

Working Group 2: EU Market Draft Minutes

Tuesday, 25 May 2021

14:00 - 17:30 CET

Zoom online meeting

Welcome from the Chair, Pierre Commère

Adoption of draft agenda and minutes of last meeting (26.03.21): adopted

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

Trade

- **Update on renegotiation of EEA Agreement by Commission representative**

Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE) provided an update on the forthcoming negotiations of the new bilateral protocols and EEA Agreement. The negotiations are closely linked to the financial mechanism under the EEA Agreement. The financial mechanism and the bilateral fisheries protocols expired on 30 April. The draft mandate for new negotiations has been discussed in the Council since January. The Council adopted a mandate on 20 May to open the negotiations with Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein on the next financial mechanism for seven years. The mandate also covers trade aspects related to fisheries. There is no clear timeline yet on the opening of the negotiations. The EEAS takes the lead of the negotiations. The selection of the chief negotiator is still to be agreed. The review of the expired financial protocol will take place before opening the new negotiations, by early June.

In relation to market access of fisheries products, the Commission is aware that some Member States were approached by Norway to renegotiate the entire market access of fisheries products. The market access provisions are quite complex, since these were initially bilateral agreements with Norway and Iceland, which were later taken as concessions under the EEA Agreement. Nevertheless, there are still bilateral agreements in place for some concessions. These remaining bilateral agreements cover certain provisions which were also in the expired protocols to be renegotiated. The Commission has not been directly approached by the Norwegian authorities. DG MARE, DG TRADE and EEAS will need to establish the framework for the future negotiations.

The Commission representative drew attention to the political issue of fishing rights in Svalbard, which is gaining high political attention. It does not help with discussions on market access. In the meantime, due to the expiry of the bilateral protocols with Norway and Iceland, there have been requests from some Member and some stakeholders, particularly the EU processing industry, to



amend the ATQ Regulation, in order to cover the existing gap from the expiry of the protocols. This would allow duty-free quota access for Norwegian fish that was traded under the bilateral protocols. DG MARE is finalising the draft Commission proposal for a Council Regulation, which would amend the ATQ Regulation adopted in 2020. The timeline for the adoption of this proposal is not clear yet, since internal procedures are ongoing.

Daniel Voces (Europêche), in relation to the Commission's proposal to amend the ATQ Regulation, requested information on the species that will be covered, including the quantities.

Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE) responded that, at that stage, it was difficult to know how the proposal would look like. It will likely cover the main species traded with Norway, such as herring and mackerel. The quantities under the bilateral protocol are quite significant, but are not equally used: some quotas are quite used, while others are barely used. The Commission will not propose duty-free for quotas of low use. The Commission will take into account the level of utilisation in the past years.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) requested more information on the procedure, particularly if it required Council approval, and the timeline. Mr O'Donoghue wanted to know, in the case that there is an amendment to the ATQs Regulation, how the new EEA agreement would be adjusted. The European catching sector is concerned about the linkage between market access and the access to fisheries resources. Norway seems to want a wider market access.

Pawel Szatkowski (DG MARE) explained that the amendment to the ATQ Regulation will require an official proposal from the Commission, which will require discussion and agreement from the Council. Therefore, it will be a Council Regulation amending the current ATQ Regulation. In terms of timeline, at that stage, it was unclear. The previous negotiations took two years to agree on bilateral quotas. DG MARE and EEAS expect one year to one year and half to conclude the negotiations. It is important to have leverage in the negotiations, so the application of the ATQs would have a set period of application. The ATQs would be for the benefit of the EU processing industry and have *erga omnes* application, meaning that the EU industry could import raw material from other countries. This would not be a specific concession to Norway, but merely dealing with the shortage of raw material faced by the EU industry. In relation to the TCA, the outcome is difficult for the EU and Norwegian industry, which is likely why Norway wishes to improve their market access under the EEA agreement.

