

## Working Group 1: EU Production Minutes

Monday 2 September 2019

14:00-17:25

Avenue de Cortenbergh 168,  
1000 Brussels

Welcome from the Chair, Sean O'Donoghue

Adoption of draft agenda and minutes of last meeting (16.05.19): adopted

Action points of the last meeting

- **State of play of the decisions made during the last meeting - information**

The Chair outlined the state of play of the decisions made. On the EMFF, the WG will continue to work on the topic, but the MAC's work programme will depend on the activities of the European Parliament. On marketing standards for processed products, the MAC's advice was submitted on 12 July 2019. The Chair took the opportunity to ask the European Commission if an answer was envisaged.

The European Commission replied that the advice was received. The evaluation on the marketing standards framework was already concluded, so the advice will not be incorporated in the evaluate. Nevertheless, the Commission will analyse it and provide an answer.

The Chair informed that the draft text on EUMOFA had been circulated among the members of the WG. On STEFCF, the Commission and the MAC are on the same page concerning the MAC's attendance of the Annual STECF Fleet Report meeting.

Evaluation of the EU marketing standards

- **"Focus on the sustainability dimension" - Presentation by Commission Representative (DG MARE)**

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

The European Commission started with a presentation on the evaluation of the EU marketing standards. The purpose of the evaluation was to answer: "is the current standards framework fit for purpose?" and "does it allow achieving the objectives of the CMO?".

Different consultations were conducted, including meetings with national authorities, targeted consultations, and a public consultation to gather different opinions from experts and non-experts. There were 151 replies to the consultation. 89 respondents provided replies on their



personal capacity. Most of the respondents were satisfied with the quality of fresh seafood products in the EU. Respondents were less satisfied with sustainability both for fresh and canned products. The trust in public authorities seems to be higher than in private certification bodies and points of sale without standards definition

The results of the consultation are already publicly available. The study concluded that sustainability, transparency, and fair competition emerge as key drivers of the generally favourable view of standardisation. Lack of clarity and enforcement may mean that seafood generated from unsustainable and deceptive practices may enter the market. Some respondents stated that the consumer should be better informed on the real environmental cost of the product.

The evaluation concluded that there is no conflict between marketing standards and conservation measures. In the cases where there is no minimum conservation reference sizes, the minimum marketing size avoid undersize fish to be sold on the market. However, other policies contributes more to sustainability . 2/3 of the supply to the EU market comes from imports and marketing standards apply to 13% of those imports and minimum marketing sizes to only 1 to 3%. Private standards are commonly used on top of the EU's marketing standards. Other dimensions of sustainability are usually not covered by those private standards (e.g. social).

Concerning market demand, since 2009, voluntary claims on environment and animal welfare have increased the most. According to the final report on the feasibility of an EU Ecolabel, development of ecolabels is mainly retailer driven and ecolabels are primarily used as an assurance mechanism and therefore have been incorporated into purchasing decisions and sourcing policies. According to a study on EU consumer habits vis-à-vis FAPs, no significant sales increase has been observed after the introduction of eco-labelled products. The demand for sustainability assurance comes mainly from the supply chain. As for consumers, for the majority of Member States, the major criteria is freshness, presentation, cost, and origin of the product. For a few Member States, the environment and the socio-ethical impacts are relevant.

As a conclusion, the Commission stated that the capacity of marketing standards to enable the market to be supplied with sustainable products is at best marginal. The Supply chain significantly relies on private systems to procure sustainable products, but only some aspects of sustainability are looked at, standards look at sustainability at catching level, and there is a plurality of private definitions of sustainability, often diverging and not always in line with CFP goals.

Visfederatie recalled that, when the marketing standards were discussed at FG's level, these were discussed as B2B standards. It is a standard used for the first sale in the chain. They asked the Commission why there was so much focus on the consumer, when the marketing standards are not really aiming at consumer information. Consumer information is a different type of information.

