

## Working Group 3: EU control and sanitary issues, consumer rules

### Draft Minutes

Thursday, 5 June 2025 (14:30 – 18:00 CET)

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

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Benoît Thomassen

#### [Presentation](#)

Adoption of the agenda and of the last meeting's minutes (28.03.25): Adopted

#### Action points

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

#### - Animal Transport

- Secretary General to contact the AAC Secretariat to check about previous work on the transport of aquatic animals.
- Secretariat to prepare a proposal of draft advice, with a market-perspective, to be considered by the Working Group.
  - According to AAC Secretariat, no new work on animal transport since the 4 March 2022 recommendation on “fish welfare in live fish transport”.
  - Proposal of draft advice circulated on 12 May 2025.

#### - Common Fisheries Policy

- Following the integration of the suggestions of the members, draft advice to be considered via written procedure.
  - Procedure ongoing.

#### European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUMOFA)

- **Presentation of study on the challenges of aquaculture products in food outlets by Tanguy Chever (EUMOFA)**

#### [Presentation](#)

Tanguy Chever (EUMOFA) presented a study on the challenges of aquaculture products in food outlets. The study was based on desk research and interviews across various Member States. Mr Chever explained that, in 2022, farmed products accounted for 29% of EU apparent consumption. When considering only EU farmed



products, the ratio was 10%. Several farmed products were among the top three species consumed in several Member States, namely gilthead seabream, mussel, carp, and catfish. In recent years, the household consumption of fresh fishery and aquaculture products decreased. He also outlined the production trends, in volume, for the main EU farmed species.

Mr Chever stressed that the key challenges identified were consumption trends, difficulties to increase the volume of production, increase of costs, strong competition on the market and importance of price, evolution of the number of fishmongers and of fish counters in large-scale retail, and the low level of organisation in the sector – with high importance of small-scale companies in several Member States and variable cooperative structures. He outlined the various challenges faced by farmed products across several Member States.

Mr Chever explained that the main criteria for consumers when buying fish were price, appearance, and origin. 56% of consumers did not show a clear preference between farmed and wild-caught products. He drew attention to differences between coastal and non-coastal consumers, providing examples in Italy and in France. In coastal areas, consumers tend to favour specialised fishmongers, wild-caught products, and nationally sourced products.

Mr Chever underscored the importance of certification schemes and brands for several farmed species, including the organic scheme, Protected Designations of Origin, Protected Geographical Indication, Traditional Specialities Guaranteed, Aquaculture Stewardship Council, Label Rouge, Global GAP, Český kapr, Sistema di qualità nazionale acquacoltura sostenibile, among others. These provide possible intermediate impacts, such as quality management and differentiation on the market, as well as possible final impacts, such as market access, and price premium. However, these impacts are not systematic. In the case of the organic scheme, challenges remained in the narrative to present to consumers, since it requires an articulation between farmed and wild-caught products, as these products share the same retail space. The added value of the organic scheme for shellfish products was particularly challenging. Regarding the attention of consumers, he emphasised that the protected name and the brand are key, but that the consumer might not see the logos or not understanding the certifications. Therefore, certification must be part of a whole strategy.

Mr Chever drew attention to the low level of organisation in the sector. Small-scale companies have a large importance. Cooperatives and Producer Organisations have a more variable importance in the aquaculture sector. The EU sector includes 33 Producer Organisations, one Association of Producer Organisations, and one Inter-Branch Organisation. The low organisation presented limitations in terms of bargaining power and access to the market, and collective investments and innovation.

As a conclusion, Mr Chever highlighted that farmed products are on the same shelf as wild-caught ones, so coherence is needed. Consumers must be provided with products that complies with their expectations (e.g.,



price, appearance, origin), and relevant information that they are able to process, since not all consumers are seafood experts. He argued that investments are needed to be in line with market requirements, for example on communication, quality management, and processing. Beyond consumer preferences, farmed products, in comparison with wild-caught products, presented specific assets for retailers.

