

Working Group 1: EU Production

Draft Minutes

Wednesday, 31 January 2024 (09:00 – 12:30 CET)

Copa Cogeca (Meeting Room A), Rue de Trèves 61, 1040 Brussels

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Julien Lamothe

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

Adoption of draft agenda and of the last meeting minutes (29.11.23): adopted

Action points of the last meeting

- **State-of-play of the decisions made during the last meeting - information**
- Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet:
 - Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire to the members on suggestions for the Terms of Reference of the 2024 edition of the Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet
 - At the next meeting, draft advice based on the input received to be considered
 - Questionnaire circulated: 3 – 15 January 2024
 - Draft advice circulated: 18 January 2024
 - Consideration of draft advice scheduled (12:00)
- Energy Transition in EU Fisheries and Aquaculture:
 - Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire to the members on the expected impact on the market of fisheries and aquaculture products
 - At the next meeting, draft advice based on the input received to be considered
 - Questionnaire circulated: 3 – 15 January 2024
 - Draft advice circulated: 25 January 2024
 - Consideration of draft advice scheduled (11:30)
- Marine Action Plan:
 - EAPO to prepare draft advice on expected impacts on the EU supply to the market, which will be considered at the next meeting
 - EAPO's proposal of draft advice circulated: 19 January 2024
 - Consideration of draft advice scheduled (11:00)
- Market Disturbances:



- Compilation document on crises measures to be prepared ahead of the March 2024 meeting
 - Pending

Fishers of the Future

- **Presentation of the project by Commission representative**

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

Joan Roussoulière-Azzam (DG MARE) delivered a presentation on the foresight project “Fishers of the Future – what will the future look like for fishers in 2050?”. Ms Roussoulière-Azzam highlighted social sustainability and a fair standard of living for the fisheries sector are among the objectives of the Common Fisheries Policy. Social sustainability is necessary for the continuity, stability and well-being of the fishing sector. It is a way to future-proof it. The Commission representative added that the times are changing due to competition for space, climate change, political developments, and the business environment.

Ms Roussoulière-Azzam recalled that the Fisheries & Oceans Pact of February 2023 reaffirms the importance of “empowering people in fishing communities” and acknowledges the challenges ahead that will have an impact on the sector. In order to guide policy-making, the European Commission has committed to conducting an EU-wide participatory foresight project on “Fishers of the Future”, to forecast the crucial role of fishers in society, beyond the provision of high-quality seafood with a relatively low carbon footprint. On the basis of qualitative interviews on the ground, the project will identify the trends, opportunities and threats that determine the attractiveness of the fishing sector.

Ms Roussoulière-Azzam explained that the overall objective of the project was to project fishers in the future, explore changes in profession, role and identity of fishers in the long-term to generate a common understanding of fishers of the future and supporting engagement. There will be specific steps: 1) set the scene: “who are today’s fishers and what environment do they operate in?”, 2) identify patterns and insights: “what may happen over the next decades?”, 3) explore the future of fishers using foresight methods (megatrends and drivers), and 4) identify scenarios leading to 2050 and define fishers’ profiles (who they will be).

In terms of scope, the project will cover commercial fisheries (not recreational), marine (not inland or aquaculture), the catching sector (vessel owners and crew, not onshore upstream or downstream sector), EU waters (including outermost regions), 22 coastal EU Member States and overseas territories, up to 2050. Concerning tools for engagement, the project will be based on engagement with fishers across 22 countries via key informant interviews, focus group discussions, engagement with stakeholders, expert workshops, surveys, and events. As for timeline, the study was started on November, a survey would be launched in February 2024, a presentation event with the first set of



results would take place on March 2024, while the final study and presentation of results would be in December 2024.

Ms Roussoulière-Azzam emphasised that the objective was to feed into reflections and bring new insight at the start of the new Commission mandate. The mentioned survey would be circulated to the Advisory Councils.