Good Fish Foundation wanted to know where the results of the public consultations could be



found.

The European Commission agreed that the current marketing standards is a B2B tool. The evaluation also looked into the demand on the consumer side. It was more a state-of-play on all sides of the supply chain. The demand for sustainability was made clear in the evaluation. The Commission explained that the results of the public consultation are available online. The results of the evaluation were not yet public.

FEDEPESCA asked for more information on the European Commission's next steps.

Visfederatie highlighted that the sustainability issue has been discussed within the MAC and is an ongoing discussion. They recalled the process at the FG, adding that they would like to continue and reach a result. They urged the Commission to focus on marketing standards in a B2B relationship perspective.

CONXEMAR highlighted that consumers feel the need to be more informed on the environmental cost of each product. They wanted to know if the Commission will delve more into this issue from a marketing perspective.

The European Commission explained that the evaluation will be published in the second semester of 2019. Then, there will be an impact assessment. That will be the time when the Commission decides what happens next. It is just an evaluation of the current marketing standards. The decisions will be made at the moment of the impact assessment. At that time, the Commission will analyse what can be done on the consumers' side.

Visned reminded the Commission that the MAC is comprised of the parties that have been working on the marketing standards since 1996. Consumers have not been working on this B2B standards. There is room for improvement on the legislation. The room is for a smaller role by the Commission and a more intense role by business partners. The public needs to be informed, but consumer information should not be mixed with marketing standards.

The Chair asked the Commission to clarify if the evaluation would be published by the end of the year.

The Commission clarified that, if there is a revision, there will be an impact assessment.

The Chair wanted to know, in case of an impact assessment, what the timescale would be.

The Commission replied that it was not possible to provide a deadline. It would take one or two years to conclude.

Visned highlighted that the MAC finalised the advice on marketing standards for processed products. The MAC is in a position to take the next step forward. From the FG on Marketing Standards, there can be advice to start revising the freshness categories. They have come up with a standardisation process. Within the next three weeks, they will present a planning for the



Autumn for two or three meetings of this Focus Group. The Secretariat will inform itself on the procedure for standardisation. National standardisation authorities need to be consulted. They expressed hope of presenting a plan of action at the next WG. During the process, they will communicate with the Commission. It is important to maintain the processes align to reach the right result.

ADEPALE expressed confusion concerning the nature of the work. From their point of view, the FG on Marketing Standards was supposed to express an advice. Two advices were drafted. They were not aware of a new mandate for the FG. They are not aware of the future work of the FG. They are still expecting the Commission's evaluation. They argued in favour of waiting for the evaluation.

Visned stated that new terms of reference need to be made. At the May meeting, there was agreement to follow this step for the WG. They will present terms of reference to the WG. After the decision of the WG, they can continue the work. They must present plans that are in line with the May meeting. The FG will not present any advice, but will prepare the way forward, as discussed in May.

The Chair stated that the MAC agreed to continue working on fresh fish standards. The aim would be develop these at the FG's level. Visned will be following through with what was agreed at the Executive Committee for fresh products. The Chair expressed hope that there will be a document too discuss with the WG at the next meeting. Given the period of the revision, the guidelines are probably more important now to try to develop. The MAC should try to develop these.

## EUMOFA

- **Agreement on recommendations**

The Chair asked the members if any changes were needed on the draft recommendation on EUMFOA. The Chair expressed hope that the recommendation would be concluded at the Executive Committee meeting or by written recommendation before the end of September.

Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V., in relation to the third paragraph of the draft, highlighted that there is already information regarding fresh products in the data bank. Data should be presented for all the market. New information should be provided to all market segments.



The Chair agree with the proposed broadening of the scope.

ADEPALE expressed agreement with Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.'s comment, since there is no specific reason to limit the evaluation for fresh products. The whole value chain should be covered.

