

Working Group 1: EU Production

Minutes

Thursday, 27 March 2025 (09:30 – 13:00 CET)

Zoom

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Julien Lamothe

[Presentation](#)

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

Action points

- **State-of-play of the action points of the last meeting - information**

- Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet:
 - Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire to the members to collect feedback, which will serve as a basis for a future draft advice on the Terms of Reference of the next edition of the Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet.
 - Questionnaire circulated: 12 to 26 February 2025
 - Written procedure ongoing
- European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA):
 - Later in the year, Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire to the members to collect feedback, which will serve as a basis for future draft advice on the work programme of EUMOFA for 2026
 - Pending
- Sustainability Criteria for Fishery and Aquaculture Products:
 - Draft advice on “Development of Sustainability Indicators by STECF” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption
 - Advice adopted on 30 January 2025
 - Reply by DG MARE on 18 March 2025
- Producer Organisations:



- Secretariat to circulate a report of the workshop held on 28 January 2025
- Draft advice on producer organisations, based on the contributions from the workshop's breakout sessions, to be considered at the next meeting
 - Workshop report circulated on 27 February 2025
 - Draft advice circulated on 12 March 2025

Producer Organisations

- **Consideration of draft advice on Producer Organisations under the Common Market Organisation in Fishery and Aquaculture Products**

The Secretary General recalled that the draft advice was based on the feedback provided by the breakout groups of the workshop on Producer Organisations co-organised with the South Western Advisory Council (SWWAC) on 28 January 2025. The draft advice was circulated on 12 March 2025. Prior to the meeting, preliminary feedback was sent by OPP72 and EAPO.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) signalled that, due to time constraints, her organisation had not been able to read the document in detail ahead of the meeting. Therefore, more time could be needed.

The Chair expressed understanding for the time constraints. The Chair encouraged members to provide feedback on the entirety of the document.

The Secretary General provided an overview of the introductory section of the draft advice. He informed that, as preliminary feedback, EAPO suggested the addition of additional references to their work.

Jacinta María Ramírez (OPP 72), concerning section 1 on “small-scale operators”, suggested to propose a “margin of tolerance” for fishing vessels above 12 meters that participate in artisanal Producer Organisations. In her view, in the classification as “artisanal”, it was necessary to consider other parameters, such as location, crew members, and fishing gear. A fishing vessel of 13 meters could have equivalent characteristics as a vessel of 12 meters but lose the recognition as “artisanal”. Ms Ramírez drew attention to the limited resources available for small-scale Producer Organisations. The lack of recognition as artisanal made the situation even more challenging. There should be proper recognition to improve the conditions of the operators.

The Chair mentioned that the lost of recognition was related to the definition of “small-scale”. In his view, in their proposal, OPP72 could have provided more details on the consequences. The Chair highlighted that the issue was related to the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund, so it was not directly about the legislative framework of Producer Organisations. He added that the SWWAC had initiated work on the appropriate definition of “small-scale fishing”.



Jacinta María Ramírez (OPP 72) argued that, even though the legislation provided for a definition of “small-scale”, there was a need for some tolerance for the artisanal fishers slightly above 12 meters.

Jean-Marie Robert (Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne) commented that there were benefits for small-scale vessels for their participation in Producer Organisations. If compliant with the rules, Producer Organisations could be established specifically for small-scale fishers, which included advantages in the production and in the marketing. Mr Robert argued that those issues should be settled internationally by the Producer Organisations. In his view, the addition suggested by Ms Ramírez would impact the coherence of the text.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) mentioned that, in Ireland, small-scale vessels were classified as under 55 feet, which had implications in the distribution of the catches. Mr Murphy highlighted that there were cases of small-scale and large-scale operators working together in the same Producer Organisation. He expressed agreement with Mr Robert, arguing that Ms Ramírez’s suggestion would not be appropriate.

Jacinta María Ramírez (OPP 72) responded that the members of her organisation complied with the legislation. Nevertheless, their Producer Organisation included three vessels barely above 12 meters that, in her view, should still be considered “artisanal”.

The Chair emphasised that the overall message of the draft advice was to call for an improved level-playing-field across the Member States. Therefore, it was important to refer to good practices and guiding principles. In his view, it would be contradictory to include requests for flexibility. The Chair suggested to, instead of the text proposed by Ms Ramírez, to include a reference to the ongoing work of the SWWAC on the definition of “artisanal fishing”.

Jacinta María Ramírez (OPP 72) expressed concern regarding the classification of “artisanal Producer Organisations”. Ms Ramírez added that, due to the lack of consensus, she would accept the suggestion from the Chair. She emphasised the importance of references to small-scale fisheries.