- **Exchange of views**

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) requested information on the preparations of the project, the selection process of the fishers for the key informant interviews, and the timing of the deliverables. Mr Murphy argued that the Advisory Councils should have been engaged since the beginning. He stressed that the project was overdue, as the loss of fishing vessels in the sector continues to increase. Overregulation is also one of the difficulties faced by the sector, he added.

Pim Visser (VisNed) informed that he had never heard of the project or the engagement with stakeholders in the Netherlands, which demonstrated a disconnection. Mr Visser urged the Commission to connect to the people on the ground and expressed agreement with Mr Murphy's intervention. He emphasised that the future of the fishers will also be defined by the onshore upstream and downstream sector. He wanted to know if the Commission also planned initiatives to cover the period between now and 2050.

Jaroslav Zieliński (PFPA) expressed disappointment that the onshore upstream and downstream sector was not included in the project, exemplifying that, in the Baltic Sea, the fishing sector is completely dependent on the processing sector. Mr Zieliński requested information on the selection process of the fishers for the key informant interviews, adding that Baltic stakeholders were not aware of the project.

Joan Roussoulière-Azzam (DG MARE) explained that the project was launched in November 2023. Interviews with fishers from the 22 coastal Member States had been ongoing for several months. The contractor has country experts that are interviewing local fishers. The contributions of these fishers will be made available to the Advisory Councils through the survey and the March 2024 event. Ms Roussoulière-Azzam stated that she took note of the comments about the onshore upstream and downstream sector, but drew attention to the budgetary limitations in the set-up of the project. The Commission representative that these would, nevertheless, be accounted for in the trends portion of the project.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) welcomed the exercise, but expressed disappointment that the shellfish farming sector was not included. Mr Guillaumie highlighted that there were common issues faced, such as spatial planning. He added that there are many questions on the role of aquaculture farmers under the Common Fisheries Policy and in the context of the MAC.



Joan Roussoulière-Azzam (DG MARE) responded that, due to budgetary limitations, it was not possible to cover all topics. Ms Roussoulière-Azzam recognised that, in the future, it would likely be required to go further on other aspects, such as aquaculture, and the onshore upstream and downstream sector.

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) stated that the project was unknown among stakeholders. Mr López drew attention to the “fight for space”, as the fishing sector is seen as “getting in the way” of other newer sectors. He underscored that the scenario for the future of fishers was quite negative.

Massimo Bellavista (Copa Cogeca) recognised the importance of the project, but added that it must take into account the many regulations applicable to the sector. In some Member States, there is no professional training available for the sector, which leads to a “fleet of the last century”. Mr Bellavista wanted to know how the local groups of fishers were identified and whether all Member States were covered in the project.

John Lynch (ISEFPO) expressed disappointment that the interviews and surveys had been ongoing for months, but that Irish stakeholders were unaware of these, adding that the members of his organisation had not been contacted. Mr Lynch requested information on how the métiers and the different Member States would be assessed.

Laure Guillevic (WWF) requested information on how the general trends would be defined and which ones had been identified.

Joan Roussoulière-Azzam (DG MARE) responded that several of the views expressed by the members were similar to those in the interviews held. The experts had been listening to the sector on the ground. Concerning the trends, the mega trends defined by the JRC and IPSOS had been used, for example on an ageing demographic. The trends will be used in the survey that will be sent to stakeholders. Initial profiles of fishers will be shared. In terms of training, as per another commitment made in the Fisheries Package of February 2023, the Commission is considering the implementation of IMO safety training standards and certification into EU law.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) requested information on the final report, particularly whether it would be one overall report for the 27 Member States or whether there would be divided by Member State.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) expressed disappointment that the Commission went ahead with a survey without first consulting the stakeholder associations, the Producer Organisations, and the Advisory Councils. Since the project was ongoing for four months, Mr Murphy expressed hope that it would be possible to exchange with the experts soon. He commented that the members of his association would likely call for decommissioning schemes for fishing vessels, since the future of the sector is seen as negative, expressing doubts that the sector will still exist by 2050. Additionally, he asked for information on the budget of the project.