- **Update on Cape Verde's derogation of rules of origin by Commission representative**

François Becquart (DG TAXUD) explained that, in 2018, the EU agreed on a derogation of rules of origin for fisheries products from Cape Verde. It is difficult for Cape Verde to comply with the standard rules of origin. Cape Verde has a reduced fleet, making it difficult for vessels to do long fishing trips for migratory species. It is difficult to have enough raw material to comply with the rules of origin. The derogation allows a set quantity of raw material from other sources. The derogations have been renewed several times. The problem is that these derogations do not encourage Cape Verde to



develop its fleet. There are also problems in the control of the rules of origin. Originally, the EU did not intend to renew the derogations, but the situation changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The impact on Cape Verde's economy was very significant due to the dependence on tourism and fisheries. Therefore, the EU will renew the derogation for three years. The EU hopes that, in those three years, an alternative to the derogation will be developed. The derogation is supposed to be temporary. The EU will work with Cape Verde to develop alternatives, for example extension of Cape Verde's flag or support mechanisms. The Commission is finalising internal paperwork to put forward the proposal to the College of Commissioners for adoption in the end of May/beginning of June.

The Chair wanted to know if the regulation would be adopted by the Commission or by the Council.

François Becquart (DG TAXUD) responded that it was an implementing regulation from the Commission. The basis is Article 64.6 of the Customs Code.

The Chair wanted to know about the connection with the EU Economic Partnership Agreement with West Africa.

François Becquart (DG TAXUD) explained that the EPA with West Africa was not yet in force, because it requires the signature of all the participating parties. Therefore, Cape Verde is not able to make use of the allowances of the EPA. It is unclear when the agreement would enter into force.

The Chair suggested that this topic could be discussed again in the future.

Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements (SFPAs)

- **Presentation of evaluation exercise by Benoit Caillart, Associate Director, F&S, and by Commission representative**

The Chair recalled that the MAC previously adopted an advice on the Evaluation Roadmap. The external consultant selected by DG MARE has initiated an evaluation exercise

Benoit Caillart (F&S) explained that the evaluation exercise started earlier that year with a team of experts focused on different areas, such as sector support and access to waters. Mr Caillart thanked the MAC for its advice. The importance of the SFPAs' market dimension for the MAC was noted, particularly the relevance of SFPAs for the supply of the EU market, the governance capacity, and developing sanitary conditions. SFPAs cover 13 third countries. The catches of the EU fleet there represents 9% of the EU fleet's production with particular importance for specific species, such as tuna. There are four countries that are particularly important for the EU processing industry, namely Morocco, Ivory Coast, Mauritania and Senegal. From the other third countries, the contribution to the EU's supply is quite limited. Mr Caillart explained that there is some leverage to assist the third



countries in the development of sanitary systems through sectoral support. It can contribute to the development of favourable business environment and in supplying the EU market.

Under the evaluation exercise, 150 targeted consultations are taking place, including stakeholders in third countries. The consultation started in March and is an ongoing process. A public consultation was launched, which is open until the end of June. There is also ongoing work with the EU's delegations in the third countries to evaluate the coherence, complementary, and synergies in the different areas of development of the fisheries sector. As for a timeline, an intermediate report will be submitted to DG MARE in June. The final report will be submitted in September. Publication is expected in the Fall 2021. Based on this work, the Commission will develop a Staff Working Document to contribute to the CFP's implementation report in 2022.

Marta Moren Abat (DG MARE) emphasised it is an important opportunity for stakeholders to contribute with additional elements on the SFPAs. The Commission's Staff Working Document will be based on the evaluation report, which will contribute to the report on the implementation of the CFP. Under the evaluation, the Commission wishes to consider all related policies and coherence as well as EU interest in the third countries/regions. The Commission launched a public consultation and targeted consultations.

