

Working Group 2: EU Markets

Minutes

Thursday, 27 March 2025 (14:00 – 17:30 CET)

Zoom

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Pierre Commère

[Presentation](#)

Adoption of the agenda and of the last meeting's minutes (29.01.25): Adopted.

Action points

- **State-of-play of the action points of the last meeting - information**
- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing:
 - Draft advice on the fight against IUU fishing in the Outermost Regions to be developed with the Outermost Regions Advisory Council (CCRUP)
 - Consideration of draft advice schedule for 16:45 CET
- Trade Agreements & Trade Policy Instruments:
 - Following an informal exchange with the most interested members, draft advice on “Integrations of sustainability criteria under the regime of Autonomous Tariff Quotas for certain fishery products” to be considered via urgent written procedure.
 - Informal exchanges held with AIPCE-CEP, EAPO, Européche, and Oceana
 - Consideration via urgent written procedure ongoing
- Fisheries Control Regulation:
 - Following an informal exchange with the most interested members, draft advice on “Upcoming delegated Act on Additional Rules for Traceability of Fresh and Frozen Fishery and Aquaculture Products and Marketing of Lots” to be considered via urgent written procedure.
 - Advice adopted on 12 March 2025

Trade Agreements & Trade Policy Instruments

- **Presentation on the regulation on certain measures for the purpose of the conservation of fish stocks in relation to countries allowing non-sustainable fishing by Commission representatives**

[Presentation](#)



Silvia Scalco (DG MARE) explained that Regulation (EU) 1026/2012 allows the Commission to adopt restrictive measures (e.g., import bans and limitations on the use of EU ports) against uncooperative third countries allowing unsustainable fishing of stocks of common interest. Adopted in 2012, in the context of the failed discussions on the sharing of the mackerel stock in the Northeast Atlantic, the regulation contributed to reaching an agreement on mackerel in 2014. Ms Scalco emphasised that the regulation is an important tool, and both the regulation and the proposed legislative amendment are compatible with WTO rules. Implementation must also be WTO compliant, adhering to principles of proportionality, non-discrimination, and "even handedness." The Regulation has only been used once, in 2013, against the Faroes Islands. A WTO case brought up by the Faroe Islands was never adjudicated, as, following positive developments in the management, the Commission lifted the sanctions.

Ms Scalco informed that the amendment proposal, adopted by the Commission on 13 September 2024, aims to amend the regulation with two main objectives: 1) to clarify the conditions for triggering the regulation, and 2) to reinforce the due process and dialogue before and after adopting measures. This is a technical amendment, but the political message is clear: sustainability and cooperation are taken very seriously, and the tools at the Commission's disposal are being reinforced. The content of the COM proposal is as follows: To achieve the first objective (clarification of the conditions), a definition of "failure to cooperate" is introduced, and it is clarified that failure to adopt "necessary fishery management measures" includes implementation and control to ensure the effective conservation of stocks of common interest. To achieve the second objective (reinforcement of due process and dialogue), the procedures prior to the adoption of measures are revised to be more flexible in terms of deadlines and opportunities for third countries to remedy the situation. Additionally, a new provision ensures that, even after measures are adopted, the Commission will continue consultations with third countries to find solutions to cease overfishing. The ultimate objective of the regulation is to restore sustainability.

Ms Scalco also provided information on the state-of-play. On 30 September 2024, the Commission presented the proposal to the European Parliament's Committee on Fisheries. MEP Thomas (S&D, Malta) was appointed rapporteur on behalf of the European Parliament. The shadow rapporteurs are Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR, Netherlands), Sander Smit (PPE, Netherlands), Emma Wiesner (Renew, Sweden), Luke Ming Flanagan (The Left, Ireland), and Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE, Sweden). On 3 October 2024, the proposal was presented to the Council's Working Party on Fisheries. The Council's negotiating mandate was adopted by COREPER. On 22 January 2025, the European Economic and Social Committee adopted its opinion. On 19 February 2025, the draft report was presented to the European Parliament's Committee on Fisheries. Adoption of the report by the Committee was expected during the meeting of 9 and 10 April 2025. The interinstitutional negotiations are expected to take place in the second quarter of 2025, with potential adoption in the third quarter of 2025. Ms Scalco expressed hope that the adoption of the legislative amendment would be swift.