Pim Visser (VisNed) requested information on the researchers and the participants involved in the project. Mr Visser suggested the organisation of a meeting with the Advisory Councils about the onshore upstream and downstream sector. He also drew attention to several factors affecting the sector, such as artificial intelligence, the internet, and the digital market.

Joan Roussoulière-Azzam (DG MARE) responded that the exact format of the final report had not been decided yet. Reporting per country is available, so it would be relevant to provide detailed information. Ms Roussoulière-Azzam stated that the disappointment was noted, but that the Terms of Reference had already been defined. The development of other projects could be considered. Concerning the contract for the project, the identity of the consultants was publicly available. As for the budget, she would have to check internally about the possibility to publicly disclose.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed for the Working Group to discuss the survey at the next meeting.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) wanted to know if it would be possible to suggest modifications to the planned survey.

Joan Roussoulière-Azzam (DG MARE) responded that comments through the survey would be welcomed.

Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products

- **Update on STECF Expert Working Group meeting on validation of selected sustainability indicators and underlying methodologies (11-15 December 2023) by Commission representative (MARE A4)**

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) explained that the STECF Expert Working Groups (EWG) had been focused on three lead fisheries-specific indicators: 1) impact on seabed, which was finalised under the previous meeting, 2) impact on targeted stocks, and 3) impact on sensitive species. In the 11-15 December 2023 meeting, an EWG worked on the last two mentioned indicators. In the case of the indicator on targeted stocks, the group discussed the concrete operationalisation of the approach developed the STECF previously. A pilot tool was used to implement and test the approach. In the case of the indicator on sensitive species, the group developed an approach for a limited scope and assessed its feasibility for a broader application. The Commission representative informed that report of the meeting was not yet published. The report would be discussed at the next plenary meeting of STECF taking place in March 2024.

Concerning the indicator on the targeted stock and on the seabed, Mr Heinen informed that an information system was under development. The aim would be for the tool to be available by end of 2024. Based on an input of species, fishing gear, and catching area, the tool will provide a score for



the status of the stock and the impact on the seabed. The tool will need to be tested thoroughly, including with the involvement of the MAC.

- **Exchange of views**

Paul Thomas (EAPO) wondered about the potential policy developments linked to the sustainability criteria and how the criteria would be included in EU legislation, since these were originally planned to be integrated into the revision of the marketing standards framework and later meant for the Sustainable Food System Framework. Mr Thomas recalled that, under previous reports, for the grading of fishing products, two possible data systems were foreseen: one based on the available mandatory information of the Common Market Organisation Regulation, and another based on voluntary data provided by operators. He wanted to know if there had been developments on the possible external inputs under the second system.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) recalled that there had been developments in France on the definition of sustainability criteria, so he wondered if these were accounted for by STECF. Mr Simonnet wanted to know when the mentioned tool would be accessible to operators.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) stated that she shared Mr Thomas's questions.

Christine Absil (Good Fish) wanted to know about the place of the tool under development in relation to other initiatives, such as the Horizon call for a tool informing consumers on the health and sustainability of seafood products.

John Lynch (ISEFPO) wanted to know whether the definition of sustainability indicators on fish stocks was directed at consumers and operators. Mr Lynch also wanted to know if imported products would be covered by the initiative.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE), on policy developments, stated that the Sustainable Food System Framework's labelling system was currently on hold. The aim of the tool would be to operationalise and test the indicators before potentially including them in any policy initiative. The principle would still be to develop a "system 1" and "system 2" as described by Mr Thomas, meaning that operators would be able to submit more detailed information, when available.

Mr Heinen stated that the French project was broadly on the product environmental footprint (PEF) method, which does not cover at this point fisheries-specific elements. The French project team was however taking the STECF work into account for a potential inclusion of fisheries-specific aspects.

Mr Heinen informed that the tool would be publicly available, so downstream operators would be able to use it. Imported products would be covered.



As for consistency with Horizon projects, Mr Heinen stated that there were several projects aiming at seafood sustainability in a broad sense, but that he would be available to discuss these bilaterally.

Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) explained that STECF was working based on information that is transmitted along the supply chain, meaning that the indicators would use traceability information. The planned tool will allow calculations on sustainability. Additional information under “system 2” will be possible based on the parameters already defined, for example on fishing gear.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) wondered about how aquaculture certification, for example on organic production, would be accounted for.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) expressed surprise that only environmental indicators were being taken into account, since, on 15 October 2021, the MAC provided advice to DG MARE drawing attention to the importance of social and economic indicators. Mr Robert emphasised that there was a lack of information on imported products, which meant that these products would be able to achieve a high scoring even there are cases of forced labour, as exemplified by the European Parliament concerning Chinese fishing operations.

Jennifer Reeves (MSC) wanted to know about the assurance systems behind the tool. Ms Reeves highlighted that, in the context of the legislative proposal on substantiating and communication on explicit environmental claims, there were political groups in the European Parliament calling for the mandatory use of Product Environmental Footprint. If approved as proposed by the ENV Committee, it would mean a “fast-tracking” system for certain claims. She expressed concern about the lack of assurance and the risk of “green washing”.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE), on aquaculture certification, clarified that the planned tool was at this point only directed to fisheries. STECF was also doing separate work on aquaculture, linked to the guidelines for sustainable aquaculture, but the development of operational indicators was not yet as advanced as in the case of fisheries. Mr Heinen committed to informing his aquaculture colleagues about the interest of the members on this work, so that updates could be provided in the future.

Regarding social indicators, Mr Heinen explained that social sustainability indicators are generally not specific to fisheries. Hence the idea to cover them in the horizontal Sustainable Food System Framework. Moreover, it was quite difficult for STECF to work on socio-economic indicators, since these are generally not traceable. He recalled that the Commission does have an initiative on fighting forced labour on the market.

As for the legislative proposal on environmental claims, Mr Heinen stated that it was a matter of expertise of DG ENV. The final provisions will depend on the outcome of the interinstitutional negotiations.



Jennifer Reeves (MSC) asked about the assurance mechanisms behind the tool of DG MARE.

Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) responded that the tool was not a certification scheme, so it not required certification from third parties. The tool would use traceability data, meaning information that is already legally mandatory.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) wanted to know whether the sustainability scoring would be down to the level of the fishing vessel or to the species.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) stated that the input parameters related to species, catch area and gear, and did not include other specific characteristics at the operator's level.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) argued that, in that case, one "bad actor" could bring down the entire grading, since it is a shared resource.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) responded that the tool would not be a certification scheme and scores would not depend on the behaviour of individual operators, but on the sustainability of a given stock. So, behaviour of individual operators should not be a risk for other operators, unless individual operators would have an impact on the sustainability of the stock as a whole.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to invite the Chair of the STECF Expert Working Group for a presentation and exchange of views at the next meeting.

European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA)

- **Overview of 2024 work programme by Commission representative (MARE A4)**

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

Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) thanked the members for their interest in the work of EUMOFA. Ms Jolly delivered a presentation on the 2024 work programme of EUMOFA, including ongoing studies, price transmission analyses, *ad-hoc* studies, and other developments. She highlighted that several suggestions from the MAC were already integrated into the work programme.

- **Consideration of draft advice on suggestions of studies to be integrated in the 2024 work programme**

The Chair commented that several suggestions of the draft advice were already reflected in the work programme of 2024, such as the development of species profiles for mackerel and sardines. Plus, suggestions made in 2023, such thematic analyses for sea bass and sprat had also been integrated into the work programme of 2024.



Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) recommended the removal of the repeated suggestions. Concerning the suggested price structure analysis on mussels, Ms Jolly informed that one had been published in November 2022. The price structure analysis on frozen cod fillet was published in 2021, so it was likely too early to publish an update. She informed that a special Eurobarometer would be launched in the near future about EU consumer habits.