- **Exchange of views & way forward**

The Chair recalled that, in March 2021, the MAC adopted an advice on the Evaluation Roadmap. It is a very important topic for the MAC and the EU seafood market. It is important to know what happens to the fish caught by EU fleets in third countries, particularly if it is supplying the EU market or third countries. Taking into account that the EU market is deficit market, it is worth analysing how much it contributes to supplying EU and to local markets. It is a matter of food security. There are social matters to be taken into account.

Marta Moren Abat (DG MARE) emphasised that it was an opportunity to analyse the opinion of the different sectors about SFPAs, which will help shape and improve future agreements. These should benefit the EU and the third countries.

The Chair stated, once the evaluation report is published, the MAC will analyse it and consider if further advice is needed on the matter. The topic should be on the Work Programme for Year 6.

EUMOFA

- **Presentation of study “Impact of seafood imports on the EU Small-Scale Coastal Fleet”**

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



The Chair explained that the study was published by EUMOFA in April and that an online workshop by EUMOFA took place the same month to present it. The topic is quite relevant for the MAC's work, so it was important to ensure that members were aware of the study.

Sébastien Metz (Sakana) explained that the objective of the study was to better understand the functioning of supply chains and markets for the EU small-scale coastal fleet (SSCF) and to analyse potential market interaction with seafood imports. It identified and described the SSCF and the market it supplies, for each Member State. It identified and analysed the sourcing strategies used by actors in fishery supply chains. It investigated the observed and potential impact of seafood imports on the EU SSCF. It identified communities or regions that are most impacted by imports due to a high dependency or interaction with the local fishing fleet.

The study's approach analyses if the price of the imported products affects the price of the SSCF products in the market. For certain market segments, there is a significant distinction between these products. In terms of average landed value by SSCF, it is almost one billion euros. The top six Member States represent 87% of the value. The top 20 species represent 87% of the value landed. There were three case studies: cod caught in Sweden competing with Norwegian cod, octopus caught in Spain (Galicia) competing with octopus caught in Portugal but also in Northern Africa, and lobster caught in France competing with lobster from Northern America (Canada) and Europe (UK, Ireland).

In relation to the focus of the lobster case study, there are two species: *Homarus Gammarus* and *Homarus Americanus*. According to specialists, the taste is different. The average French consumer is not able to tell the difference. The primary production area in France is in Normandy. The French production is essentially SSCF. Some of the production has ecolabels. The imports are mostly live/fresh lobster. Canada, UK, USA, and Ireland provenances represent 90% of the imported quantities. In relation to UK imports, the French SSCF is the price maker. In relation to Canadian imports, there is an influence in the French prices. According to French retailers, there are two groups of consumers: older customers with more disposable income and younger customers with less disposable income. The first group will buy EU products regardless of the price. The second group will purchase based on the price regardless of the origin.

As for findings, imports are sometimes an issue, but never the only issue and never even the biggest issue. There are many strategies to create a niche for SSCF products, for example through marketing to recognise local qualities or through ecolabels. For example, Asturian octopus with MSC ecolabel is able to be exported to the USA, creating a small niche market. There are broader issues about SSCF economic power. There may still be scope for impactful policies, institutions and SSCF market strategies.

- **Exchange of views & way forward**

The Chair requested clarification about the broader issues of SSCF economic power.



Sébastien Metz (Sakana) explained that, for several years, the issue for producers is not primarily the opening of the EU market, through trade agreements, to new competitors, but more the access to quotas and fishing grounds.

The Chair commented that it was essentially a matter of strategy, since the quotas are a resource that is available to the fleet. The Chair recalled that EU processors have debated many times the impact of imports on the prices of EU products. International prices and EU prices are not necessarily connected and imports do not necessarily impact EU production. The Chair wanted to hear from DG MARE about the context of the study and if similar studies by EUMOFA were envisaged.

Laurène Jolly (DG MARE) responded that EUMOFA could produce similar studies for other kinds of fisheries and fleets. It could be integrated in the future EUMOFA's work programme. The current study covered several case studies, but it would also be possible to cover additional case studies.