Sergio López García (OPP Lugo) congratulated the Chair and the Secretary General on the preparatory work. Mr López recognised that the definition of “small-scale” could be unjust. Nevertheless, in his view, the text under discussion was not the appropriate document for the discussion. The aim of the draft advice was to highlight challenges faced by producers and to call for a better level-playing-field, including in the financing.

Emiel Brouckaert (EAPO) in section 8 “exceptions to the application of competition rules” of title II, suggested to explicit mention “recognised” when referring to Producer Organisations.

Sergio López García (OPP Lugo) suggested the inclusion of a recommendation explicitly calling for a level-playing-field across Member States. Mr López exemplified that there were differences in the treatment of Producer Organisations, including due to management by regional or federal authorities.



The Chair stated some of the concerns raised by Mr López were also reflected in recommendation c), which called for the development of an EU-level guide.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) highlighted that, between the change from the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund to the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund, Member States were no longer required to provide funding to Producer Organisations through Production and Marketing Plans. In his view, it should be an obligation. It should not be dependent on the will of individual Member States.

The Chair suggested to integrate that suggestion into recommendation k) by calling for a revision of the legal framework to foresee a legal obligation for national authorities to provide funding to Producer Organisations through the Production and Marketing Plans.

- **Way forward**

The Chair informed that agreed draft advice would be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval.

The Secretary General informed the document would also be considered by the SWWAC. In case substantial amendments were introduced by the SWWAC, the amendments would be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration via written procedure. If there were no amendments by the SWWAC, the text could be considered adopted by both Advisory Councils.

Common Fisheries Policy

- **Consideration of draft advice on the evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy (questions 1-2, 4, 6-23)**

The Chair highlighted the high number of contributions sent by members following the circulation of a questionnaire by the Secretariat, which served as a basis for the draft advice.

Julien Daudu (EJF) thanked the Secretariat and the other members for the preparatory work. Mr Daudu informed that his organisation lacked the time to analyse the entirety of the document prior to the meeting.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) indicated that her organisation also lacked the opportunity to analyse the entirety of the document. Mr Vulperhorst added that it could be relevant to abbreviate the document.

Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) informed that, prior to the meeting, he submitted preliminary, but that he had been unable to reach the end of the document.

The Chair recalled that the sections on consumer information would also be addressed by Working Group 3.



The Secretary General explained that, when preparing the document, the Secretariat followed the structure and topics of the European Commission's public consultation. The Secretary General recognised that some topics were addressed multiple times in the document, but from different perspectives.

The Chair expressed support for the structure of the document. The Chair recalled the importance of the Common Fisheries Policy, which would require comprehensive exchanges.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), concerning section 1 "economic sustainability" of part II "effectiveness", disagreed with the perspective that the Common Fisheries Policy had not sufficiently focused on economic sustainability.

Pim Visser (Nova) exemplified that, when introducing the landing obligation, the European Union showed a lack of consideration for economic sustainability. Mr Visser argued that ports and infrastructure were not adequately considered in the context of the landing obligation.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) argued that the reference to the lack of sufficient focus on economic sustainability constituted a factual statement. Mr Murphy exemplified that there was a lack of economic advice in the context of ICES. In the case of Brexit, there was also a lack of economic evaluation of the impacts. He expressed opposition to the deletion to the reference in the draft advice.

Sergio López García (OPP Lugo) also expressed opposition to the deletion to the reference. Mr López suggested to also refer to social sustainability, as there had been insufficient focus on both aspects. He recognised that reaching agreement on such a comprehensive document would be challenging.

The Chair expressed availability to dedicate the necessary time to consider the document. The Chair encouraged member to focus the discussions on the key points.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) emphasised that the European Union took steps to address economic sustainability. Ms Vulperhorst exemplified that state aid was provided in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, Brexit, and the fuel crises. She signalled interest from her organisation in recording a dissenting view, in case of lack of agreement.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) called for stronger emphasis on economic sustainability. In his view, there had been a lack of economic impact studies in the context of recent crises, such as Brexit.

The Chair suggested to refer to the economic realities faced in the sector.

Julien Daudu (EJF) suggested to include factual references to the status of the stocks, as it was important to link economic sustainability with environmental sustainability, while also reflecting on the social aspect. Mr Daudu expressed availability to send a proposal of text on the matter.

The Chair expressed concern about the mixing of topics, highlighting that environmental aspects were covered further down in the document.