- **Exchange of views:**

The Chair stated that, following the proposed amendment, the geographical scope seemed to be moving from the Atlantic Ocean to a broader range of contexts, including Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOS). The Chair asked for more information about the geographical scope.



Silvia Scalco (DG MARE) responded that, in terms of geographical scope, the regulation was horizontal, so not limited to the Northeast Atlantic. The amendment aims to make that scope clearer. The position of the European Parliament goes in the same direction. The geographical scope is provided by the definition of “stocks of common interest”, which is not confined to specific basis. The regulation can be applied to stocks of common interest and managed in cooperation with third countries.

Laure Guillevic (WWF) expressed full support for the overall aim of achieving sustainability. Ms Guillevic expressed concern about the developments on herring and mackerel stocks in FAO zone 27, which included fishing activities from several third countries, including the UK, Russia, Norway, and the Faroe Islands. She asked for more information on the actions taken to address the conservation of these two stocks.

Dominic Rihan (KFO) expressed support for the aims of the regulation and drew attention to challenges related to the management of mackerel stocks. Mr Rihan wondered whether, if actions under the regulation were enacted, the Commission expected countermeasures from the third countries, including the submission of cases in WTO. He added that he was aware that the Commission planned to use the regulation as a deterrent.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) commented that the questions raised by Mr Rihan very relevant. As the regulation focuses on species under joint management systems, Mr Pastoor wondered if it also allowed for measures against other fishery and aquaculture products from the third countries allowing unsustainable fishing. He asked for information on whether the Commission had the discretion to implement measures under the regulation or whether prior approval from the Member States and the Parliament was required.

Silvia Scalco (DG MARE), concerning Ms Guillevic’s questions, responded that the Commission was aware of the situation of the mentioned stocks. A comprehensive sharing agreement was not yet reached, despite EU efforts in Coastal States negotiations. While, at Coastal States’ level, there was agreement to set annual Total Allowable Catches in line with ICES advice, in the absence of a comprehensive sharing arrangement the sum of unilateral quotas put the stocks in a situation of overfishing, which is indeed of great concern. Engagement with other coastal States was ongoing, including through a planned ICES workshop on the benchmarking of the stocks. The legislative proposal would also serve as a point of pressure. The Commission would continue all its efforts in this sense.

Concerning Mr Rihan’s questions, Ms Scalco explained that it was difficult to predict the outcome. In the previous situation against the Faroe Islands, the regulation was useful to push Faroes to reduce their unilaterally inflated quota and reach an agreement on mackerel stocks. The pressure led to the restarting of negotiations with the third country. Ms Scalco acknowledged that there was a risk of countermeasures and/or WTO challenge by the third countries, but the aim was to facilitate a cooperative process, not to launch trade disputes. She added that each individual case would have to be built in a way that ensures compliance with WTO rules.

Concerning Mr Pastoor’s questions, Ms Scalco explained that the Commission implemented the regulation via the comitology procedure and that the European Parliament was informed. No changes to the described procedure were foreseen under the legislative amendment. The Commission representative further explained that, prior to the measures, the Commission submits a letter of identification, which includes a



description of the measures. Prior to adopting the measures, their socioeconomic impact on the third country (and to the EU processing sector) should also be carefully assessed. She added that stakeholders' involvement would be relevant during the building of the case. The products targeted by the measures can cover the shared stock(s) for which the third country allows non-sustainable fishing and its associated species.

Pieter Roden (Feedback EU) asked for more details on the case against the Faroe Islands, including the nature of the dispute and the reasoning for Denmark to challenge the EU's actions.

Silvia Scalco (DG MARE) explained that the Faroe Islands had inflated the quotas for shared stocks of mackerel and herring, which led the EU to adopt measures against these products. Denmark, on behalf of the Faroe Islands, submitted a case to the WTO arguing that the measures were not justified under the environmental exemptions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In the context of those environmental exemptions, measures must have a good scientific basis that demonstrates the inflation of the quotas.