The Chair suggested to return to this topic under the MAC's Work Programme for next year. EUMOFA studies are very interesting and relevant to understand the functioning of the market.

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU)

- **Presentation of draft proposal on flags of convenience by Sophie Nodzenski, EJF**

The Chair recalled that, at the previous meeting, EJF presented a report on flags of convenience and offered to propose a draft advice on the topic. The draft was circulated to the members in advance. Depending on the level of comments from the members, the draft could be put forward to the Executive Committee or remain in the Working Group for further work.

Sophie Nodzenski (EJF) explained that the draft advice was based on the findings of the EJF report and provides recommendations to the European Commission about how to stop the negative impact of flags of convenience in the fisheries sector. The recommendations are divided into two sections. The first section covers measures to close the loopholes offered by flags of convenience, so it is focused on EU nationals. The second section is about how the EU can use its bilateral relationships to reduce the detrimental of flags of convenience.

- **Consideration of draft proposal**

The Chair proposed to start by the consideration of the draft recommendations.

Sophie Nodzenski (EJF) suggested to merge points iii) and iv) of recommendation b).

The Chair asked Ms Nodzenski to clarify the meaning of "public access" under recommendation c), particularly if it meant access by public authorities or by the general public.



Sophie Nodzinski (EJF) clarified that it would be the general public. The list mentioned in b) is based on the EU flag register, which does not necessarily include information about beneficial ownership.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) highlighted that, under the SMEF Regulation, there are two different levels of lists: lists for Member States and lists for the general public. Mr Voces informed that he would need to check internally whether his organisation could support points i) and ii) of recommendation b). The recommendations might imply significant bureaucracy and jeopardise business confidentiality. Mr Voces expressed understanding for the objective to prevent flag hopping and abuse of reflagging, but it is also important to check the operational impact.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) recalled that, under the applicable regulations, Member States are already encouraged to provide to the Commission the information mentioned in recommendation b). Therefore, a list should already exist since the entry into force of the IUU Regulation. Therefore, it would not create additional administrative burden. Ms Vulperhorst expressed support for the draft.

Sophie Nodzinski (EJF) offered to redraft recommendation e), in order to shorten the text and ease the reading comprehension. The main aim is to encourage cooperation between fisheries authorities in situations of reflagging.

The Chair requested more information about the concept of “beneficial ownership”.

Sophie Nodzinski (EJF) explained that it is the last beneficiary of the operation.

Following the agreement reached on the draft recommendations, the working group proceeded to consider the introductory section of the draft text.

Katarina Sipic (AIPCE-CEP) suggested to include a reference to the ProActive Vessel Register of the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation, which is a best practice in the tuna sector. These lists are audited yearly by independent third parties. These serve as information for seafood stakeholders to identify vessels undertaking sustainability efforts.

Sophie Nodzinski (EJF) suggested to include this reference at the bottom of the introductory section together with international and private efforts.

The Chair emphasised the importance of recognising and promoting good initiatives. Most of the tuna industry utilises the ProActive Vessel Register and it is quite important in the market.

Sean O’Donoghue (KFO) emphasised the importance of the agreed recommendations, adding that the working group could consider reducing the length of the introductory section.



Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo (ETF) expressed support for the draft text. Mr Trujillo suggested the inclusion of a reference to the requirement of genuine link between the actual owner of a vessel and the flag of convenience, under the UNCLOS.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) highlighted that, in the maritime sector, sometimes flags of convenience are used for tax purposes. In the fishing industry, it can be connected to the allocation of fishing opportunities in RFMOs. Under UNCLOS, many fishing communities declared EEZs and extended territorial waters. In order to have access to these waters, some operators had to change flags despite working in the same area for many years. Therefore, in some of these cases, operators have been operating under the same flag for many years, so it is not a matter of flag hopping. In relation to the expression “destructive illegal fishing practices”, Mr Voces suggested to limit it to “illegal fishing practices”, since “destructive” is a more subjective concept.

