

Working Group 1: EU Production

Draft Minutes

Tuesday, 4 June 2024 (10:00 – 13:30 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 the agenda and of the last meeting's minutes (03.04.24): adopted

Action points

- **State-of-play of the action points of the last meeting - information**
- Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products:
 - Following the publication of the report of the STECF EWG, feedback from the members to be collected on the development of the three fisheries-specific indicators, to be considered at the next meeting
 - Questionnaire circulated: 6 – 20 May 2024
 - Draft advice circulated: 23 May 2024
- Fishers of the Future:
 - Following the integration of market elements, signing of the joint letter drafted by the NWWAC on the methodology of the project would be proposed to the Executive Committee
 - Input about market policy integrated into the joint letter
 - Endorsement by the Executive Committee: 22 May 2024
- Energy Transition in EU Fisheries and Aquaculture:
 - Secretary General to informally exchange with the interested members on the pending text
 - Afterward, draft advice to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval via a one-week urgent written procedure
 - Secretary General exchanged with Oceana, Europêche, EAPO, ClientEarth, and EMPA
 - Approval by the Executive Committee: 29 April 2024
- Social Data in Fisheries:
 - Email message to be sent to DG MARE informing that no formal reply to the questionnaires on social indicators and a vademecum on the allocation of fishing opportunities would be sent, while mentioning the issues raised by the members at the meeting, including the importance of developing social indicators
 - Email message sent: 9 April 2024



- European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund (EMFAF):
 - o Email message to be sent to the European Commission's external consultant informing that no formal reply to the questionnaire on the mid-term evaluation of the EMFAF would be sent, while mentioning the issues raised by the members at the meeting, including that the implementation was still in the early stages in many Member States
 - Email message sent: 9 April 2024

Landing Obligation

- **Update on the study supporting the evaluation of the landing obligation, including stakeholder consultations, by Pedro Reis Santos (Secretary General)**

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

The Secretary General, on behalf of Evelien Ranshuysen (DG MARE), updated members on the study supporting the evaluation of the landing obligation, which included stakeholder consultations.

The Secretary General explained that the European Commission commissioned a study from external consultants to support the evaluation of the landing obligation. The MAC was expected to provide feedback on the mentioned policy. The evaluation was launched in 2023 and will continue until 2025. The assessment aims to determine how the landing obligation has performed across seven criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, EU added value, complementarity, and sustainability. The Secretary General stated that the contractors would seek input from Member States, Advisory Councils, and EU-level stakeholders, and that they expected both quantitative and qualitative data. In this regard, he reminded members that a survey had already been circulated for feedback.

The Secretary General expressed availability to send questions from the members, in written format, to Ms Ranshuysen.

- **Exchange of views**

Pim Visser (VisNed) wondered about the impact of the landing obligation on the first points of sale, particularly the required investments in infrastructure, if there was a full implementation of the policy. Due to the existing exemptions, no significant quantities of fish were going to fishmeal. Due to the lack of fishmeal plants near ports, a very significant investment would be required. Therefore, Mr Visser wanted to know if these elements were taken into account in the study. In his view, it was necessary to consider the workability of the policy and the consequences for port and processing infrastructure. He argued that the landing obligation should be replaced with better and more transparent catch registration on board the fishing vessels.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) wanted to know whether, after the evaluation in line with the Better Regulation Guidelines, there would be possibility for a reform of the policy.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) encouraged the submission of the raised questions in writing to the Commission services, to ensure coordinated responses.



Nicolás Fernández Muñoz (OPP72) argued that the landing obligation originated from an arbitrary political decision that did not involve the stakeholders, which were suffering the consequences. Mr Fernández called for, under the next mandate, for a change in approach of the European Commission. The Commission should ensure the involvement of the industry stakeholders, including from the primary sector and processing. Mr Fernández wanted to know whether the Commission services were satisfied with the results of the landing obligation.

- **Way forward**

The Chair stated that, later in the year, a wider exchange about the landing obligation could take place when discussing the ongoing evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy, which should take into account previous advice on the matter.

The Secretary General recalled the commitment, under the annual work programme, to provide advice to the European Commission on the implementation of the landing obligation. The Secretary General also recalled the possibility to circulate a questionnaire to the members based on the survey of the external consultants.

The Chair proposed to proceed with the submission of the questions raised by the members in writing to the Commission services. The Chair also proposed to proceed with the circulation of a questionnaire to the members, which would serve as a basis for a draft advice to be considered at the next meeting.