- **Way forward**

The Secretary General wanted to know if the Working Group wished to proceed with advice concerning the legislative proposal. The advice would have to focus on the market aspects of the implementation, such as the banning of products from the EU market.

The Chair expressed the view that it was not timely relevant to proceed now with an advice. In his view, the Working Group could potentially address the regulation again at a later stage to look into the implementation modalities.

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing

- **Presentation of findings on the implementation of EU import control measures in 2020-23 by Julien Daudu (EJF) and Jesus Urios Culianez (EJF)**

Presentation

The Chair explained that the findings of EJF, as a member of the EU IUU Coalition, included significant market and trade aspects of relevance to the MAC. At the initiative of EJF, the aim was to undertake joint work on the topic with the Long Distance Advisory Council (LDAC).

Julien Daudu (EJF) explained that, every two years, Member States are required to submit reports to the European Commission regarding the implementation of measures against Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (IUU) fishing, including catch certificates and import controls. In 2023, following a report from the EU IUU Coalition, the MAC and the LDAC adopted advice on the matter. Mr Daudu informed that, on 16 October 2024, at a meeting of Working Group 5 of the LDAC, a preliminary analysis of the most recent biennial reports was presented. Due to the relevance of market aspects on import controls, it was concluded that it was relevant to work together with the MAC.



Jesus Urios Culianez (EJF) emphasised that, according to the preliminary findings, differences in scope and quality of checks by Member States persist. Following the 2018-2019 biennial reports, the EU IUU Coalition found disparities in the implementation of important controls across Member States. The MAC-LDAC Advice emphasised the need for harmonised import controls between Member States in order to prevent the products of IUU fishing from entering the European Union market. A 2022 special report of the European Court of Auditors found differences in the scope and quality of the checks undertaken by Member States, weakening the system.

Mr Urios provided an overview of the ecosystem of the EU catch certification system, which includes routine documentation, checks of the catch certificates of imported products, application of a risk-based approach to the assessment of catch certificates, the verification of the catch certificates to ascertain compliance, physical inspections, rejection of consignments in the case of non-compliance, biennial reporting on activities under the EU IUU Regulation.

Mr Urios highlighted that, from 2020 to 2023, there were low rates of verifications and rejections for imported fishery products across the EU. Across all the Member States that shared data, a total of 794,336 catch certificates were received. There were 2,304 verification requests sent to flag States, meaning 0.29% of the total. 87 imports were rejected, meaning 0.01% of the total catch certificates. He added that there were particularly low verifications and rejection rates of imported fishery products by some of the top importing Member States, such as Italy, Sweden, and Portugal. In the case of Italy and Portugal, there was a significant quantity of imports from China and from “yellow-carded” countries. Even in the case of countries with high rates of verification, such as Spain, there was a low rate of rejections.

Mr Urios argued that fisheries products arriving from China were still not being adequately verified or rejected, even though there was a high percentage of processing statements, including for products processed in China with catch certificates from different Flag States. Across all Member States that shared data, for the 2020-2021 period, there were 14,653 catch certificates from China, of which 0.3% were verified, and there were zero rejections. For the 2022-2023 period, there were 13,697 catch certificates from China, of which 0.4% were verified, and there were two rejections. He also drew attention to disparities in the direct landings of fishery products from Russia, which were mainly going to the Netherlands, which had low inspection rates.

Mr Urios underscored that, under the EU IUU Regulation, Member States are required to inspect a minimum of 5% of direct landings (on average across all flag States of origin). Nevertheless, non-compliance with the 5% legal threshold for physical inspection of direct landings persists, namely in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Poland.

Mr Urios recalled that the European Court of Auditors demanded actions from the Commission to remedy the disparities in import controls by 2026. According to the recommendations of the 2022 special report, the Commission should pursue digitalisation (via CATCH IT), uniform risk identification criteria (included in CATCH IT), and monitor that scope and quality of the checks by Member States are sufficient to address the risks and take necessary actions to remedy any shortcomings. He argued that, in his view, the CATCH IT system alone would not suffice to remedy the identified shortcomings.



- **Exchange of views**

The Chair, in relation to Mr Urios's argument that the CATCH IT system would be insufficient to respond to the demands of the European Court of Auditors, asked whether this was a general remark or specifically about the direct landings.

