

Working Group 1: EU Production

Minutes

Tuesday, 17 September 2024 (14:30 – 18:00 CET)

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

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Julien Lamothe

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

Adoption of the agenda and of the last meeting's minutes (04.06.24): adopted

Action points

- **State-of-play of the action points of the last meeting – information**
- Landing Obligation:
 - Secretariat to submit, in written format, the questions raised by the members on the study supporting the evaluation to the Commission services
 - Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire to the members on the evaluation of the landing obligation, to serve as basis for a draft advice to be considered at the next meeting
 - Written questions submitted on 10 June 2024
 - Questionnaire circulated: 18 June – 2 July 2024
 - Draft advice circulated: 31 July 2024
- Awareness and Role of Producer Organisations:
 - EAPO to include aquaculture representatives in the development of the guide document listing all fisheries and aquaculture Producer Organisations and their work
 - Ongoing
- Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products:
 - Secretariat to review the draft advice on “Development of Fishery Sustainability Indicators by STECF” to reflect the exchanges held, which will be followed by recirculation
 - Draft advice recirculated: 3 September 2024
- European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA):
 - Draft advice on “European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA)”: Suggestions of studies to be integrated in the Work Programme (2024)” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption
 - Advice adopted on 5 June 2024



Fishers of the Future

- **Exchange of views on the consultant's draft profiles of fishers for 2050**

The Chair recalled that, prior to the meeting, a first draft of the fishers' profiles prepared by the consortium of the foresight project "Fishers of the Future" had been circulated". On 20 September 2024, the consultants would be holding an online workshop, and the MAC would be able to participate. The Chair explained that the consortium had developed four scenarios that differentiated between small-scale and large-scale fisheries. He outlined that these scenarios were based on two factors: 1) the severity of a "planetary crisis", and 2) demand for fish. He outlined the four scenarios.

The Secretary General explained that the consultants were holding workshops with the Advisory Councils and the social partners on 16, 17 and 20 September 2024. The 20 September date was to accommodate the participation of the MAC. He invited members to express their interest to participate on behalf of the MAC, as there could be five representatives per Advisory Council.

The Chair encouraged the members to express their interest as soon as possible. He informed that he would be unable to attend the workshop.

Nicolás Fernández Muñoz (OPP72) expressed concerns that the project's outcomes were not being taken seriously enough, emphasising that the actions of the Commission through the project could have significant repercussions for the sector. Mr Fernández drew attention to the fact that non-English speakers were unable to participate in the relevant events, such as the workshop on 20 September 2024, preventing the participation of a wide range of fishers. He added that the issue of working languages was a continuous issue with the European Commission.

Mr Fernández expressed concern about the future of the sector, expressing doubts about its viability by 2030, even though the Commission was focused on scenarios for 2050. He expressed disagreement with the approach of the consultants, which were disregarding the principles of fishers. The delimitation of the EU fleet into only two categories (small-scale and large-scale) was too simplistic, as it missed intermediate segments of the fleet.

Mr Fernández expressed disappointment with the letter of reply of Director-General Vitcheva to the joint letter on the project, as it showed that DG MARE never admits mistakes. In his view, there was no proper consultation of the sector, and project was overly focused on certain geographical areas. Fishers from Spain, Ireland, and France were not consulted, even though these were among the EU's main fishing countries.

The Chair acknowledged the concerns expressed by Mr Fernández, adding that the concerns were shared among the membership of the MAC. The Chair expressed disappointment that the Advisory Councils were only informed about the project after the profile interviews had been completed. In the case of France, a consultant contacted some fisheries organisations, but used poorly translated documents, which posed issues for their comprehension. In his view, the scenarios for 2050 were outside the reality of the daily lives of fishers. Additionally, the forecast scenarios did not account for



the corresponding necessary legislative changes. He emphasised the importance of drawing the Commission's attention to the gaps and challenges identified.

The Secretary General expressed availability to share the concerns expressed by Mr Fernández to the consultants and to the Commission. The Secretary General recalled that the issue of language had previously been raised to DGMARE. According to the Commission services, while the interviews were conducted in a variety of languages, there was not sufficient capacity to hold the workshops in any language other than English.