Pim Visser (Nova) argued that the provision of subsidies in times of crises was not the same as considering economic sustainability when developing market policy. Mr Visser insisted that economic sustainability was not considered when developing the landing obligations provisions.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) emphasised that the draft advice was merely stating that there was insufficient consideration for economic sustainability, not that there was no consideration. Therefore, the draft advice was merely calling for more action.

Julien Daudu (EJF) expressed willingness to complement the subsection.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) acknowledged that the Common Fisheries Policy did not include an adequate system to face economic shocks to the sector. Nevertheless, Ms Vulperhorst expressed opposition with the description that there was insufficient consideration for economic sustainability.

The Chair highlighted that, from the perspective of the fishing sector, the point went beyond the external crises. The Chair concerning paragraph a) “fisheries catching sector” informed that EAPO suggest to delete the reference to small-scale fishers being particularly disadvantaged. The Chair also suggest to add “as a consequence of CFP constraints” in the second paragraph.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) suggested to include a reference as to how underutilisation of fishing quotas created tensions between the EU catching sector and the EU processing sector. In accordance with the AIPCE-CEP’s seafood supply synopsis, the utilisation rate was 66%.

The Chair, concerning paragraph b) “fisheries processing sector”, to add that “relations with third countries can only be developed with respect for EU producers by ensuring a level playing field of sustainability norms”.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) expressed opposition to referring to the Autonomous Tariff Quotas regime as playing an important role in the market supply. Ms Vulperhorst expressed willingness to record a dissenting view, which would be in line with the discussions on the draft advice on “integration of sustainability criteria under the regime of Autonomous Tariff Quotas for certain fishery products”. In her view, the mentioned regime was not helpful for the EU fishing sector.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM) expressed disagreement with the intervention of Ms Vulperhorst. Mr Commère emphasised that the point under discussion was about the processing sector and that the Autonomous Tariff Quotas regime was important for the processing sector.

The Chair, concerning paragraph c) “fisheries marketing sector”, suggested to refer to EU-level figures, instead of Spanish data.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) drew attention to the deterioration of profitability across several parts of the supply. Mr Simonnet suggested to include a reference to the deterioration of the “mareyage” sector”.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), concerning paragraph a) “fisheries catching sector” of section 2 “modernisation and innovation”, expressed disagreement with phrasing in the draft advice. Ms Vulperhorst exemplified that there were funds available to modernise vessels and to improve safety. Concerning paragraph c) “fisheries marketing sector”, she suggested to refer to “sustainable” products.



Janne Posti (Conxemar) highlighted that there was no agreed definition of “sustainability”. Mr Posti expressed concern about the potential confusion that “local products” or “short supply chains” would automatically be perceived as sustainable. He expressed preference for deleting the reference to “local”, as the local element should not be a synonym for sustainability. He mentioned that a reference to “Maximum Sustainable Yield” instead of “sustainable” could be more appropriate.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) expressed preference for the reference to “sustainable”, as Total Allowable Catches were not set for all stocks.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) argued that the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund should be used for the promotion of the rebuilding of stocks. Promotion efforts should not go towards overfishing stocks. Ms Vulperhorst exemplified that some of the efforts undertaken by the EU sector to reach sustainability might have not been applicable to imported products.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM) suggested to refer to the “facilitation” of marketing strategies, instead of “allowing”, as there were EU stakeholders that undertook awareness campaigns without EU funding.

Christine Absil (Good Fish Foundation) expressed agreement with the reference to “sustainable” products suggested by Ms Vulperhorst. Ms Absil also agreed with Mr Posti that local products were not always synonymous with sustainability.

Katarina Sipic (AIPCE-CEP) wondered if the reference to local products was meant to also include also products processed in the EU.

The Secretary General stated that he assumed that it a reference to short supply chains.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) recalled that Producer Organisations used funding from the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund to promote their local EU products in a sustainable way. Ms Álvarez argued that, in the case of Producer Organisations that act as marketing enterprises, financing advantages should not take place, as it would be unfair competition in comparison with other operators.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM) suggested to delete the last paragraph of the subsection that detailed the funding committed under the European Maritime and Fisheries Funding to marketing measures. Concerning paragraph a) “ensuring availability of food supplies at reasonable prices for consumers” of section 3 “functioning of the market”, Mr Commère suggested the use of data with a long-term perspective, since the latest revision of the CFP had concluded in 2013.