Julien Daudu (EJF) responded that it notably referred to direct landings. In his view, the CATCH IT system would improve the situation, including reorienting the controls. Nevertheless, it would not solve all issues related to verification activities. The IT system can improve the allocation of human resources, but physical inspections would still be needed.

Janne Posti (Conxemar), regarding the catch certification schemes, wanted to know whether the low performing Member states had provided an explanation for their low inspections and rejections rates.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) argued that, if the inspections were below the minimum legal threshold, then there was clearly a problem. Therefore, he wondered about the explanation provided for not meeting the threshold. Mr Pastoor emphasised that, in the case of the Netherlands, the third countries were expected to guarantee the legality of the catch certificates. While the EU undertakes audits, the aim was to minimise checks in the EU, in a similar manner to the veterinary checks. In practice, in the Netherlands, the physical checks for compliance with the IUU Regulation and the checks for compliance with veterinary requirements were undertaken by the same person. There could be several factors impacting the controls, such as species, seasonality, trade records, and origin. He wondered about how products that come to EU ports but that are destined to other countries were addressed, since, for example, in Dutch ports, there could be reefer vessels in between the fishing vessel and the port.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) recalled that, in the case of veterinary requirements, there was a prior audit by the Commission's services of the facilities in the third country. In the case of the IUU Regulation requirements, there was no prior audit by DG MARE. Ms Vulperhorst emphasised that it was the responsibility of the Member States to check the legality of the fishery products. Some Member States were under infringement procedures for lack of compliance with the IUU Regulation. There was a case against the Netherlands due to the lack of checks on reefer vessels and on traceability. She asked if any further information was available about the infringement procedures.

Julien Daudu (EJF) clarified that physical inspections of "direct landings" referred to both landings and transshipments. Mr Daudu agreed that it would be relevant to receive replies from the Member States and from the Commission on the explanation of the Member States performance. One of the possible reasons for the different rates of controls could be resources of national authorities. There were also differences based on the authorities that were responsible at the national level, for example customs officials, veterinary officials, or fisheries experts, which may translate into different priorities. He explained that the biennial reports mostly provided quantitative data (by opposition to qualitative data). The lack of respect for the minimum legal threshold for direct landings had been a problem for several years. In his view, there should be a closer monitoring of the Member States by the Commission.



- **Consideration of draft advice on harmonisation of import controls across Member States to prevent the entrance of IUU fishing products into the EU market**

The Chair recalled that the intention was to develop joint advice with the LDAC. Working Group 2 was the first to consider the draft document. The document was circulated in advance of the meeting. No preliminary feedback was received before the meeting.

Julien Daudu (EJF) explained that the document was informally presented to Working Group 5 of the LDAC. After the meeting of Working Group 2, the members of the LDAC would be formally consulted.

Alexandre Rodríguez (LDAC) informed that, following the consideration by Working Group 2, the LDAC Secretariat was available to launch a parallel written consultation under an agreed deadline.

The Secretary General provided an overview of the structure of the document.

The Chair expressed concern that the document could give the impression that the CATCH IT system would not improve the situation. In his view, via the digitalisation of the catch certificates, there would be an improvement of the controls, including via improvements to the targeting of the processes and verifications. Both the membership of the MAC and of the LDAC were supportive of the CATCH IT system. Under the present system, there was an accumulation of paperwork, which made data analysis difficult. Following the digitalisation of the certificates, artificial intelligence could also be used to improve the controls. Once there was more data available on control failures and on direct landings, it would be possible to better focus the controls on potential fraud and other issues.

Julien Daudu (EJF) responded that he was essentially in agreement with the Chair concerning the usefulness of the CATCH IT system. Nevertheless, the system would not solve every issue related to the verification of certificates. It could help target verifications and facilitate them, but action from the competent authorities would still be required to trigger the verifications and, where appropriate, to activate the refusals. Mr Daudu expressed availability to redraft certain parts of the document with the Chair.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) expressed agreement with Mr Daudu. The CATCH IT system would be helpful but would not solve every issue. Member States will still be required to undertake verifications of the catch certificates. Furthermore, the Member States were able to start acting before the launch of the new system.