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) agreed with the previously mentioned issues of participation in the project. Mr López explained that he first heard about the foresight project at the 31 January 2024 meeting of Working Group 1 and there were no prior consultations. Therefore, the project was essentially already designed and did not account for the practical realities. In his view, before forecasting for 2050, there should have been a thorough analysis of the existing situation faced by fishers. He argued that the scenarios and profiles were overly simplistic. He added that it was difficult to be involved in the project, if the decisions seemed to have been made already.

- **Way forward**

The Chair emphasised the importance of members providing feedback on the various scenarios and contextualising them in the context of the sector's existing challenges. The Chair asked members to inform the Secretary General about their availability to participate in the workshop.

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) informed that he would send, via email, some feedback to the Secretary General to be taken into account at the workshop.

Landing Obligation

- **Consideration of draft advice on the study supporting the evaluation of the Landing Obligation**

The Chair delivered an introduction on the draft advice on the study supporting the evaluation of the Landing Obligation. The Chair recalled that, prior to the draft advice, the Secretariat circulated a questionnaire to the members. Replies from EAPO, Ribarska Zadruga Friška Riba, OPP Burela, and FEDOPA were received.

The Secretary General informed that, following the circulation of the draft advice, preliminary feedback from EAPO and ClientEarth was received. He outlined the sections and content of the draft.

Pim Visser (NOVA), concerning subsection 4.2 "difficulties with handling, storage, processing of unwanted catches at port", called for the inclusion of a point on the lack of processing capacity, both in ports and on land. In practice, the catches had to be trucked around the countryside. The landing and processing of unwanted catches presented a poor business case. There are also issues of excessive bureaucracy on storage and use. Since the unwanted catches are classified as "category 3" products, these cannot be stored together with food products intended for human consumption.



Sergio López García (OPP Burela) drew attention to the complexity of the rules for certain species. Mr López exemplified that, in the cases of species under quota, there would be notifications from the Spanish authorities to the sector that the fishery was closed, which meant that the catches could no longer be landed, violating the landing obligation. In his view, there were issues with the classification of the catches, and it was not possible to commercialise these. He drew attention to the importance of the solutions provided in subsection 5.3 “increase in the project infrastructure to facilitate landings for the non-human consumption market”, meaning the possibility of donations.

The Secretary General informed that, under subsection 4.4 “inexistence of an economic outlet for unwanted catches brought to land”, EAPO suggested, as preliminary feedback, the removal of a sentence referring to the limited outlets available for unwanted catches. According to EAPO, the aim of the landing obligation was to eliminate discards, not to encourage adding value to them.

Rosalie Tukker (Europêche) suggested the addition of a new sub-chapter on legal conflicts between the Landing Obligation and the Treaty of Lisbon.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) expressed disagreement with the text proposed by Europêche, adding that it was outside the scope of the draft advice.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) stated that, to facilitate consensus, Europêche would accept to not include the proposed sub-chapter. Mr Voces explained that the text originated from a resolution of the social partners of sea fisheries on the landing obligation adopted in 2018. The resolution covered problems caused by the landing obligation from a social dimension, including increase labour onboard, less rest on board, and difficulties in the management of fishing quotas.

The Secretary General proceeded to outline the draft recommendations.

Pim Visser (NOVA), concerning recommendation c), suggested to include a reference to the lack of processing infrastructure, in line with subsection 4.2. Concerning recommendation d) on the very limited market outlet options, Mr Visser highlighted that, in the Netherlands, in the context of fish auctions, it would be extremely difficult to build a positive business case to find market outlets for unwanted catches. Until the moment, the only viable outlet was fishmeal. Therefore, he expressed caution about the recommendation.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) reiterated that the aim of the landing obligation was to reduce unwanted catches, not to create new market outlets. The challenges in the generation of market outlets were already referenced in recommendation b). Therefore, Mr Marchais expressed support for the deletion of recommendation d).