Jaroslav Zieliński (PFPA), concerning the suggestion of a thematic analysis of sprat in Sweden, Denmark, and Poland, highlighted that most of the catch, in Sweden and Denmark, goes towards fishmeal and fish oil. In the case of Poland, a part of the catch goes to consumer consumption. It was relevant to analyse both the trends in landings for human consumption and for fishmeal and fish oil. Therefore, it would be relevant to include Latvia and Estonia, where most of the production goes to human consumption in Ukraine. Mr Zieliński stated that trainings on the use of EUMOFA would be very useful and encouraged Ms Jolly to participate in more meetings with stakeholders about it.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) wanted to know whether, after approval, the work programme of EUMOFA could still be amended. Concerning the study on market composition per fishing method, Mr Thomas wanted to know whether the classification of fishing gears provided by the Common Market Organisation Regulation would be used or whether a more specific classification would be used instead. He expressed satisfaction that the suggestions from the MAC were being integrated into the work programme of EUMOFA.

Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) responded that the thematic analysis of sprat in Sweden, Denmark, and Poland had been a prior suggestion of the MAC, plus that a study about fishmeal and fish oil had been published in September 2023. The supply of sprat to Ukraine would likely be reflected in the planned study about market evolutions.

Ms Jolly explained that the work programme of 2024 had been decided at the beginning of 2024, integrating the suggestions made by the MAC in 2023. Suggestions of new studies would likely go under the work programme of 2025. For 2024, the planned price transmission analysis on smoked salmon in France, Poland, and Denmark, could potentially be replaced. The remaining studies were essentially prior suggestions of the MAC.

The Secretary General asked Ms Jolly for her views on the suggested thematic analysis on “evolution of EU consumers on consumption of fishery and aquaculture products”, as it could be too similar to the periodical special Eurobarometer reports on EU consumers habits regarding fishery and aquaculture products. Concerning the suggested analysis on “digital traceability of fishery and aquaculture products”, the Secretary General recalled that, in 2021, EUMOFA published a study on online business-to-consumer sales, and that, in 2023, the MAC suggested a study on the different selling methods of fisheries and aquaculture.



Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) responded that it could be relevant for EUMOFA to address the “evolution of EU consumers on consumption of fishery and aquaculture products”, even it was not necessarily under a thematic analysis. Concerning the suggested thematic analysis on “digital traceability of fishery and aquaculture products”, Ms Jolly argued that it might be better to wait for the publication of the planned study on “digitalisation of selling methods at first sale stage”. As for the suggested thematic analysis on “impact on market of banning bottom-trawling fishing gears in Marine Protected Areas, the Commission representative highlighted that impact assessments were outside the scope of EUMOFA.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to, taking into account the feedback provided by DG MARE, recirculate the draft advice via written procedure to gather new suggestions, which would be considered at the next meeting of the Working Group.

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

- **Consideration of draft advice on the Terms of Reference of the 2024 edition of the Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet**

The Chair provided an overview of the proposal of draft advice on expected effects of the Marine Action Plan on the EU supply to the EU market.

Pim Visser (VisNed), on section 6 “special chapters”, in relation to the reference to a specific chapter estimating the impacts of Brexit, suggested to also refer to the impact of the most recent UK’s regulations, including on spatial limitations for fishing activities.

The Working Group agreed on the draft advice on the STECF’s Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet (2024).

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to put forward the agreed advice to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.

Marine Action Plan

- **Presentation of proposal of draft advice on expected effects on the supply to the EU market by Paul Thomas, EAPO**

The Chair recalled that, at the previous meeting, Paul Thomas, on behalf of EAPO, delivered a presentation about the expected effects of the Marine Action Plan on the supply to the EU market. In the proposal, there was a pending point about Other Effective Conservation Measures (OECMs).



- **Consideration of proposed draft advice**

Pim Visser (VisNed) emphasised that the focus should be on the impacts on the EU market, which was governed by the Common Fisheries Policy and by other regulations adopted by the EU legislators. On the other hand, the Marine Action Plan was a communication of DG MARE without legal value. The Member States could choose to do nothing or to embrace the plan, which means that an uneven-playing-field could be created. Therefore, the European Commission should clarify why the choice of a non-binding initiative, instead of a legislative proposal.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) informed that her organisation would like to put forward several substantial amendments to the draft text.