The Chair expressed agreement with Mr Commère and encouraged members to share data.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA), concerning paragraph b) “supplying aquatic food to processors and consumers with adequate level of information”, emphasised the importance of the point on shellfish production. Mr Pivetta mentioned that water quality was also an important factor.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana), concerning paragraph c) “improving the stability of the fishery and aquaculture market”, asked about the meaning of the reference to “economic bond to EU businesses”



Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) expressed availability to provide clarification on the meaning.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) suggested to delete the reference that “the CFP had to be supplemented by trade policy instruments”, since the trade policy instruments exist regardless of the CFP.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM) expressed preference for maintaining the reference. Concerning paragraph d) “ensuring fair competition conditions between stakeholders of the fishery and aquaculture sector on the EU market”, Mr Commère argued that the last sentence about reliance of carnivorous aquaculture species on fish meal and fish oil did not reflect the efforts of the sector the change towards plant-based ingredients. He suggested to add “even though the fish meal and fish oil sector has made significant efforts to reduce the described reliance” or, alternatively, to delete the sentence.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) emphasised that the point was about traceability and fair competition. Mr Vulperhorst expressed willingness for the inclusion of the mentioned point in the document.

The Chair suggested to include the point as a footnote.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) asked for a scientific reference to confirm the argument made by Mr Commère.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM), concerning section 4 “fair standard of living”, emphasised that “employment” was not only about employment at sea. Employment on land was also important, including processing and marketing activities. Even when not local, these activities were still relevant to local communities.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) agreed with Mr Commère. Mr Posti suggested an alternative wording “a profitable, economically viable, and environmentally sustainable fisheries and aquaculture sector in Europe is essential, but the EU fish processing sector also plays a critical role in supporting local economies, creating jobs, and enhancing competitiveness. These sectors are deeply interconnected.”

The Chair suggested to replace “but” by “and”.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) suggested to also include a reference to marketing activities.

Katarina Sipic (AIPCE) expressed agreement with Mr Commère.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM), concerning paragraph c) “fisheries marketing sector”, recalled that there were funds specifically for small operators. Mr Commère suggested to delete the reference on particular disadvantages faced by smaller players.

The Chair expressed agreement with Mr Commère.

Alessandro Manghisi (ASC), concerning paragraph d) “aquaculture sector”, expressed disagreement with the statement about increases in standards and administrative demands. Mr Manghisi argued that the increases in social standards aimed to protect small operators.



Julien Daudu (EJF), concerning section 1 “landing obligation” of part III “efficiency, informed that he would need more time to review the comments submitted by EAPO prior to the meeting.

The Secretary General informed that, through the questionnaire, members had submitted a wide array of contributions about the landing obligation. Nevertheless, these contributions mainly focused on fisheries management aspects under the competence of other Advisory Councils. Therefore, as an alternative, the Secretariat used text from previously agreed pieces of advice.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) suggested to delete the reference to a lack of a business case.

The Secretary General, concerning section 3 “marketing standards”, informed that several members (FEDEPESCA, Good Fish, Oceana, WWF) sent feedback calling for a revision of the marketing standards framework to promote sustainability criteria and improved consumer information. In previous opportunities, DG MARE representatives had already communicated that such work would not be integrated in the marketing standards framework. Under the present draft advice, the mentioned points were already raised in the context of a potential revision of the Common Market Organisation Regulation. Therefore, for the section on “marketing standards”, the Secretariat made reference to text from previously agreed pieces of advice on the framework.

Pim Visser (NOVA) argued that the freshness criteria foreseen under the marketing standards framework were no longer fit for purpose.

The Chair, concerning section 1 “use of scientific advice to inform policy decisions” of part IV “governance”, suggested to delete the reference to the USA. In his view, it could be considered out of the scope.

Laure Guillevic (WWF) suggested the deletion to the reference to competition among scientific institution. Mr Guillevic emphasised that Regional Fisheries Management Organisations and other institutions have their own scientific bodies. She added that EUMOFA provided market insights.

The Chair, concerning section 2 “involving stakeholders at all stages of the policymaking process” expressed doubts about calling for a review of the membership of the Advisory Councils by the Member States.

The Secretary General informed that the reference originated in feedback provided by Fischverband. He recalled that, in accordance with the CFP Regulation, the membership of the Advisory Councils was endorsed by the Member States. In practice, the Member States did not take a very active role in the setting of the membership of the Advisory Councils.

Stefan Meyer (Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.) agreed to the deletion of the mentioned reference.

Janne Posti (Conxemar), concerning paragraph e “unfair competition” of section 1 “successfulness of CFP Regulation” of section V “effectiveness and efficiency”, suggested the inclusion of an additional paragraph: “However, it is important to note that the EU does import fisheries and aquaculture products from third countries that adhere to good management and labour standards. In addition, the EU has recently established stringent regulations and guidelines to ensure that the products it imports are sourced from



countries that maintain sustainable practices and fair labour conditions, including the recently adopted CSDDD Directive, the Forced Labour Regulation, and the EU CATCH IT System.”