The Chair stated that the draft text would be amended to include the whole value chain. The Chair highlighted that EUMOFA is a tool for professionals, but it also needs to be user-friendly for the occasional user. A help-line facility should be put in place. There should be an area on the EUMOFA's website to demonstrate that errors have been corrected.

Visfederatie argued that it would be beneficial to know the source of certain figures. There are difficulties in matching sources. They proposed to include a reference to add in the draft text.

Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V. drew attention to the time of publication of data on EUMOFA's website. At that time, the most recent consumption table was from 2016. This is not very helpful, since 2019 figures are already available.

The Chair proposed to include a bullet point on the timeliness of the data. The Chair recalled that the European Commission has provided some information on the who is using EUMOFA and their purpose.

The European Commission explained that there are 18 Member States participating and contributing with data. Iceland and Norway are also participating. There will soon be more Member States, since the Commission is cooperating with Bulgaria and Cyprus. Concerning the use of EUMOFA, they informed that there are 3000 unique users every month. The visits are continuously improving, particularly after being promoted in fairs and exhibitions, which translates into peaks in the system. The Commission is confident that EUMOFA delivers. There are many questions from users, but very few users complain or highlight weaknesses in EUMOFA. The Commission can provide more information on the users, including the geographical coverage of the tool.

The Chair proposed to remove the reference in the draft text to information on EUMOFA users.

ADEPALE argued that the point on users should be included in the text, since it is important to know the purpose of the users, which is not clear. The evaluation should be strengthened. It is a point that could be analysed more in depth, in order to understand the expectations of the users and to completely understand the use of the tool.

The Chair suggested to change the emphasis on the number of users and more towards the purpose of the use. There can be requests to the Commission and the MAC can be updated.



ADEPALE underscored that an evaluation is paramount. There is no information from the Commission on the purpose of the users.

The European Commission stated that, after receiving all recommendations from the MAC, the Commission will address all recommendations one by one within the inherent limits of the tool. EUMOFA can only work with the existing data. For example, there is a lack of data on aquaculture. The data gathering and validation process for certain steps of the supply chain is particularly long and out of the control of EUMOFA (e.g. data from Eurostat), so the data takes one or two years to be available to the experts of EUMOFA. EUMOFA itself is not responsible for those delays. It works on alternative ways to measures, using predictive tools. The Commission took note of the lack of user-friendliness of certain features of EUMOFA. The Commission signed a new contract for EUMOFA. One of the requirements to the contractor was to set-up a pilot users group. A group of users will report to EUMOFA on different topics, based on questionnaires and interviews, in order to systematically improve features and develop new functionalities.

The European Commission stated that they would appreciate details on errors when these are identified and users believe that these were reported but not properly addressed. As far as the Commission knows, all errors are corrected and those who report the errors are informed. Regarding sources, it is key for EUMOFA to be fully transparent on the sources of information. It is a large challenge for EUMOFA to have data comparable over time. The only way to achieve this is through estimates and proxies. There will always be shortcomings, but there is an obligation to deliver market intelligence. The other alternative would be not to have market intelligence. At Member States' level, there are observatories that are more comprehensive, but that do not deliver EU's level information.

The Chair explained that the objective is to develop recommendations to make EUMOFA better from a user and industry's point of view. In relation to ADEPALE's intervention, the Chair proposed to recommend a yearly evaluation of the EUMOFA users and their purpose.

ADEPALE agreed with the suggestion.

The Chair highlighted that trainings on EUMOFA were provided in some Member States . The Chair highlighted that there are some discrepancies between quarterly and annual data. There should be more systematic training and the Member States can help on that. The European Commission could do more to advertise EUMOFA as well.

Visfederatie explained that, at the end of May, there was new legislation for the agricultural sector, which provides a legal basis for studies along the supply chain. They checked with the European Commission and the Dutch Government that the legislation does not cover fish products, since these are implementing regulations for the agricultural sector. The alternative is to achieve these studies through the EUMOFA system. There are already examples of price



transmission analyses across the value chain. When it on the basis of the legislation, the system is stronger, because operators must provide the data. The agricultural system has permanent monitoring. Through EUMOFA, it would be a more ad hoc system. It is quite difficult to gather data across the value chain in the fisheries sector. The MAC could identify specific species or markets that are of interest and ask the European Commission to perform these studies.