- **Exchange of views**

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) drew attention to the disappearance of traditional fishmongers and of fish counters in large retailers, particularly in rural areas, which significantly impacted consumption. Ms Álvarez exemplified that, in Spain, since 2013, 30% of fishmongers had disappeared. There was also a decrease in mobile outlets, which were able to serve more remote communities. She highlighted that the average age of fishmongers, highly specialised professionals, was advancing. Many were expected to retire within the following ten years. Therefore, the sector was losing expertise. She added that the importance of maintaining a presence in rural areas was often overlooked in broader discussions.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) stated that he had a pessimistic outlook on the development of aquaculture mollusc production. Mr Pivetta expressed doubts about the comparisons across the use of certification labels and branding systems, since these not always worked effectively. Regarding the structure and organisation of the sector, he drew attention to the existence of a French inter-branch organisation that was not recognised at the EU-level, which impacted the communication abilities. In Italy, there were many Producer Organisations, but lacked coordination.

Mr Pivetta expressed doubts about the practical implementation of the organic label to molluscs, since these were more impacted by the water quality than by professional practices. In his view, the labels did not always provide an added label. He stressed the increasing reduction in production volumes. He called for more recognition of the efforts undertaken by producers, which were impacted by economic losses. Therefore, it was essential to identify inefficiencies in support, better understanding of the sector's economic weight, and an evaluation of how the resources are attributed.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) expressed agreement with Mr Pivetta. Mr Ojeda welcomed the quality of the report and called further work, for example on consumption in the HORECA context. On the challenges faced by the sector, He drew attention to the strong competition in the market, including from imports, and difficulties in the value chain. He argued that individual branding, certification schemes, and collective brands could be effective, but, at the same time, retailers could demand the removal of the labels, undermining their value.

Mr Ojeda argued that aquaculture was a sustainable sector, but that it was small and lacking recognition. He expressed concern that EU environmental legislation was contributing to the decline of the EU aquaculture sector, which would lead to more imports.

Tanguy Chever (EUMOFA) responded that there was a significant number of products with quality schemes on the market. In his view, when well implemented, quality schemes were effective tools. These contribute



to quality management and consumer information, while overlapping with branding. As for consumption in the context of the HORECA sector, Mr Chever explained that it would be complex to investigate. Several studies were available on the matter, but not in a homogenous or complete manner.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) called for caution when discussing the price of aquaculture products. While the products were perceived as expensive, there were species with affordable prices, such as trout and mussels. Ms Álvarez argued that consumers seemed to not be able to differentiate and continue continued to consume more expensive products. She drew attention to the importance of perception of the value of the products among consumers.

Tanguy Chever (EUMOFA) expressed agreement with Ms Álvarez.

### Valorisation of by-products

- **Presentation on the valorisation of side and waste streams of fishery and aquaculture products by Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish)**

#### Presentation

The Chair highlighted that Eurofish had undertaken work on market opportunities of fishery and aquaculture products from side and waste streams in the context of the circular economy. He recalled that, in the recent past, the MAC adopted advice on the valorisation of fisheries and aquaculture byproducts.

Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish) explained that, due to a growing population, there was a growing demand for fishery and aquaculture products, which led to a higher generation of side and waste streams. Despite the demand, a significant portion - estimated at over 30-35% - of global fisheries and aquaculture production was lost or wasted each year. Mr Espersen Schrøder argued that there were opportunities for implementation of increased valorisation and recovery of lost material at numerous stages of the supply chain. He provided examples of waste products from the industry, including side streams, shell waste, packaging and tubs, sludge, and nets.

Mr Espersen Schrøder further explained that the world's resource consumption was less than 10% circular. In a linear approach, raw material extraction takes place, followed by processing, side stream, and the consumer. The conventional side stream applications include fish meal and oil, while waste goes to landfilling, burning, incineration, and anaerobic digestion. In a zero-waste approach, there is sustainability and circularity, including through the introduction of novel products, eliminating the need for waste applications. He added that there was a big gap to cover, which was a sustainable opportunity for innovative products.