Awareness and Role of Producer Organisations

- **Presentation of projects financed under the Production and Marketing Plan by Thomas Kruse, Danish Fishers Producer Organisation (DFPO)**

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

Thomas Kruse (DFPO) presented projects financed under the Production and Marketing Plan of his Producer Organisation. Mr Kruse explained that the Danish Fishers Producer Organisation (DFPO) is the largest Producer Organisation in Denmark, representing fishers of all scales, from small to large. He emphasised that the DFPO prioritises sustainability across the environmental, economic, and social pillars, securing up to 60,000 jobs and collaborating with all local fisheries associations. He stated that the fish auction in Hanstholm has an annual revenue of more than 70 million euros. The DFPO operates in the North Sea, Skagerrak, Kattegat, Baltic Sea, Greenland Waters, and the Northern Atlantic, with the Baltic Sea situation having a significant impact on regional associations.

Mr Kruse described the DFPO's main activities, which include advising local fishing associations and fishers on national and EU fisheries regulations. The DFPO does not assign quotas to members; instead, they are assigned directly through Individual Transfer Quotas. He emphasised the importance of national and international cooperation, highlighting that the DFPO has an office in Brussels that works to influence policy. Mr Kruse also stated that the interpretation of international and regional agreements, particularly post-Brexit, is a key focus for the DFPO. Furthermore, he mentioned that the



DFPO has a close relationship with Danish authorities, serving on all standing committees within the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Fisheries.

Mr Kruse stressed that co-existence at sea, particularly with the wind farm industry and environmental NGOs, is crucial. In this regard, he explained that the DFPO takes an ecosystem-based management approach toward the development of Marine Protected Areas that can both provide conservation benefits and allow the industry to continue fishing. Mr Kruse also outlined that collaboration with the workers union (3F) and DTU Aqua as well as educational efforts through the North Sea College was actively taking place.

Mr Kruse drew attention to a CCTV project in Kattegat, noting that, while Danish fishers initially opposed CCTV in the Norway lobster fishery, future vessels will have three options for participating in the project: 1) voluntarily with reduced controls, 2) opting for the cameras to be used only for research purposes, subjecting them to more controls, or 3) opting out of the scheme, subjecting them to strict controls. He emphasised that 80% of Danish vessels already use CCTV because they are licensed to operate in UK waters, where CCTV is mandatory. He predicted, in the future, all Danish vessels would be equipped with CCTV.

The Chair requested information on the number of fishing vessels part of DFPO.

Thomas Kruse (DFPO) explained that the majority of Danish fishing vessels participate in the DFPO or in the Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation. There is a third Producer Organisation in Denmark that focuses on coastal fisheries and represents around 2% of Danish fishing vessels.

Pierre Commere (PACT'ALIM) wanted to know whether there was a long-distance fleet in Denmark and, if so, whether this fleet participated in Producer Organisations.

Thomas Kruse (DFPO) responded that there were Danish fishing vessels operating in the shrimp fisheries in Greenlandic waters. In the pelagic fleet, there were around 20 vessels operating in international waters with vast activity in the North Sea, including in UK waters. The fleet was also active in Skagerrak, meaning Danish and Norwegian waters.

Garazi Rodríguez Valle (APROMAR) wanted to know whether DFPO collaborated on awareness-raising activities with other stakeholders, for example aquaculture associations.

Thomas Kruse (DFPO) responded that the Danish Seafood Association would be the most appropriate forum for such exchanges.

Poul Melgaard (Danish Seafood Association) informed that there were no ongoing awareness raising activities ongoing due to lack of funding. In the context of the EMFAF, Producer Organisations received funding for awareness campaigns, but cooperation along the supply chain was lacking.

Christophe Vande Weyer (DG MARE), referring to the ambitious Production and Marketing Plan of the DFPO, wanted to know whether the DFPO maintained a close relationship with the national authorities and whether significant negotiations were required to approve the plan.



Thomas Kruse (DFPO) responded that his organisation worked very closely with the Danish authorities in the preparation of the Production and Marketing Plans. The plan included a wide catalogue of 20 to 30 activities, which were checked by the national authorities.

Nicolás Fernández Muñoz (OPP72) requested specific examples of activities by the DFPO, particularly on the coexistence with other sectors. Mr Fernández expressed concern about the significant concentration of fishing vessels into two Producer Organisations, particularly on the lack of representation of coastal fishers, which were the most affected by wind farms.