The Chair asked the members if, at the present stage, there were any specific studies to include in the draft recommendation.

ADEPALE expressed reservations concerning the wording of the second paragraph of the draft text and proposed to replace mentions of “direct monitoring”, since EUMOFA is about observing and evaluating the market, but is not a management tool.

The Chair agreed with the removal of the reference to “direct”.

Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V. argued that the draft text gives the impression that retail is only one channel, when the market is divided into different ones. It is not possible to have real time information on EUMOFA.

The Chair stated that it was a misunderstanding and not the intention of the text to claim that EUMOFA provides real time information. The Chair highlighted that the MAC is asking the European Commission to perform price studies and that the MAC will provide more details on these.

The Chair proposed to amend the draft text and circulate it again with the WG members. The Chair informed that the Executive Committee will be informed on the proposal and that the Executive Committee will be asked to move through written procedure. The WG will be asked to assess the final version, which the Chair hopes would be circulated at the start of the following week. The second paragraph must be reworded to clarify that the data is not live. The reference to “fresh” will be deleted. The Chair expressed hope that useful recommendations on EUMOFA will be developed.

## EMFF

- **State of play of the adoption of the dossier – information by Commission Representative**

The European Commission explained that the European Parliament has adopted a first reading position and that the Council adopted a partial general approach. The new Parliament did not express a willingness to revisit the first reading. There are amendments that are problematic, from the Commission’s point-of-view, particularly the ones introducing subsidies, which could lead to overfishing and overcapacity, such as the subsidies on vessels construction. These might



contradict the objectives of the CFP and the EU's international commitments.

The requests for higher levels of financing are problematic, in the Commission's view. It will decrease the amount of measures that can be supported and will minimise the responsibility of the Member States in ensuring that the money is correctly spent. The European Parliament reintroduced storage aid, which is in line with the view expressed by the MAC. The Council did not take this amendment as such, and kept the deletion of storage aid. There is a difference of opinion between the two institutions.

Concerning the use of financial instruments, the Commission proposed to make them mandatory for the processing industry and productive investments in aquaculture. Under its amendments, the European Parliament removed the financial instruments for both. The Council only maintained the instruments for the processing sector other than SMEs.

The Chair recalled that, at the last WG meeting, a full analysis of the European Parliament's amendments was made in relation to the MAC's recommendations. One of them was the Production and Marketing Plans, which the European Parliament had in the preamble, but not as such in the text.

The European Commission stated that the Production and Marketing Plans is included in the preamble, which provides visibility and highlights the tool for the sector. In terms of making the support mandatory, it is still not the case. There is no way for the Commission to introduce the measure at this stage.

ANFACO wanted to know if the European Parliament agreed on the possibility of a subsidy for the processing sector. The processing sector, as part of the value chain, could receive subsidies, but not financial instruments. They stated that the industry is quite surprised with the European Parliament's decision. There is a clear need for innovation. The European Commission and the Council consider that these can only be as financial instruments. The Council do not believe that the processing industry should not receive subsidies. They emphasised that these instruments have been able to improve social and economic fabric.

The European Commission replied that there are no obvious market failures that would justify grants to the processing industry. The Council's views are not in line with the Commission. The Council would allow grants in the processing industry for SMEs.

ANFACO wanted to know if, for larger companies, there would only be financial instruments.

The European Commission clarified that the Commission rejects grants to the processing industry, while the Council would allow grants only to SMEs.

ANFACO urged the European Commission to take into account the discussion on the need for grants. The energy efficiency and the competitiveness of the industry is based on these funds.



There are good examples from Galicia.

The European Commission took note of ANFACO's request.