The Chair stated that there seemed to be agreement on the long-term vision, but different perspectives regarding the short-term approach.

The Secretary General provided an overview of section 3 “recommendation” of the draft advice.

The Chair suggested to delete the reference to human rights abuses, since, even though human rights abuses and IUU fishing were usually linked, the regulation under discussion was only about IUU fishing.

Julien Daudu (EJF) informed that he was not opposed to the deletion.



Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), concerning the second paragraph of the section, recalled that it was the responsibility of the Member States to act. Therefore, it was not only a matter of data, but also of capacity.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie), concerning the first recommendation, suggested to include a reference to the undertaking of cooperation efforts between national authorities and the European Commission.

Julien Daudu (EJF), concerning the second recommendation, emphasised that, for some aspects, action was currently required from the European Commission and the Member States. Mr Daudu called for the reinforcement of cooperation between Member States.

- **Way forward**

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie), to ensure more time for consideration, suggested to proceed with an ordinary written procedure.

The Chair stated that no major oppositions to the draft text were identified, which meant that there was overarching consensus. The Chair proposed to proceed with an ordinary written procedure, providing the members with another opportunity to consider the document.

Due Diligence

- **Presentation on initiatives for due diligence in the fisheries and aquaculture supply chain by Carmen Gonzalez-Valles Martinez and Mercedes Mendoza (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership)**

Presentation

The Secretary General recalled that the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive would increase reporting obligations on environmental and social issues. The aim of the presentation was to provide examples of initiatives on due diligence in the fisheries and aquaculture supply chain. He recalled that, at a previous opportunity, Oceana expressed interest in the development of advice about the directive. Therefore, it would be useful to have views on the way forward.

Carmen Gonzalez-Valles Martinez (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership) explained that her organisation was an NGO founded in 2006 and based in the USA, operating as a virtual organisation without physical offices. Their work spans across the globe with more than 70 experts in over 20 countries. SFP does not run consumer campaigns, nor does it see boycotts as a solution. SFP is cautious when working with companies to avoid “greenwashing”. The aim is to collaborate with stakeholders throughout the supply chain to improve fishing and aquaculture practices and to advance sustainable production. Their work includes partnering with retailers, restaurants, and brands, mobilising the seafood supply chain, organizing supply chain roundtables, and offering tools, science, and services.

Mercedes Mendoza (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership) explained that her organisation provided advisory services via the Seafood Metrics platform, the leading global solution for tracking, monitoring and evaluating



seafood sourcing performance. The platform analyses sourcing using data from FishSource, SFP's public online database of fisheries and aquaculture information. While the Seafood Metrics platform provides company with a private location for their data, the Ocean Disclosure Project provided a transparent, public location for companies to disclose the sustainability of their seafood sources. Ms Mendoza emphasised that her organisation's tools help the industry understand the environmental challenges of the resources that they rely on, connecting this information throughout the supply chain, and facilitating the transparent transfer of the data to third parties or to consumers.

Ms Mendoza informed that FishSource is a free-access website, supported by a large database, that provides information on the ecological sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture zones. The tool aims for global coverage and uses only publicly available information. It compiles and summarises stock assessments, management measures, and reports on the environmental impacts of fishing. It also includes data on the status of small-scale fishers. She further informed that the Global Record of Stocks and Fisheries project is a collaboration between FishSource, the Ram Legacy database, and the FAO. It is a catalogue of global stocks and fisheries, producing unique codes for each stock and fishery. This project was awarded funding from the United Nations Development Programme's Ocean Innovation Challenge to complete the work and develop a business plan. The aim is to go global with a fishery identification service, setting a global standard for traceability (to be included in the Global Dialogue Standard for Traceability), catch reporting, management, and product identification/labelling, involving science, academia, and NGOs. She added that the Ocean Disclosure Project is a transparency-focused initiative that enables seafood-buying companies to disclose their wild-caught and farmed seafood sources through Ocean Disclosure Project profiles. This is a free-access resource, targeted at investors, NGOs, and consumers.