Thomas Kruse (DFPO) clarified that only around 2% of the Danish coastal fishers were not part of the DFPO or of the Danish Pelagic Producer Organisation. In the context of Danish fishing activities, there was a significant amount of coastal fleet, including both small and large vessels.

Nicolás Fernández Muñoz (OPP72) expressed satisfaction that there was a significant coastal fleet. Mr Fernández expressed concern about the increasing sale, since 2006, of the fishing rights of artisanal fishers in Denmark, which had an impact on social sustainability and on coastal communities. He argued that the Producer Organisations should focus on coastal communities.

Thomas Kruse (DFPO) assured Mr Fernández that the DFPO promotes sustainable coastal fisheries and aims for inclusive and balanced growth for all stakeholders. A special tool was used for quotas for coastal fishers and for young fishers.

- **Update on the guide document listing all the fisheries and aquaculture Producer Organisations and their work by Paul Thomas (EAPO)**

Paul Thomas (EAPO) recalled that a commitment was made to develop a guide document listing all the fisheries and aquaculture Producer Organisations and their work. Mr Thomas informed that a template was prepared and would soon be distributed to EAPO members for feedback. Afterward, the template would be distributed to the Producer Organisations in the official list of DG MARE. Mr Thomas recognised the delay in delivering the document. A preliminary draft, based on the feedback of the EAPO members, is expected to be completed by September 2024.

- **Exchange of views**

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) highlighted that EAPO is composed of fisheries Producer Organisations, so the guidance document risked reflecting only the objectives of those organisations. Mr Guillaumie encouraged Mr Thomas to consult with aquaculture Producer Organisations, including those working with molluscs. Collaboration between the MAC and the Aquaculture Advisory Council could also be relevant.

The Chair recognised that there were differences between fisheries and aquaculture Producer Organisations, so it would be necessary for these organisations to collaborate.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) recognised that EAPO was only representative of fisheries associations. Mr Thomas asked Mr Guillaumie to provide him with contacts from the aquaculture associations, so that their view can be integrated in the template.



Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products

- **Consideration of draft advice on the development of fishery sustainability indicators by STECF**

The Chair recalled that, based on the technical report of STECF, a questionnaire was circulated to the members from 6 to 20 May 2024. Replies were provided by FEDEPESCA, PACT'ALIM, Oceana, and EAPO. The draft advice was circulated on 23 May 2024. The Chair expressed disappointment that socio-economic indicators were not developed by STECF. He recalled that the objective of STECF was to develop indicators based on traceable data. Two systems were developed by STECF which were dependent on the data availability.

The Secretary General informed that, prior to the meeting, preliminary feedback was received from EAPO and from Conxemar.

Amélie Laurent (Oceana), regarding section 2 on “indicator of stock status” emphasised the importance of FAO sub-zones. Ms Laurent suggested to replace the reference “without going into detail about sub-zones” with “and sub-zones when available.”

Paul Thomas (EAPO) argued that the exchange on sustainability indicators went beyond the area of competence of the MAC. In his view, before finalising the advice, the draft should be circulated to the other Advisory Councils to gather additional input.

Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) emphasised the importance of practicality and usability for the market. Mr Commère mentioned that several comments from the NGO members called for more detailed information, while primary producers were focusing on managing and handling the indicators in a practical manner. The processing industry was concerned about the availability of the data to be used. In his view, the reference to larger FAO areas would provide more stability. He called for a more general discussion amongst the members before delving into a detailed analysis of the text.

The Chair commented that clarity was lacking on how the Commission would use the sustainability indicators. The discussions on the integration of the criteria were quite technical. Under System 1, data that is legally required from primary producers would be used. Under System 2, producers would be able to go further than the mandatory data. The Chair expressed concern about the Commission not fully taking into account the practical questions raised by operators of the various sectors. He also inquired about the next steps.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) expressed understanding for the reiterations from the members to consider the three pillars of sustainability. Mr Heinen explained that the sustainability criteria were based on traceable information, such as on the fishing gear and the catch area. It would be more difficult to define socio-economic indicators based on traceable data, but suggestions would be welcomed. In terms of next steps, Mr Heinen clarified that it would depend on the next Commission, as the sustainability indicators could potentially be used as “soft law” or as actual legislation. He recognised the complexity and the highly technical aspects of the STECF's report. The Commission services plan to develop a tool by early 2025, allowing scoring based on data inputted by operators and/or consumers. Stakeholders, including the MAC, would be able to test the tool.



Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) in response to Mr Commère's intervention, expressed preference to use all the data available. The FAO sub-zones were available for some products. Following the revision of the Fisheries Control Regulation, in the case of imported products, this information would be available in the catch documentation. Ms Vulperhorst argued that the provision of more data would benefit producers and consumers. She expressed availability to provide input directly to DG MARE.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) drew attention to a German project for the provision of information on the catch area and stock status. Mr Meyer argued that the retail sector needed flexibility and interoperability. In his experience, there was an increasing number of young people in charge of retail portfolios who lacked knowledge about fisheries products, as there were hundreds of fish species and origins. This was leading to merely copying lists from expert reports. Mr Meyer argued that, under the new due diligence rules, there was a strengthening of the responsibilities of operators and of the sharing of information, so there was no need for a new tool. Access to information needed to be improved instead.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) expressed concern about the methodology used to develop the sustainability indicators, as it did not include all products, namely aquaculture and processed products. Processed products represent about 50% of the products on the market but are not covered by the information obligations of Article 35 of the Common Market Organisation Regulation. Therefore, Mr Posti expressed concern that an inadequate view would be provided to consumers. He argued that sustainability indicators should cover all food products, as land-based products have more impacts than wild caught fishery products.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) emphasised the complexity of implementing sustainability criteria in practice. Mr Voces called for proceeding with a general approach, while particularly taking into account the added value for the market and for consumers. The use of three indicators would likely be confusing for consumers and for the retail chain. The benefits should be addressed before proceeding with the development of a complex tool.

The Chair highlighted that the Commission was already working on the development of the sustainability indicators and that the tool would be made available regardless. There were several technical aspects to be addressed on fisheries management, frequency of the data, and the importance of information for consumers. The Chair suggested proceeding with the analysis of the technical elements and, after, to include general elements.

Amélie Laurent (Oceana) suggested to include a paragraph explaining the two system systems.

The Chair argued that, as the two systems were explained in the STECF's report, it was not necessary to include additional paragraphs in the draft advice about the matter.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) stated that it would be relevant to indicate which members were supportive of System 1 and which members were supportive of System 2.

The Chair agreed that members could express their preference for either system but that technical descriptions of the indicators should be removed from the draft advice.



The Secretary General highlighted that both systems would be used. System 2 would be used when operators were willing to provide additional data. The tool for the sustainability scoring was already under development and would be completed soon.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) emphasised that the two systems were designed to complement each other and are meant to coexist. When detailed data is not available, System 1 would be the default. Such an approach would allow to cover more products, particularly imports. As for other sustainability dimensions, specific suggestions on the indicators to use would be needed. Mr Heinen mentioned that, once the tool is available for testing, members would be able to provide further views on the technical aspects.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) recognised that the two systems are meant to coexist but argued that it was difficult to understand when a product could fall under System 2. Further discussion was needed on how products could meet the requirements of System 2 and about the “bonus” provided.

The Chair underscored that there should be consensus on the promotion of the most accurate information as possible.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) argued that tool should not be a priority, as it is not the responsibility of the Commission, but of the operators. In his view, there was a risk of bad data being used. As an example, many third countries do not prioritise the quality of their stock assessments, namely for mixed fishery stocks assessments. Instead, responsibility of operators through due diligence should be prioritised.

The Chair stated that the development of a common ground could reduce ambiguity in data sourcing, particularly for imported products. The Chair emphasised the importance of operators inputting data directly into the tool, which meant that it was necessary to address who would be responsible for curating the system.

Bruno Guillaumie (EMPA) wondered whether STECF reflected about molluscs and aquaculture production. Mr Guillaumie further wondered about how indicators would be compared between different products. He argued in favour of providing more information to consumers but added that the approach should be more horizontal.

The Chair recalled that there was already information made available under the Common Market Organisation Regulation. At present, there was already some confusion amongst consumers. The aim of the Commission was to use traceable information. In his view, with additional effort, traceable socioeconomic indicators could be developed.

Pierre Commere (PACT'ALIM) emphasised the importance of comparability with other food products under the Sustainable Food System Framework. Mr Commère wondered about how the work on fishery products would be used and integrated in the broader context of sustainability labelling. He highlighted that, at each stage of the supply chain, it was necessary to prepare the data elements for aggregation and comparability.