The Chair stated that this was already included in the MAC's recommendations.

- **Future work on MAC recommendations**

The Chair outlined several topics that need to be followed-up. First, on Production and Marketing Plans, the MAC must follow-up with its recommendation with the Parliament and Member States. Second, on capital funding for Advisory Councils, the Chair highlighted that several ACs wrote to the European Commission. ACs can only apply under research and development schemes. It is worth bringing up again with the Parliament and the Member States. Third, on transitional arrangements, it is important to avoid the void of last time. The Chair wanted to know if this would be addressed from a legal perspective.

The European Commission stated that they could look into the transitional arrangements matter.

The Chair stated that the MAC will follow on the recommendation on PMPs and capital fundings with the European Parliament and the Member States.

FEAP wanted to know if there was any information concerning the appointment of rapporteurs at the European Parliament. Additionally, in the case of a hard Brexit, if there was any information on the timeline. They also wanted to know about the rapporteurs for the Control Regulation proposal.

The European Commission responded that the Commission will follow-up on these matters.

EAPQ stated that they would like to see the Commission's response to the MAC's advice on the EMFF.

The Chair replied that he understood the Commission's response was already circulated but in any event will be posted on the MAC's website.

## **Review of the State aid framework applicable to the fishery and aquaculture sector**

- **Review existing State aid framework**

The Chair explained the review of the State aid framework involves the De Minimis Regulation, the Block Exemption Regulation, and the State Aid Guidelines. The objective of the review is to ensure effective State aid control to minimise negative effects on the internal market, to simplify the State aid rules, and to contribute to the achievement of the CFP's objectives. The Chair provided an overview of the different scenario options under the Commission's Roadmap.



Europêche informed that the De Minimis Regulation will expire in 2020 and that they are looking into possible ways to revise the regulation. The first step should be to grant de minimis aid per vessels. Currently, the regulation provides €30.000 of aid per company over a period of three fiscal years. Many companies in the EU are managing several vessels, so Europêche is asking for a change of the regulation's definition.

The €30.000 figure was agreed in 2007. The figure is currently falling short. It does not allow companies to face the current economic situation. Europêche is proposing an increase of the ceiling to €100.000. The Commission's intention is to align this regulation with the EMFF. Under the Commission's proposal, the EMFF is more flexible. There will be some general principles on what cannot be done. It is a more practical approach from the Commission. It will be up to the Member States to decide if the aid can be granted. Investment aid can be provided for health, safety, training, welfare, and onboard conditions.

Europêche further argued that the Block Exemption Regulation should be fully in line with the new EMFF. It should allow investment in work and safety conditions, while also taking into account the impacts of Brexit.

The Chair stated that Europêche's position was a good starting point to discuss the MAC's contribution to the review of the State aid instruments applicable to the fishery and aquaculture sector. Under the Roadmap, there were four scenario options, so the Chair wanted to know which option Europêche had selected.

Europêche replied that they had probably selected option 4.

EMPA states that some European regions have proposed a fifth option to the Roadmap. It would consist of a modification of the de minimis thresholds. They offer a threshold of € 200,000. The AEPM has raised two other possibilities with certain regions: 1 / the choice to pass small productive investments under the exemption regime; 2 / As part of the financial engineering proposed by the EMFF, the creation of a solidarity guarantee fund, so that shellfish farmers can borrow conventionally from their bank but without having to mortgage their own property (house). Heavy productive investments aimed at avoiding heat losses on farms, designing the shellfish vessel of the future, experimenting with new off-shore exploitation techniques should, for their part, remain eligible for direct aid.

The Chair took note of the "fifth option". Different sectors will have different requirements in terms of de minimis thresholds. In order to achieve a common position as MAC, it would be better to avoid specific figures. Option 4 could be agreeable, as long as it allows to deviate from the current de minimis thresholds. The Chair argued that state aid should apply to the vessels and not to the commercial enterprises. The threshold dates back to 2007 and needs to be actively assessed. Brexit needs to be mentioned in the document. The Chair stated that a document would be put together to circulate to the WG.