Carmen Gonzalez-Valles Martinez (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership) presented supply chain roundtables in Mauritania as a case study. Ms Gonzalez-Valles explained that the goal was to track the challenges in octopus fisheries in Mauritania and the impact across the supply chain. The work was undertaken in a pre-competitive and collective manner. In practice, when risks are identified, it can be difficult to tackle them. Therefore, it is necessary to work with experts in the field. Her organisation made a proposal to address due diligence on human rights in fisheries of Mauritania. In that work, they conducted interviews, involving the industry and other stakeholders. The aim is to develop recommendations and to assess risks. This should empower the companies to conduct better risk assessments.

- **Exchange of views**

Sergio López García (OPP Lugo) requested information on the source of the data for non-certified fisheries. Regarding the indication that 1/3 of small-scale fisheries were lacking data, Mr López wanted to know if the EU fisheries were included. He drew attention to challenges faced in the context of the EU-Mauritania Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreement, as, for example, it was difficult to receive health certificates, making it difficult to comply with the International Labour Organisation's Convention 188.

Christine Absil (Good Fish Foundation) highlighted that the Verifish project was also looking into the use of data for the development of an information system for suppliers and consumers. The mentioned project was also working with data from FishSource and from the FAO's Global Record.



The Chair asked about the presence of the organisation across the various Member States.

Carmen Gonzalez-Valles Martinez (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership), on the presence of her organisation across EU and Europe, informed that there was a team based in Spain, Portugal, and the UK. Regarding the classification of the various fisheries, Ms Gonzalez-Valles explained that it was based on public data from the FAO, the Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, and the national authorities of each country. The information is both public and certified. Her organisation asked for data updates every year. In the case of Mauritania, the focus was on the octopus value chain, particularly addressing the needs of the private sector and of the public authorities. She expressed hope that the public sharing of information would improve the situation in the country.

Mercedes Mendoza (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership) explained that, on the number of certified fisheries, SFP was taking into account certification by the Marine Stewardship Council. The combination of this certification together with fisheries improvement projects, and other tools such as stock assessments, provided a broader view of the status of fisheries. Ms Mendoza recognised that there were some challenges due to the Marine Stewardship Council providing certification to several species under the same certification. She added that the data of the EU, particularly in the case of large-scale operations, could generally be trusted. There were less reliability with the data from third countries.

- **Way forward**

The Chair mentioned that, when undertaking future work on the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive, it was relevant to keep in mind existing initiatives and efforts.

Outermost Regions

- **Consideration of draft advice on the fight against IUU fishing in the Outermost Regions**

The Secretary General recalled that, at the previous meeting, a presentation of a report estimating the quantity of illegal fishing by third countries in the waters of French Guyana had taken place. Following a prior agreement to proceed with joint work with the Outermost Regions Advisory Council (CCRUP) on the presence of IUU products in the market of the Outermost Regions, a proposal of draft advice on the topic had been circulated. The Secretary General provided an overview of the document. He informed that, following the consideration of the document by the relevant Working Group of the CCRUP, one additional recommendation had been added calling for the regulating and control of recreational fishing activities.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) highlighted that, in the document, serious allegations against third countries about tolerance for IUU fishing practices were being made. Therefore, in his view, it was important to further substantiate the accusations.

The Secretary General replied that several of the allegations were substantiated with studies and references. The Commission had also initiated IUU dialogues with some of the third countries mentioned in the document, such as Suriname, Guyana, Venezuela, and Brazil. Nevertheless, in the case of other countries, such as China and Iran, better substantiation was missing. Prior to the meeting, EJF sent preliminary feedback



with similar concerns. As a follow-up, the Secretary General had informed the CCRUP Secretariat that some better references would likely be required for several of the allegations made.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) emphasised that the recommendations went in the right direction, but that it was essential to substantiate the allegations made.

The Chair expressed agreement with Mr Pastoor.

Julien Daudu (EJF) suggested that, for cases missing robust footnotes, it could be relevant to include a recommendation to the Member States calling for the undertaking of surveys on IUU fishing practices.