Purificación Fernández (OPPC-3) argued that it should be clear when the word “State” meant “EU Member State” or “country”. Member States flags are not flags of convenience. Mentions of illegal fishing should always be referred to as “IUU fishing”. Ms Fernández requested additional time to review the new text. The aim would not be to propose substantial amendments, but for a detailed reading.

The Chair agreed that there should be a written consultation after the meeting.

Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo (ETF) stressed again the importance of the “genuine link”, since there are vessels that change their flag to avoid control and sanctioning, which goes against good governance.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to circulate the draft advice again to the working group for a new written consultation of two weeks.

Georg Werner (EJF) highlighted that the draft advice has a market angle, but that, at the same time, it has an importance for the EU distant fleet. Therefore, Mr Werner wondered about the possibility of a joint advice with the LDAC, adding that the Commission has expressed satisfaction for the adoption of joint advice by the Advisory Councils.

The Secretary General informed that the General Secretary of LDAC had confirmed intention to attend the meeting, but that he had finally not been able to do so. Nevertheless, the LDAC Secretariat did expressed interest in the development of a joint advice.

The Chair explained that, ahead of the meeting, the Management Team reflected on the matter. Taking into account that the draft was quite advanced in the MAC and the complexity of cooperation



with other Advisory Councils, the Chair suggested for the MAC to finalise the document and for LDAC to potentially include additional comments at a later stage, instead of restarting consultations.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) agreed that it could be quite complex to consider a draft in several Advisory Councils. Nevertheless, a significant part of the recommendations affects the EU long distance fleet, even though there is also a market angle. Therefore, it would be important to ensure an involvement with the LDAC to guarantee that the EU long distance fleet is heard.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) agreed with EJF and Europêche that it would be beneficial to involve the LDAC. A joint adoption by the MAC and the LDAC would make the advice more powerful.

Purificación Fernández (OPPC-3) supported joint work the LDAC. The draft advice should continue to be under Working Group 2 and the put forward to the Executive Committee, which could determine the relevance of cooperation with LDAC.

The Secretary General explained that there are no set rules on the cooperation between Advisory Councils. The Commission encourages cooperation and the adoption of joint advice, but the actual framework is quite open. The Secretary General committed to contacting the LDAC Secretariat to launch cooperation on the advice, but added that it would be useful to hear from the members whether they preferred to reach an almost finalised text to send to LDAC or if they preferred a joint MAC-LDAC meeting to consider the entire text together.

The Chair stated that the draft text was almost finalised. Therefore, it would be better to advance with the text in the MAC. In parallel, the LDAC could be consulted to reach a common position. Taking into account the existing common members, the Chair expressed conviction that comments from LDAC would not require significant changes to the text. Therefore, the written consultation should advance in the MAC and advance to the Executive Committee, while the LDAC should be consulted. If there were substantial comments from LDAC, then the draft could potentially be further discussed in the working group.

Sean O'Donoghue (KFO) argued that it is important to take into account the remit of each Advisory Council. If recommendations cover the EU long distance fleet, then the involvement of the LDAC must be ensured. The Executive Committee should consider whether certain recommendations fall under the remit of the MAC or the LDAC.

The Secretary General proposed to recirculate the draft to the working group for a written consultation of two weeks. The Secretariat would discuss with the LDAC Secretariat about cooperation on the advice. Once there is a revised draft, it would be sent to LDAC for their comments and endorsement. It could be sent to the Executive Committee to bridge together their position and the LDAC's comments.