Good Fish Foundation agreed with the development of a document by the MAC, but was against the inclusion of detailed figures.



LIFE stated that the €30.000 agreed in 2007 seemed quite ad hoc, when considering that companies have varying numbers of vessels and personnel. It might be necessary to look at different fleet segments and uses. They expressed agreement with the priorities for health, safety, and working conditions. It should not be for engine capacity or construction of new vessels.

The Chair highlighted, in relation to safety and other equipment, that part of the problem, at the moment, is that some safety provisions are mandatory, so State aid cannot be provided. It is an opportunity, particularly for smaller sectors, to allow de minimis to cover part of that. As for the figures, the MAC can provide a more generic view. The Chair concluded that the MAC should try to have a draft document out as soon as possible, using the Europêche's draft document as the basis.

EMPA stated that, in a couple of weeks, it would be too late for the submission. Taking into account the time needed for approval by WG and the Executive Committee, it needs to happen very quickly.

The Chair stated that the aim should be to have some input, in order to conclude the document by the consultation's deadline. The written procedure will be used for adoption by the Executive Committee.

## Landing Obligation

- **Review Markets situation**

The Chair explained that the MAC has previously decided to wait for the full implementation of the landing obligation, which took place on January 1 2019. Only next year will it be possible to assess if there are problems. From a market point-of-view, it does not seem to be a substantial issue. Under the MAC's work programme, it will be an item to review and to decide upon. The MAC must seriously look into this topic.

Visned stated that, when the fish was below minimum size, the best practice was to discard it. Under the landing obligation, the fish must and cannot be sold. It can only be sold for non-human consumption. Therefore, there are possibilities to distort the market.

Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation stated that undersized fish can be included as an added product to products for human consumption. There is a potential to distort the market.

CEP argued that there is a perception that the landing obligation is not being fully implemented. It might not have an impact on what is really reaching the market. There is a reputational issue that can have a market impact. There are rumours that some fisheries will no longer be certifiable, if they cannot demonstrate compliance. Clearly, there is a need for a period to analyse the developments. Retailers have been alerted to concerns connected to reputational problems. There were some prominent articles in the press concerning the landing obligation.



The Chair argued that, from an Advisory Council's point-of-view, it would be important to see figures. The full implementation has taken place. Next year, the Chair would like to see the exact data on the landing obligation, including how much additional fish was landed. The Chair agreed with the mentioned reputational issues. Nevertheless, more data is required to assess the potential problems with the landing obligation.

Good Fish Foundation drew attention to a meeting by the European Commission on the enforcement of the landing obligation, where it was discussed how the implementation was not effective. EFCA was very clear on the implementation problems.

The Chair highlighted that a number of ACs are actively pursuing the issue. The MAC is not the key player on the control side of the landing obligation.

Good Fish Foundation argued that, from the market's side, it is an issue in the UK, particularly for cod. In the Netherlands, there are derogations on several complex species.

The Chair stated that, if the reputation issue turns out to be significant, the MAC should be involved. Data is needed to determine it. The Chair expressed hope that, in January, the MAC would look into the market's situation.

Good Fish Foundation wanted to know what kind of data the Chair was looking for. If it was data on the market or data provided by the enforcement agency.

The Chair responded that the data should come from different sources on the different Member States' discard plans. Member States have proposed de minimis rules and there are rules that allow discards for certain species. If there is undersized fish, there must be records.

Good Fish Foundation argued that the de minimis derogation is not being taken up. In the Netherlands, additional quota is set aside and can be asked, if needed. This quota is not being used. They wondered why it was not being used, particularly if the quota is not necessary or if the discards continue.

The Chair emphasised the need for data. If there is an issue, the MAC needs to address it from a market's point-of-view. The Chair proposed to discuss initial ideas in the January 2019 meeting.