Alessandro Manghisi (ASC) underscored that aquaculture production had not been fully addressed. Mr Manghisi called for the collection of as much data as possible to meet the expectations of consumers. He called for the development of a system for aquaculture products with clear standards.

The Chair recalled that the STECF's report focused on fishery products, so the draft advice was also focused on fishery products. Nevertheless, section 5 of the draft advice highlighted the lack of coverage of aquaculture products.

Paul Thomas (EAPO), regarding section 3 on "indicator on the bycatch risk of sensitive species", stated that, under System 0, data was very aggregated. More precision was needed for the indicator to be representative.

The Chair recognised that the level of precision of the indicators was not always the same.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.), regarding section 4 on "indicator on the impact on the seabed", argued that the indicator would require mapping. This would be a challenge, since it is not available for many products coming from third countries. More awareness on the matter across third countries was needed. Mr Meyer argued that more information would be needed on the climate and biodiversity impacts.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) recalled that the sustainability indicators used the fishing gear information available under the Common Market Organisation Regulation. The Marine Strategy Directive was already using this data. Mr Vulperhorst argued that the data would never be perfect, but that it was important to test the tool. Otherwise, it would be necessary to wait a very long time for data improvements before proceeding. In her view, the information provided by the tool would be useful for companies.

The Chair expressed concerns about some of the data and its usage. EU products could be scored using well thought out criteria, but this might not necessarily be practical for operators. Consumers should be provided with operational data.

Janne Posti (Conxemar), regarding section 5 on "lack of coverage aquaculture products", highlighted that information was only available for fresh products. Mr Posti suggested to include a reference to the percentage of aquaculture and processed products in the EU market, which would not be covered by the sustainability indicators.

Roberto Carlos Alonso Baptista de Sousa (ANFACO-CECOPECA) argued that there was a reasoning for the differentiation provided by the EU legislation between fresh and processed products. For products under Chapter 16 of the Combined Nomenclature, there was a wide variety of processing techniques. Mr Alonso wondered if similar requirements would be asked from processed meat products, as there were more and more challenges for fishery products.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) argued that there should be a level-playing-field in the market, particularly if processed fishery products represent over 40% of the EU market.

The Secretary General asked Mr Heinen whether processed products had been considered by the STECF, particularly whether a revision of Article 35 of the Common Market Organisation would be



needed or whether the transmission of traceability information under the revised Fisheries Control Regulation would be sufficient.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) responded that traceable information under the Fisheries Control Regulation could potentially be used. In the context of the evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy, the Commission would look into consumer information requirements. This would help determine whether existing consumer information requirements are sufficient.

The Chair suggested to prioritise a system directed at operators and only later for consumers.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) stated that, in 2025, information would be available for more products, so these should eventually be included in the system. In her view, the indicators should be used as soon as data is available.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) argued that the issue should be referenced in the draft advice.

Roberto Carlos Alonso Baptista de Sousa (ANFACO-CECOPECA) emphasised that each part of the supply chain has its own solutions. Processing companies buy products falling under Chapter 03 of the Combined Nomenclature. Products under Chapter 03 and under Chapter 16 were not always comparable. It was necessary to find ways to analyse the different parts of the supply chain.

The Chair, regarding section 6 on “lack of coverage of the social and economic pillars of sustainability”, emphasised the importance of the three pillars of sustainability.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), regarding section 7 on “availability of information”, argued that a revision of the Common Markets Organisation Regulation could benefit both consumers and producers by establishing a legal basis for data collection.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) expressed support for Ms Vulperhorst’s intervention.

Roberto Carlos Alonso Baptista de Sousa (ANFACO-CECOPECA) argued that members should wait for the completion of the study on feasible traceability systems and procedures for prepared and preserved products.

Christine Absil (Good Fish Foundation) suggested to include a reference to the point raised by STECF that a revision of the Common Market Organisation would be needed to fully develop the sustainability indicators with traceable data.

The Chair concluded by recommending that the advice be redrafted to reflect the day’s discussions and then recirculated before being sent to the Executive Committee.

- **Way forward**

The Chair suggested to proceed with a redrafting of the text to reflect the discussions held.

European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA)



- **Consideration of the revised draft advice on suggestions of studies to be integrated in the Work Programme of EUMOFA**

The Chair recalled that the draft advice had been considered at the 31 January 2024 meeting. It was agreed, as an action point, that the text would be recirculated to gather new suggestions and that the updated version would be considered at a later meeting. The Chair invited members to provide their view on the revised text.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) wanted to know whether northern albacore tuna was part of the scope of the study on the EU tuna sector, which the MAC suggested in 2023.