Trade

- **Update on latest developments by Commission representative**

The Commission representative provided an update on the EU-USA Boeing WTO trade dispute. In March 2021, the EU and the USA suspended, for four months, all duties on both sides to help find an agreement on a permanent solution. Intense negotiations with the USA are ongoing and the Commission hopes to reach a permanent solution before 11 July 2021. As for the EU countermeasures, the representative recalled that these entered into force in November 2020, including for frozen pacific salmon fillets. The product included in the preliminary list was CN Code 03048100, which reads “frozen fillets of pacific salmon”. Following the consultation with the stakeholders, there was a decision to include it in the final list of EU countermeasures. Under the current suspension, this product is not subject to duties for the time being. The representative highlighted that CN Code 03031100 was never part of the EU countermeasures and were never subject to duties under the dispute. The Commission is consulting internally on the shipping clause. The Commission representative committed to reporting back to the MAC, in case a permanent solution is not found.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) drew attention to the time pressure, since, in six weeks, there will be shipping of US-origin salmon to China, which can reach EU ports after 11 July. Under the previous measures, all consignments that had left the USA were free from duties until the date of arrival. On the Combined Nomenclature, Mr Keller argued that it was clear that code 03048100 covers all salmon species regardless of the different specifications, independently of being Pacific or Atlantic salmon. In the list, annexed to the regulation, it is clearly stated that Atlantic salmon falls under the scope of the regulation. Therefore, it would make sense to also include fillets. Pacific salmon as a whole fish is not included, so it does not make sense for Pacific salmon fillets to be under the scope. Mr Keller expressed his hope that the Commission services would reanalyse and clarify the described situation.

The Commission representative, in relation to the shipping clause, explained that it is still being discussed internally in the Commission services. The aim is to reach a permanent solution with the USA to remove the duties on both sides. The purpose of the shipping is to not take by surprise EU importers. The EU applies the described clause, but the USA never applied a similar system. On the product code, the CN code included in the preliminary list, the EU was always entitled to demand additional duties on the covered products. Pacific salmon is covered by this CN code. The representative explained that the DG Trade Director-General would send a reply on this specific issue.

Matthias Keller (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) highlighted that there are different ways to pay duties in the EU. Member States are charging import duties differently. The rules of origin are not clear. Some authorities consider as the origin the company where the product comes from (economic origin), while others refer to rules of origin.



Pacific salmon, which is duty-free to the EU, goes to China for filleting for economic reasons, but the origin of the product is not changed through the processing. There is no other processing than filleting, so it does not change the USA origin. Therefore, it is not understandable that the whole fish is duty-free to the EU, but that, when it is filleted, it requires duty. Mr Keller wanted to know the rationale behind this approach. Whole Atlantic salmon is not duty-free from the USA to the EU, so it is logical that filleted Atlantic salmon is also not duty-free. The problem is that there are different CN codes for whole Atlantic and whole Pacific salmon, but there are no differentiated CN codes for filleted salmon. Mr Keller wondered if the application of the CN Code for filleted salmon without distinction was not an oversight from the Commission services. The financial impact is very significant for EU importers.

The Commission representative explained that the upcoming clarification would be on the shipping clause. As for the inclusion of codes in the countermeasures list, the representative explained that it was the result of a two months information gathering exercise plus one year of fine-tuning. The Commission selected products that they hope will contribute to reaching a permanent solution. The Commission services are aware that there could be negative impacts on the EU stakeholders, but worked to minimise these.

Brexit

- **Presentation of the results of the Secretariat's questionnaire and draft proposal**
- **Consideration of draft proposal**

The Chair explained that a draft advice was prepared by the Secretariat, which used the replies of the prior questionnaire as a basis. The questionnaire was open to contributions from members for two periods. The Chair proposed to start the consideration by the draft recommendation and then continue with the consideration of the introduction and main text.

The working group agreed with the draft text as proposed.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to put forward the agreed draft advice to the Executive Committee for adoption through written procedure.