The Chair highlighted that, in some of the references to recreational fishing, it was not entirely clear whether the recreational fishing itself was illegal or whether the trading of the products was illegal. The Chair suggested to check the matter with the CCRUP. He also suggested to clarify the references to recreational fishing by South Korea and China.

Julien Daudu (EJF) suggested improvements to make the section about Mayotte clearer.

- **Ways forward**

The Secretary General informed that he would be contacting the CCRUP Secretariat again about the improvement of the substantiation of the allegations made in the document. The Secretary General offered to informally check these improvements with Mr Pastoor and Mr Daudu.

The Chair proposed to submit the revised document to the CCRUP for their consideration. Once the document was considered by the CCRUP, it would be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval.



Summary of action items

- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing
 - Draft advice on “urgent need for effective implementation of EU import control rules across Member States” to be considered via an ordinary written procedure.
- Outermost Regions
 - Secretariat, in collaboration with the CCRUP Secretariat, with informal involvement of the most interested members, to pursue an improvement of the substantiation of the allegations made in the draft advice on “Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing in the Outermost Regions of the European Union”.
 - Following the consideration of the revised draft advice by the CCRUP, the Secretariat will put forward the document to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval.



Attendance List

Representative	Organisation	Role
Adrien Simonnet	Union du Mareyage Français (UMF)	Member
Alessandro Manghisi	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)	Member
Alex Vancoppenolle	Belgium	Observer
Alexandre Bonneau	SNCE	Member
Alexandre Rodríguez	Long Distance Advisory Council (LDAC)	Observer
Alonso Abreu Lozano	Asociación de Armadores Punta del Moral (OPP80)	Member
Àngels Segura Unió	AECOC	Member
Anna Rokicka	Polish Association of Fish Processors (PSPR)	Member
Camille Maisonneuve	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Carmen Gonzalez-Valles Martinez	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	Expert
Caroline Gamblin	PACT'ALIM	Member
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation	Member
Cristina Pita	Spanish National Research Council	Observer
Dominic Rihan	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation (KFO)	Member
Emiel Brouckaert	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Fabian Schäfer	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.	Member
Fabijan Hrvatin Peronja	Ribarska Zadruga Friška Riba	Member
Felicidad Fernández	ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Gaetane Le Breuil	European Fishmeal	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Giuseppe Scordella	COPA-COGECA	Member
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie	Member
Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón	ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Isabel Alonzo Cabezas	Spain	Observer
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member
Jens Hons Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
Jérémie Souben	FEDOPA	Member
Jesus Urios	Environmental Justice Foundation	Member
João Pereira	FRUCOM	Member
John Lynch	Irish South and East Fish Producers Organisation (ISEFPO)	Member
José Basilio Otero Rodríguez	Federación Nacional de Cofradías de Pescadores (FNCP)	Member
José Carlos Escalera Aguilar	FECOPESCA	Member
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF	Member
Juana Parada	OR.PA.GU.	Member
Julien Daudu	Environmental Justice Foundation	Member
Julien Lamothe	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO) / ANOP	Member
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
Linda Zanki Duvnjak	Ribarska Zadruga Friška Riba	Member
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA	Member
Malgorzata Kieliszewska	Poland	Observer
Marcus Breuer	European Parliament	Observer
Mercedes Mendoza	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	Expert
Nicolás Fernández	OPP72	Member
Olivier Hottlet	FRUCOM	Member
Mariano García García	Federación Andaluza de Cofradías de Pescadores	Member
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation	Member
Pedro Luis Casado López	OPP80	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pierre Commère	PACT'ALIM / Eurothon	Chair
Pieter Roden	Feedback EU	Member
Pim Visser	NOVA	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
Poul Melgaard Jensen	Danish Seafood Association	Member
Rafael Piñero Scapachini	EuroCommerce	Member
Sergio López García	OPP7 Burela	Member
Silvia Scalco	European Commission	Expert
Stefan Meyer	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.	Member
Sylvie Becaus	Vereniging Vlaamse Visveilingen (VVV)	Member
Thibault Pivetta	European Molluscs' Producers Association (EMPA)	Member
Thomas Kruse	Danish Fishermen P.O. / Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation (DPPO)	Member
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana	Member
Yobana Bermúdez	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE)	Member