The Secretary General confirmed that northern albacore tuna was part of the study.

Roberto Carlos Alonso Baptista de Sousa (ANFACO-CECOPECA) argued that, under section 5 on “EUMOFA Talks”, there was too much on sustainability. In his view, it was necessary to consider the decrease in the consumption of fishery and aquaculture products in Europe. There should be discussions about consumption drivers to better understand consumer purchasing behaviours, allowing the industry to adapt appropriately.

The Chair agreed that it was important to consider consumer trends.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) added that EUMOFA should, for both studies and panels, use the most up-to-date available consumer data.

Paul Thomas (EAPO) stated that the thematic analyses could feed into the EUMOFA talks.

Christophe Vande Weyer (DG MARE) highlighted that a special Eurobarometer survey on EU consumer habits regarding fishery and aquaculture products would be launched in the first quarter of 2025. Therefore, an ambitious EUMOFA Talk on the topic could take place after, while involving as many stakeholders as possible, for example at the Conxemar Fair.

The Working Group agreed on the amended draft advice on “European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA): Suggestions of studies to be integrated in the Work Programme (2024)”.

- **Way forward**

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

AOB

- **Mid-term evaluation of the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund**

The Secretary General recalled that, on 17 June 2024, the external consultants hired by the European Commission would be organising a workshop on the mid-term evaluation of the European Maritime



Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund. The Secretary General expressed availability to represent the MAC at the workshop invited members to provide their views on any major points to be raised on behalf of the Advisory Council.

DRAFT



Summary of action items

- Landing Obligation
 - Secretariat to submit, in written format, the questions raised by the members on the study supporting the evaluation to the Commission services.
 - Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire to the members on the evaluation of the landing obligation, to serve as basis for a draft advice to be considered at the next meeting.

- Awareness and Role of Producer Organisations
 - EAPO to include aquaculture representatives in the development of the guide document listing all fisheries and aquaculture Producer Organisations and their work.

- Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products
 - Secretariat to revise the draft advice on “Development of Fishery Sustainability Indicators by STECF” to reflect the exchanges held, which will be followed by recirculation.

- Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA)
 - Draft advice on “European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA): Suggestions of studies to be integrated in the Work Programme (2024)” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.

DRAFT



Attendance List

Representative	Organisation	Role
Alonso Abreu Lozano	OPP80 Punta del Moral	Member
Amélie Laurent	Oceana	Member
Aodh O'Donnell	IFPO	Member
Arthur Yon	FROM Nord	Member
Bruno Guillaumie	European Molluscs' Producers Association (EMPA)	Member
Christophe Vande Weyer	European Commission	Expert
Daniel Voces de Onáindi	Europêche	Member
Emiel Brouckaert	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Garazi Rodríguez Valle	APROMAR	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón	FEICOPESCA / ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member
Jarosław Zieliński	Polish Fish Producers Association (PFPA)	Member
Javier Barón Fernández	Spain	Observer
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne	Chair
Jens Høj Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association	Member
John Lynch	Irish South and East Fish Producers Organisation (ISEFPO)	Member
José Beltrán	OPP Burela	Member
José Carlos Escalera	Federación de Cofradías de Pescadores de Cádiz (FECOPECA)	Member
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	European Transport Workers' Federation (ETF)	Member
Julien Lamothe	ANOP	Member
Katarina Sipic	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE) / European Federation of National Organizations of Importers and Exporters of Fish (CEP)	Member
Louis Lambrechts	WWF	Member
Mariano García García	Cofradía "Virgen del Carmen" de Isla Cristina	Member





Market Advisory Council

Representative	Organisation	Role
Nicolás Fernández	Organización Productores Pesqueros Artesanales Lonja de Conil (OPP72)	Member
Paul Thomas	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Pedro Luis Casado López	Asociación de Armadores Punta del Moral (OPP80)	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pierre Commère	PACT'ALIM	Member
Pim Visser	VisNed	Member
Poul Melgaard	Danish Seafood Association	Member
Roberto Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPECA / FEICOPESCA	Member
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche	Member
Stefan Meyer	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.	Member
Thomas Kruse	Danish Fishers Producer Organisation / Danish Pelagic Producer Organisation	Member
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana	Member
Yobana Bermúdez Rodríguez	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE)	Member

DRAFT