Initial Focus Group on Trade

- **Update on the work by Poul Melgaard Jensen, Focus Group Chair**

Poul Melgaard Jensen (Danish Seafood Association) recalled that, at the last WG2 meeting, an overview of the proposed FG report was provided. The report will be divided in three parts. The first



part maps out the structure of the EU market, outlining how the total demand is met by EU catch fisheries, EU aquaculture, and imports. The second part is a total listing of current EU trade instruments affecting imports, which is divided into four groups: trade defence, preference agreements, *erga omnes* agreements, and SFPAs. The instruments are described by the products covered and the terms of market access. The third part aims to understand the impact of trade instruments, including through a selection of 10 main species/products. The selected criteria would be quantity, value added, most in conflict with EU production, and risk of IUU fishing. The aim would be to quantify the most important trade instruments for each species/product.

DG MARE expressed willing to support the development of the report with the assistance of EUMOFA. The FG still needs to agree with DG MARE on the precise terms and scope. A reply from DG MARE on the proposed scope and a meeting is pending. Mr Melgaard Jensen highlighted that the EU IUU Coalition prepared a factsheet on live weight conversion factors, which they hope will be discussed by the FG and considered in the report. As a conclusion, Mr Melgaard Jensen highlighted that more time was required, plus a dialogue with the Commission services.

The Chair requested more information on the foreseen timescale.

Poul Melgaard Jensen (Danish Seafood Association) expressed hope that the report could be developed before the summer break.

AOB

None.



Summary of action points

- Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements (SFPAs)
 - o Once the external consultant's evaluation report and the Staff Working Document are published, Working Group 2 to analyse these and consider if further advice is needed on the topic
- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU)
 - o Draft advice on flags of convenience to be recirculated to the working group for a written consultation of two weeks
 - o Secretariat to contact LDAC Secretariat for potential consideration and endorsement of the amended draft by LDAC
 - o In case LDAC submits a small number of comments, the draft will be put forward to the Executive Committee for integration of the comments and adoption. Otherwise, the draft will continue at the working group's level for further consideration
- Brexit
 - o Agreed draft advice to be put forward to the Executive Committee for adoption through written procedure

DRAFT



List of attendees

Representative	Organisation
Agnieszka Korbel	WWF
Angelo Torrente	European Commission
Anna Boulova	FRUCOM
Aurora Carbonero de Blas	Spain
Benoit Caillart	F&S
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation
Daniel Voces de Onáindi	Europêche
Daniel Weber	European Fishmeal
Emiel Brouckaert	EAP0
Erin Priddle	MSC
François Becquart	European Comission
Frangiscos Nikolian	European Commission
Georg Werner	Environmental Justice Foundation
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie
Jens Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association
José Basilio Otero Rodríguez	FNCP
José Carlos Escalera	FECOPESCA
Josip Furčić	Croatia
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF
Katarina Sipic	AIPCE-CEP
Laura Rull	Spain
Malgorzata Kieliszewska	Poland
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA
Marta Moren Abat	European Commission
Massimo Bellavista	COPA COGECA



Representative	Organisation
Matthias Keller	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.
Mike Turenhout	Visfederatie
Mirta Novak	Croatia
Nicolás Fernández Muñoz	OPP72
Nieves Noval	ClientEarth
Nuria Navarro Diaz	European Commission
Pablo Iraeta	Spain
Patrick Murphy	IS&WFPO
Pawel Szatkowski	European Commission
Pedro Luis Casado López	OPP80 Punta del Moral
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council
Pierre Commère (Chair)	ADEPALE
Poul Melgaard Jensen	Danish Seafood Association
Purificación Fernández	OPPC-3
Quentin Marchais	ClientEarth
Rebeca Díez Barca	CONXEMAR
Roberto Carlos Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPECA
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche
Sean O'Donoghue	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation Ltd
Sébastien Metz	Sakana
Sergio López García	OPP LUGO
Signe Aaskivi	EFCA
Sophie Nodzinski	EJF
Stavroula Kremmydiotou	Market Advisory Council
Tuure Eskelinen	EuroCommerce
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana



DRAFT