Sergio López García (OPP Burela), concerning recommendation e), suggested replacing the term “food security” with “food sovereignty.”

The Secretary General informed that, prior to the meeting, as preliminary feedback, ClientEarth suggested the addition of recommendation g), which called for further support to Member States in the implementation of the landing obligation.



Pim Visser (NOVA) expressed opposition to recommendation g), arguing that the landing obligation would be evaluated in the context of the ongoing evaluation of the Landing Obligation. In his view, the Member States should not be encouraged to implementing a policy that is unworkable, as the landing obligation, in the current form, was unfeasible and only worked thanks to derogations.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) stated that, while the draft advice was focused on the challenges, as part of the evaluation, there should also be a focus on implementing solutions.

Pim Visser (NOVA) highlighted his 12 years of experience with pilot projects and other initiatives on the landing obligation. The obligation remained impossible to implement. Mr Visser encouraged ClientEarth and other NGOs to participate in the ongoing discussions in the North Western Waters Advisory Council and in the North Sea Advisory Council on the validity of the landing obligation.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth), to facilitate consensus, agreed to not proceed with the inclusion of the new recommendation.

The Working Group expressed agreement with the amended draft advice on the study supporting the evaluation of the Landing Obligation.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to put forward the draft advice to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval.

Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products

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

The Chair recalled that, prior to the meeting, an updated version of the draft advice on the development of fishery sustainability indicators by STECF had been circulated, and that several new comments were received. The Chair commented that there seemed to be some confusion about the scope of the draft text, as members mixed issues from the technical report of STECF and issues on overall sustainability policy, which was leading to diverging views among the membership. Since the technical report of STECF was focused on sustainability indicators for fresh and frozen fishery products, the Chair suggested to delete the references to “consumer information” as well as section 5 “lack of coverage of aquaculture and processed products”.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM) agreed that the scope of the draft advice was unclear and expressed support for the deletions suggested by the Chair.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) emphasised the importance of keeping section 5, since this section covered potential next steps. The indicators under developments could eventually also be applicable to aquaculture products. Ms Vulperhorst recalled that, in the case of processed products, following the recent revision of the Fisheries Control Regulation, traceability of the information across all stages of the supply chain would be required from 2029 onward. She drew attention to a recent report by



Oceana that showed that a large percentage of processed products already provide information on origin, fishing gear, and catch area.

Ms Vulperhorst highlighted that the website with the sustainability tools developed by DG MARE would be available to everyone, including both operators and consumers. She argued that, if consensus was not possible on section 5, it would be preferable to record the disagreements in the text, reflecting the differing views of the membership.

The Chair recalled that the STECF report under discussion did not cover aquaculture and processed products.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) expressed support for Ms Vulperhorst's intervention. Mr Posti highlighted that the system under development by STECF and the Commission only covered a small portion of the aquatic food products in the EU market, which could create an uneven level-playing-field.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) expressed agreement with Mr Posti and Ms Vulperhorst. Ms Álvarez highlighted that, many initiatives start with one intention and then are expanded. She argued that certain products are expected to meet an increasing number of requirements, while other products in the market do not. A similar situation was faced under the consumer information rules.

Quentin Marchais (ClientEarth) expressed support for the interventions of Ms Vulperhorst, Ms Álvarez, and Mr Posti. Mr Marchais emphasised the importance of a level-playing-field for all products in the EU market.

The Chair recognised the importance of uniform implementation of any potential legislation across fishery and aquaculture products in the market but expressed concern that such a broad scope in the draft advice was leading to too many uncertainties.

Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón (ANFACO-CECOPEPESCA) expressed agreement with the views of the Chair and of Mr Commère. In his view, the draft advice under consideration was not the appropriate document to reflect internal discussions beyond the scope. Addressing too many issues under the draft advice could undermine it.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) highlighted that Germany had introduced voluntary labelling for fishery products. In practice, these initiatives, such as including information on fishing gear and catch area, received little interest from consumers. In his view, the MAC should wait for clearer developments concerning the revision of the Food Information to Consumers Regulation and the evaluation of the Common Market Organisation. Mr Meyer added that, in Germany, there were discussions ongoing about bottom-contacting gears, but that these issues were not relevant to include on a label.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) asked for information from DG MARE about whether a parallel process was in place or planned to develop sustainability indicators for aquaculture products. Ms Vulperhorst emphasised that the aim of DG MARE was to use information already available under the Common Market Organisation Regulation and to make it understandable for consumers. This information was



important for certain consumers. According to the most recent Eurobarometer report on the matter, more than 50% of consumers want information about the origin of the products.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) informed that there was a parallel process for aquaculture products, but that more progress had been achieved on the development of sustainability indicators for fishery products. The STECF report under consideration was focused on wild caught fishery products. Mr Heinen underlined that it was unknown whether the initiative would be connected with policy initiatives. The aim of DG MARE was to proactively increase transparency. In 2025, the information system will be in place, and it will provide grading based on the parameters of the indicators. DG MARE and STECF will be finalising the indicators and processing to test them with stakeholders.

The Chair highlighted that the request to STECF was about the development of sustainability indicators based on the information available under the Common Market Organisation Regulation.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) explained that the initiative was initially linked to the planned revision of the marketing standards for fishery products. The scope was never to cover only the first sale of fishery products. Mr Heinen recalled that, in previous advice, the MAC argued that the marketing standards framework was not the appropriate tool to communicate on the sustainability of fishery and aquaculture products. In agreement, DG MARE was no longer pursuing that approach.

Mr Heinen emphasised that the aim of the current initiative was to increase transparency about the sustainability of fishery and aquaculture products, since some consumers were interested in that information. The current initiative would be voluntary. The Commission representative reiterated that the future policy initiatives on the issue were not defined.

The Chair suggested to delete section 5 of the draft advice. In his view, it would be possible to include references to the importance of a level-playing-field without entering into too much detail.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) argued against an approach that would lead to the status quo. Ms Vulperhorst expressed preference for maintaining section 5, while clearly recording the existing disagreements and reflecting the views of all members.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) expressed support for Ms Vulperhorst's intervention. Mr Posti expressed concern about the development of a system of indicators that would exclude a significant portion of the fishery and aquaculture products in the EU market.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) expressed agreement with Ms Vulperhorst and Mr Posti. Ms Álvarez highlighted that, even in the case of the mandatory information, consumers were not always able to understand the information. Nevertheless, the same rules and approaches should be applicable to all products and operators in the market.

Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) expressed concern about the previous interventions, since the sustainability indicators were being specifically developed for fresh and frozen products of wild capture fisheries. In the case of processed products, there were other relevant sustainability elements that went beyond the three indicators developed by STECF. While the development of sustainability



criteria for fishery products was relevant, the legislative approach remained unclear and was pre-empting future exchanges on the Common Market Organisation Regulation. In his view, the Commission should instead focus on the use of information.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgroßhandels e.V.) emphasised that, in practice, the retail sector dictates the approach for processed and pre-packed products. Mr Meyer drew attention to a voluntary initiative on sustainability in Germany through the provision of QR codes on the packaging. This initiative showed that consumers were not interested in the information. In Germany, a national information platform, Fischbestände Online, has been in operation for 12 years, allowing operators and consumers to access up-to-date product information. The platform was relevant for sourcing and for due diligence, but it was not relevant to inform final consumers. He added that static system as developed by STECF would not bring added value.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) responded that the mentioned German platform was relevant for informed consumers. The EU tool would go in a similar direction than the German platform. Mr Heinen clarified that the tool under development by STECF would not be static. It would use the most recent data for the three indicators.

The Chair highlighted that the STECF report was focused on three indicators for fishery products. Concerning section 5, the Chair asked the Working Group whether all the paragraphs should be maintained, including the explicit references to the positions of individual members.

Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón (ANFACO-CECOPECA) expressed concern about the continuous inclusion, on each piece of advice adopted by the MAC, of a page dedicated to the legal framework for processed products. Mr Azqueta argued that the document should include only a reference to the discrepancy in views of the membership, not detailed positions.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) recalled that the several sections of the draft advice were focused on the three indicators developed by STECF. In his view, for the identified disagreements, the names of the organisations should be mentioned in the text.

Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) expressed agreement with Mr Azqueta. Further work was needed on the future of the indicators. Mr Commère informed that, under section 5, his organisation would be introducing a third position. In relation to section 3 “indicator on the bycatch risk of sensitive species” and section 4 “indicator on the impact on the seabed”, he was favourable to the amendments introduced by Oceana but suggested to remove the references to the difficulty of communicating to final consumers.

Amélie Laurent (Oceana) stated that, according to the STECF report, the aim is not to burden the consumers. Ms Laurent emphasised that the proposed scoring system was consumer-friendly and meant to be easily understood.

Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) emphasised that the instability and complexity of the system made it difficult to provide the public with understandable information.



The Secretary General proceeded to outline the draft recommendations.

Daniel Voces (Europêche), concerning recommendation a), wondered about the reference to “the concept of sustainability”, since the Common Fisheries Policy did not provide a definition.

The Secretary General explained that the reference was made in several previous pieces of advice. The term “concept” was used due to the lack of a formal definition in the regulation.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) enquired about the paragraph proposed by Conxemar, Europêche, FEDEPESCA, Oceana, WWF, EJV, ClientEarth, Good Fish, EAPO and ETF on the need for a level-playing-field between products under Chapter 03 and Chapter 16 of the Combined Nomenclature.

The Secretary General clarified that, since it was not a consensual or explicitly majority position, the text was not included section 8 “recommendations”, but under section 5. Therefore, draft recommendation j) was accordingly deleted. Recommendations d) and g) were amended to reflect the agreement reached in sections 3 and 4.

Daniel Voces (Europêche) informed that he would not be able to participate in the meeting of the Executive Committee scheduled for the following day. Mr Voces emphasised that many outstanding issues remained on the practical implementation of the indicators. In his view, if DG MARE decided to move forward with the indicators, it should be applicable to the entire value chain, to ensure a level-playing-field.

The Working Group expressed agreement with the amended draft advice on the development of fishery sustainability indicators by STECF.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to put forward the draft advice to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval. As the Executive Committee would be meeting on 18 September 2024, the Chair asked PACT’ALIM to submit their additional position on section 5 beforehand.

Producer Organisations

- **Consideration of draft Terms of Reference for workshop on operational good practices, projects, and management measures**

The Chair reminded members that the draft Terms of Reference for a workshop on operational good practices, projects, and management measures had been circulated prior to the meeting. The Chair provided an overview of the background information and content for the planned workshop. The workshop was originally planned for November 2024, but he suggested to reschedule to early 2025, to allow further preparation.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) expressed significant interest from his organisation in the workshop. Mr Ojeda emphasised the importance of addressing the specificities of aquaculture Producer Organisations and suggested to invite the Aquaculture Advisory Council to co-organise the workshop. He called for the



inclusion of a reference to Transnational Associations of Producer Organisations, plus to make sure to include small-scale Producer Organisations in the workshop.

Pim Visser (NOVA) expressed support for the workshop. Mr Visser emphasised the importance of ensuring participation of the Member States. In his view, knowledge among the Member States about Producer Organisations was very limited.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) emphasised the importance of organising the workshop and agreed with Mr Ojeda that aquaculture Producer Organisations should be included. Mr Robert emphasised the importance of a thematic approach between the two panels proposed in the draft Terms of Reference. He agreed with the Chair that the date of the workshop should be scheduled for later.

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) underscored the importance of ample representation and suggest to co-organise the workshop with other Advisory Councils, such as the South Western Waters Advisory Council, to share the workshop's visibility.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) agreed with Mr Visser that the limited understanding of Producer Organisations among Member States was limited the development of these organisations. Therefore, it was essential to raise awareness among national authorities.

