The Chair wanted to know about the different between the figures from the FAO and the figures from STECF on the production by subsector.

Jordi Guillen (STECF) explained that the prices reported to STECF are slightly higher than the ones of the FAO.

Berhard Feneis (FEAP) wanted to know if the data for freshwater aquaculture production only covered fish sold to the market. There have been problems in assessing the production, because carp and trout can use open water systems that is not counted. Therefore, Mr Feneis wanted to know whether production for stocking and other uses was also covered.

Jordi Guillen (STECF) responded that report only consider production for human consumption. STECF did not request data on production for other uses.



Berhard Feneis (FEAP) understood the reasoning behind that choice, but added that it means that the figures do not represent the entire production of aquaculture.

AOB

None.



Summary of action points

- Marketing Standards:
 - Draft advice on incorporation of sustainability aspects in the marketing standards framework to be put forward to the Executive Committee for adoption through written procedure
- Joint MAC/NWWAC/NSAC Focus Group on Brown Crab
 - Draft advice on production and marketing of brown crab in the EU to be put forward to the Executive Committee for adoption through written procedure
- Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet
 - Presentation of STECF 2021 Annual Report to be scheduled for January meeting



List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Agnieszka Korbel	WWF
Alen Lovrinov	PO Omega3
Anna Boulova	FRUCOM
Benoît Guerin	BG Sea Consulting
Bruno Guillaumie	EMPA
Carla Valeiras	EuroCommerce
Catherine Pons	FEAP
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Daniel Voces	Europêche
Daniel Weber	European Fishmeal
Frangiscos Nikolian	European Commission
Georg Werner	Environmental Justice Foundation
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie
Javier Ojeda	APROMAR
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Jennifer Reeves	Marine Stewardship Council
Jens Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association
Jordi Guillen	European Commission
José Basilio Otero Rodríguez	Federación Nacional de Cofradías de Pescadores (FNCP)
José Manuel Fernández Beltrán	OPP Lugo
Juan Elices	Spain
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF
Katarina Sipic	AIPCE-CEP
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA



Representative	Organisation
Massimo Bellavista	COPA COGECA
Matthias Keller	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.
Nicolás Fernandez Muñoz	OPP72
Norah Parke	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation Ltd (KFO)
Patrick Murphy	IS&WFPO
Pierre Commère	ADEPALE
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council
Pim Visser	VisNed
Purificación Fernández	OPPC-3
Quentin Marchais	ClientEarth
Roberto Carlos Alonso Baptista de Sousa	ANFACO-CECOPECA
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche
Ruth Vazquez	CONXEMAR
Santiago Folgar Gutiérrez	AVOCANO
Sean O'Donoghue (Chair)	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation Ltd (KFO)
Stavroula Kremmydiotou	Market Advisory Council
Stylianios Filopoulos	Aquaculture Advisory Council
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana
Yannis Pelekanakis	FEAP
Zarah Bellefroid	EAPPO