Pim Visser (VisNed) recalled that the European Commission expected the Member States to submit their plans by the end of March 2024, so the adoption of advice by the MAC should be expedited.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), concerning subsection 2.1 “Market impacts of the Marine Action Plan’s action to ensure that mobile bottom fishing is phased out in all Marine Protected Areas by 2030”, wondered why EAPO selected the results without the UK, instead of the other dataset.

Concerning recommendation a) on a comprehensive socioeconomic impact assessment, Ms Vulperhorst called for the deletion of the second part of the paragraph, arguing that it went beyond the scope of the Marine Action Plan, which is based on environmental legislation.

Concerning recommendation b) on OECMs, Ms Vulperhorst called for a full deletion, since, as recognised by EAPO, it is not directly about market and supply.

Concerning recommendation e) on a comprehensive guidance document, Ms Vulperhorst argued that such an initiative would be more appropriately undertaken with a national perspective by the Member States, instead of being undertaken by the European Commission. Additionally, the recommendation should mention the Bird and Habitats Directives as well as the Marine Spatial Planning Directive.

Paul Thomas (EAPO), concerning the comprehensive guidance document, stated that it was an issue of being in between the European Commission and the implementation by the Member States. The Commission is setting the policy, so the Member States refer back to the Commission to ensure coherence. Therefore, clear guidance from the Commission was needed.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) stated that consistency could be ensured through the national plans.

Pim Visser (VisNed) commented that Ms Vulperhorst was referring to the national plans as if these were legally required, which was not the case. In fact, some Member States might choose not to prepare national plans.



Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) argued that the MAC could encourage Member States to draft national roadmaps, as encouraged by the European Commission.

Pim Visser (VisNed) emphasised the lack of legal basis of the Marine Action Plan, including for the phasing out of bottom-contact mobile gear.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) responded that, even though the Marine Action Plan was a communication, it made reference to legally binding legislation.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to, following the integration of the feedback received, to proceed with an urgent written procedure of one week under the Executive Committee to finalise the draft advice.

Energy Transition in EU Fisheries and Aquaculture

- **Consideration of draft advice on energy transition in EU fisheries and aquaculture**

The Chair stated that it would be difficult to finalise the draft advice at the meeting, as it would likely require some bilateral discussions, but encouraged the members to bring forward their main points.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) stated that his organisation would need more time to consider the draft text, even though they were supportive of section 5 “skills and workforce” and section 6 “business environment and financing opportunities”.

Pim Visser (VisNed) highlighted that the initiative for the energy transition in EU fisheries and aquaculture showed significant ambition, but there were limited technical capabilities. It would essentially require a whole new fleet. The fishing industry should not be looked at in isolation. EU fisheries are part of a global market with global sourcing. EU catching operators risk being priced out, as it happened to American operators in the USA market. It necessary to increase awareness on how fishers can reduce carbon emissions and costs.

Pierre Commère (ADEPALE) stated that, in the short-term, the initiative could lead to a reduction in competition and to replacements. In the long-terms, fossils fuels could be replaced by new energy sources, as the new technologies are still unknown. Therefore, the European Commission should distinguish short-term solutions from the long-term objectives.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) highlighted that there was acceptance of the initiative, but some points of dissent. Subsidies for fossil fuels have not stopped. Other measures need to be taken to support the industry. The entire value chain should be included in the initiative. Mr Marchais expressed support for the initiative and for the Energy Transition Partnership. In terms of financing, he mentioned that there were several sources of public funding available, but that it will require significant investments from the private sector.



Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) underscored that the technology for the transition was not available. There are codes of conduct for operators and the technology must be safe for the operators in the context of the marine environment. Mr Murphy agreed that the transition needed to take place and expressed availability to provide examples from efforts undertaken by the industry in the past years. He added that the draft was well written and that it was necessary to understand the complexities.

Mike Turenhout (Visfederatie) expressed agreement with Mr Visser. Mr Turenhout argued that, when considering the ambition of the EU, it is necessary to ensure a level-playing-field with the rest of the world. As for a removal of fuel subsidies, it would have to be done at a global level.