Laure Guillevic (WWF) argued that the new paragraph would need to be more nuanced. Ms Guillevic recalled that the scope of the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive was expected to be reduced. She added that the ongoing Omnibus procedure would have an impact.

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM), concerning paragraph f) “contribution to food security”, expressed preference to referring to “externally sourced materials”, as it was necessary to account for external sourcing by the EU long-distance fleet.

Vanya Vulperhorst (Oceana) called for the inclusion of a reference as to how strict environmental standards help to rebuild stocks, contributing to food security.

Laure Guillevic (WWF) suggested to remove the word “stringent”.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA), concerning paragraph c) “aquaculture sector” of section 2 “compliance costs and administrative burden” drew attention to the losses in production, such as death of specimens, that were not compensated under the present framework. Mr Pivetta added that there could be losses even without death of specimens, for example due to the closure of shellfish production zones.

Alessandro Manghisi (ASC) argued that the references to “environmental policies” and “high compliance costs” were too generic. Mr Manghisi underscored that these policies also protect EU producers.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) emphasised the human and financial burden caused by the increase in administrative procedures linked to environmental policies for aquaculture vessels. Mr Pivetta expressed availability to redraft the mentioned paragraph.

Julien Daudu (EJF), concerning section 3 “simplification and cost reduction”, suggested to redraft to “simplification efforts should not impact the collection of environmental data, the assessment of compliance, control and enforcement, or the promotion of sustainable management”.

- **Way forward**

The Chair expressed satisfaction for the overall agreement on the substance of the document. The Chair recalled that that the sections on consumer information would be considered by Working Group 3.

The Secretary General suggested to proceed with informal exchanges with the most interested members to redraft some of the pending points. Afterward, the Secretariat could proceed with an ordinary written procedure. In case there were any controversial points, these could be addressed at the next meeting.



Summary of action items

- Producer Organisations
 - Agreed draft advice on “Producer Organisations under the Common Market Organisation in Fishery and Aquaculture Products” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential approval.
- Common Fisheries Policy
 - Following informal exchanges with the most interested members to redraft pending points, draft advice on “Evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy (2014-2024)” to be considered via ordinary written procedure.



Attendance List

Representative	Organisation	Role
Adrien Simonnet	Union du Mareyage Français (UMF)	Member
Alen Lovrinov	Producer Organisation Omega 3	Member
Alessandro Manghisi	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)	Member
Alex Vancoppenolle	Belgium	Observer
Ângela Pécurto	ALIF	Member
Anna Rokicka	Polish Association of Fish Processors (PSPR)	Member
Antonio Álvarez	FEDEPESCA	Member
Arthur Yon	FROM Nord	Member
Camille Maisonneuve	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Caroline Gamblin	PACT'ALIM	Member
Catherine Pons	FEAP	Member
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation	Member
Cristina Pita	Spanish National Research Council	Observer
Dominic Rihan	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation (KFO)	Member
Emiel Brouckaert	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Fabian Schäfer	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.	Member
Fabijan Hrvatin Peronja	Ribarska Zadruga Friška Riba	Member
Gaetane Le Breuil	European Fishmeal	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Gisela Costa	University of Aveiro	Observer
Giuseppe Scordella	COPA-COGECA	Member
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie	Member
Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón	ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Isabel Alonzo Cabezas	Spain	Observer
Jacinta María Ramírez	OPP72 Conil	Member
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
Javier Barón	Spain	Observer
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne	Member
Jens Hons Mathiesen	Danish Seafood Association	Member
Jérémie Souben	FEDOPA	Member
João Pereira	FRUCOM	Member
John Lynch	Irish South and East Fish Producers Organisation (ISEFPO)	Member
José Basilio Otero Rodríguez	Federación Nacional de Cofradías de Pescadores (FNCP)	Member
José Carlos Escalera Aguilar	FECOPESCA	Member
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF	Member
Juana Parada	OR.PA.GU.	Member
Jules Danto	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Julien Daudu	Environmental Justice Foundation	Member
Julien Lamothe	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO) / 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
Malgorzata Kieliszewska	Poland	Observer
Marcus Breuer	European Parliament	Observer
Nicolás Fernández	OPP72	Member
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation	Member
Pedro Luis Casado López	OPP80	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pierre Commère	PACT'ALIM / Eurothon	Member
Pieter Roden	Feedback EU	Member



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