## STECF

- **Reporting back on the Annual STECF Fleet Report meeting**

The Chair explained that, unfortunately, he had been unable to be physically present at the meeting, but that he had contributed remotely. The 2019 Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet has been published, he informed.

Concerning the meeting, the Chair highlighted that the evaluation by STECF is quite crude. It is



just an overall volume for a particular area divided by price, which reaches an average price. It is a somewhat meaningless figure. This year, STECF tried, unsuccessfully, to get access to the price data in the Sales Notes, but was not allowed access. If there was access, the report would be much more accurate. The STECF is doing great work, but the price data is distorted. The STECF cannot generate data that they do not have, so they went back to the previous method.

At the previous WG meeting, the MAC highlighted problems to the Commission concerning the MAC's role as an observer. These problems have been resolved. The meeting takes five days, so it would not be possible for the Chair to attend fully, but the STECF facilitated ways for the MAC to provide their views. Once it is discussed with the Commission, it should be possible to achieve the same for the report on the processing industry.

The Chair proposed to submit a recommendation to the Executive Committee welcoming what the STECF has produced but highlighted the issue with the price data and that we should send a request to Commission that the sales notes data be made available to STECF. If the price structure is not good, it takes away from the validity of the report.

EMPA requested to add that the MAC fully regrets not having an identical report on the price structure of aquaculture farms in Europe.

The Chair agreed with the request.

The European Commission offered to answer questions concerning the 2019 Annual Economic Report.

The Chair stated that, since the report had been published very recently, it was too early for the MAC members to provide feedback. The Chair expressed his hope that there will be a presentation by the SFTEC Chair at the January meeting on the report.

### Summary of action points

- **EUMOFA:** Following the agreed amendments, the draft text with recommendations will be circulated again among WG members. The Executive Committee will be asked to approve the text under written procedure.
- **State Aid Framework:** The WG will proceed with the development of an advice.
- **STECF:** The WG will propose an advice covering price data and aquaculture.
- **Landing Obligation:** The WG will follow-up at the next meeting.
- **EMFF:** The WG will follow-up on the topic.

### AOB

None.



## List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Roberto Carlos Alonso Baptista de Sousa	ANFACO-CECOPECA
Marco Baldoli	AIPCE-CEP
Gerard van Balsfoort	Pelagic Fisher Trawler Association
Cynthia Benites	COPA COGECA
Victor Bouvard	FEDOPA
Emiel Brouckaert	EAPO
Arnault Chaperon	FEAP
Pierre Commère	ADEPALE
Juan Elices	Spain
José Carlos Escalera Aguilar	FECOPECA
Laurene Jolly	European Commission
Cristina Fernández	Seafish
Haydeé Fernández Granja	CONXEMAR
Nicolás Fernández Muñoz	OPP72
Yves Foezon	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Silvia Gil	FEDEPECA
Bruno Guillaumie	EMPA
Matthias Keller	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.
Andrew Kuyk	CEP
Jovana Lippens	MAC Secretariat
Sergio López García	OPP-07-LUGO
Jens Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association
Eduardo Miguez	Puerto de Celeiro S.A. – OPP77
Dana Miller	Oceana
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation
Janne Posti	Marine Stewardship Council



Representative	Organisation
Katrin Vilhelm Poulsen	WWF
Paulien Prent	Visfederatie
Erik Bjørn Olsen	Living Sea
Brian O’Riordan	LIFE Platform
Claudia Orlandini	LIFE Platform
Basilio Otero	Federación Provincial Cofradías de Pescadores de Lugo
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie
Pedro Reis Santos	MAC Secretariat
Yasmin Schinasi	European Commission
Katarina Sipic	CONXEMAR
Juan Manual Trujillo Castillo	ETF
Pim Visser	VisNed
Daniel Voces	Europêche
Christophe Vande Weyer	European Commission
Georg Werner	Environmental Justice Foundation