John Lynch (ISEFPO) highlighted that modern engines are already 20% more efficient than before thanks to the introduction of biofuels in marine diesels and the reduction of sulphur contents. Mr Lynch expressed disagreement with the introduction of taxation at different levels and with taxing the fuel of the fishing sector, as there is already a carbon tax applied in Ireland. It is necessary to show how the current technologies were used, he added.

The Chair agreed with Mr Commère, adding that there seemed to be agreement among members about the aims, but different views on the methods.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) emphasised that the industry showed availability to replace technologies, which demonstrated that there were other ways to reach the aim of the initiative.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to allow members to submit additional inputs to the draft text via a written procedure, including examples from the aquaculture sector, and to reconsider it at the next meeting.

AOB

None.



Summary of action points

- Fishers of the Future:
 - At the next meeting, schedule an exchange of views concerning the survey prepared by the Commission's contractor.
- Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products:
 - Secretariat to invite the Chair of the STECF Expert Working Group for a presentation and exchange of views at the next meeting.
- European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA):
 - Draft advice on 2024 suggestions for the work programme to be recirculated via written procedure to gather new suggestions, which will be considered at the next meeting.
- Marine Action Plan:
 - Following the integration of the feedback received, draft advice to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval via a one-week urgent written procedure.
- Energy Transition in EU Fisheries and Aquaculture:
 - Draft advice to be recirculated via written procedure to gather additional inputs, including examples from the aquaculture sector, to be considered at the next meeting.
- Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF):
 - Agreed draft advice on the Terms of Reference of the 2024 edition of the Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.



Attendance List

Representative	Organisation	Role
Adrien Simonnet	Union du Mareyage Français (UMF)	Member
Alen Lovrinov	Omega 3 Producers Organisation	Member
Amelie Laurent	Oceana	Member
Anna Boulova	FRUCOM	Member
Anna Rokicka	Polish Association of Fish Processors (PSPR)	Member
Aodh O'Donnell	Irish Fish Producers Organisation (IFPO)	Member
Bruno Guillaumie	European Molluscs' Producers Association (EMPA)	Member
Christine Absil	Good Fish	Member
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member
Jaroslaw Zieliński	Polish Fish Producers Association (PFPA)	Member
Felicidad Fernández	ANFACO-CECOPESCA	Member
Gaëtane Le Breuil	European Fishmeal	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne	Member
Jennifer Reeves	Marine Stewardship Council	Member
Jérémie Souben	FEDOPA	Member
Joan Roussoulière-Azzam	European Commission	Expert
John Lynch	Irish South and East Fish Producers Organisation (ISEFPO)	Member
Juana María Parada Guinaldo	OR.PA.GU.	Member
Julien Daudu	Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF)	Member
Julien Lamothe	Association Nationale des Organisations de Producteurs (ANOP)	Chair
Katarina Sipic	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE) / European Federation of National Organizations of Importers and Exporters of Fish (CEP)	Member
Laure Guillevic	WWF	Member
Laurène Jolly	European Commission	Expert
Linda Zanki Duvnjak	Ribarska Zadruga Friška Riba	Member





Market Advisory Council

Representative	Organisation	Role
Mariano García García	Cofradía de Pescadores de Isla Cristina	Member
Massimo Bellavista	COPA COGECA	Member
Maximilian Schwarz	Market Advisory Council	Secretariat
Miguel Lizaso	European Commission	Expert
Mike Turenhout	Visfederatie	Member
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation (IS&WFPO)	Member
Paul Thomas	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pierre Commère	Association Des Entreprises de Produits Alimentaires Élaborés (ADEPALE)	Member
Pim Visser	VisNed	Member
Quentin Marchais	ClientEarth	Member
Sergio López García	OPP Burela	Member
Thomas Kruse	Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation (DPPO) / Danish Fishermen P.O.	Member
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana	Member
Xavier Pires	ALIF	Member
Yobana Bermúdez Rodríguez	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE)	Member