Nicolas Fernández Muñoz (OPP72) highlighted that significant progress had been made on the sharing of good practices among Producer Organisations. Nevertheless, due to the lack of uniformity in the management of Producer Organisations, it was important to include other Advisory Councils in the organisation of the workshop, even if it means scheduling the event for later. Mr Fernández underscored that it was essential to look at strategies for the future. He informed that, in Spain, a seminar on Producer Organisations was being prepared.

The Secretary General thanked the members for their strong interest in the workshop and stated that, from a budgetary standpoint, it would be more practical to schedule the workshop alongside other the January 2025 meetings. The Secretary General informed that assistance from DG MARE on the organisation of the workshop had been requested. The Member States would be invited to participate too, including to deliver a presentation on the implementation of the Production and Marketing Plans. The co-organisation with other Advisory Councils would require additional time for coordination, but the Secretariat would proceed with that approach.

- **Way forward**

The Chair asked the Secretariat to contact the other Advisory Councils about their interest in co-organising the workshop. As for the timing, if January 2025 demonstrated to be too ambitious for a join workshop, then March 2025 could be an option. The Chair invited members to provide any further comments in writing to the Secretariat.



AOB

None.



Summary of action items

- Fishers of the Future
 - Members to express their interest, via email communication to the Secretariat, in representing the Advisory Council at the workshop of 20 September 2024.
 - Members to provide their views, via email communication to the Secretariat, on the fishers' profiles, so that the selected representatives can express them at the workshop.
- Landing Obligation
 - Draft advice on “study supporting the evaluation of the Landing Obligation” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
- Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products
 - Prior to the 18 September 2024 meeting of the Executive Committee, PACT'ALIM to submit their additional position on section 5 of the draft advice to the Secretariat.
 - Draft advice on “development of fishery sustainability indicators by STECF” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
- Producer Organisations
 - Secretary General to contact the other Advisory Councils about the potential interest in co-organising the workshop on Producer Organisations.



Attendance List

Representative	Organisation	Role
Adrien Simonnet	Union du Mareyage Français (UMF)	Member
Alessandro Manghisi	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)	Member
Alonso Abreu Lozano	OPP80 Punta del Moral	Member
Amélie Laurent	Oceana	Member
Àngels Segura Unió	AECOC	Member
Anna Rokicka	Polish Association of Fish Processors (PSPR)	Member
Aodh O'Donnell	IFPO	Member
Clémence Robert	France	Observer
Daniel Voces de Onáindi	Europêche	Member
Gaetane Le Breuil	European Fishmeal	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón	FEICOPESCA / ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Isabel Alonso Cabezas	Spain	Observer
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member
Javier Ojeda	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	Member
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne	Member
Jens Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association	Member
João Pereira	FRUCOM	Member
José Carlos Escalera Aguilar	FECOPESCA	Member
Juana Parada	OR.PA.GU.	Member
Julien Lamothe	ANOP	Chair
Katarina Sipic	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE) / European Federation of National Organizations of Importers and Exporters of Fish (CEP)	Member
Laure Guillevic	WWF	Member
Linda Zanki Duvnjak	Ribarska Zadruga Friška Riba	Member
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
Marian Brestovansky	European Salmon Smokers Association (ESSA)	Member
Mariano García García	Cofradía “Virgen del Carmen” de Isla Cristina	Member
Massimo Bellavista	COPA COGECA	Member
Maximilian Schwarz	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Nicolás Fernández	Organización Productores Pesqueros Artesanales Lonja de Conil (OPP72)	Member
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation	Member
Pedro Luis Casado López	Asociación de Armadores Punta del Moral (OPP80)	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pierre Commère	PACT’ALIM	Member
Pim Visser	NOVA	Member
Quentin Marchais	ClientEarth	Member
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche	Member
Sergio López García	OPP7 Burela	Member
Stefan Meyer	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.	Member
Thomas Kruse	Danish Fishers Producer Organisation / Danish Pelagic Producer Organisation	Member
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana	Member
Yannis Pelekanakis	Hellenic Aquaculture Producers Organisation (HAPO)	Member
Yobana Bermúdez Rodríguez	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE)	Member