Mr Espersen Schrøder highlighted that, in the context of seafood side streams, there was a "fillet-based economy", where the non-fillet parts went towards low value animal feed, landfill and compost. He outlined that seafood side-stream waste or by-products waste consists of cut-offs from processing, heads, fins, guts, skin and liver. Therefore, other ways to support new sources of income rather just increase catch to drive



more value were needed. He exemplified that, over the last 30 years, the utilisation rate of the Icelandic cod's biomass had increased from 40% to 90% resulting in high-value food and non-food products.

Mr Espersen Schrøder presented the “product value pyramid” to illustrate the available volume of resources for value-added solutions and to highlight the growing demands in terms of time, expertise, and development needed at each level. He proceeded with various case studies and examples of products, namely on Atlantic cod, fish skin, collagen, molluscs shells, calcium carbonate, crustaceans' shells, chitin, and ready-made food products.

Mr Espersen Schrøder highlighted that there were several challenges and risks related to consumer acceptance, financial costs and investments, supply chain stability, and regulations and compliance. He emphasised that advances in processing technologies and product development can facilitate the access to the market of high-value products from byproducts. Collaboration among seafood processors, researchers, and policy makers can enhance innovation and market reach for byproduct-based products. Increasing awareness about the benefits of seafood byproduct products can drive acceptance and demand, opening up new market segments.

- **Exchange of views**

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) expressed disappointment that less than 10% of the world's resource consumption was circular, adding that EU figures would be useful. Mr Ojeda argued that waste streams should not only be addressed from an economic perspective. In his view, it was important to consider life cycle assessments, particularly the carbon footprint. Based on such an approach, fishmeal could be a better solution than cosmetics or collagen beverages. Nevertheless, he recognised that knowing the market relevance of the products was also important.

Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish) agreed that it was important to account for life cycle assessments and to consider trade-offs between the various end products. Since the products came from the same source, in his view, it would be relevant to look into the final applications and their CO2 impact.

Pim Visser (NOVA) highlighted that, in the context of the meat industry, there was a high percentage of use of the side and waste streams. Mr Visser wanted to know about potential comparisons and whether it would be possible to reach a similar potential in the fisheries and aquaculture sector.

Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish) replied that the meat industry reached utilisation rates of 90% and, in some countries, even 100%. Mr Espersen Schrøder explained that meat products were less perishable and maintained their properties for longer. In the case of fish, there was a deterioration of the products as soon as removed from the water. The harvesting and handling, particularly the storage, could contribute to achieving critical mass. He highlighted that, in the EU, there were more byproducts originating from cattle than from fish due to the increased incentives and resources. He called for more economic side streams and also for regulation on circularity and waste management.





Christine Absil (Good Fish Foundation) asked for more information about the impact of stress hormones, including links with welfare, on the quality of the products. Ms Absil mentioned that the Catch Welfare Platform was looking into ethical issues.

Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish) acknowledged the importance of addressing animal welfare. Mr Espersen Schrøder provided the example of a Greenlandic company active in cod fisheries, which had received support from the national government. Previously, the cod was caught with trawlers and died by suffocation, which translated into lower quality meat. The company introduced the use of nets to catch and maintain the cod into pens for two to three weeks. Then a well-boat pumps the live fish into oxygenated tanks, which serve as holding pens, until stunning. The immediate slaughter translates into the elimination of blood clots, maintaining pristine, white, lean fillets. Therefore, more humane practices also meant products with higher value in the market.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) wanted to know if, in the example provided, the fishing vessels had been purposely built for the described practices.

Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish) explained that there had been no changes to the Greenlandic fishing vessels, but instead a change in the gears and methods. Under the new approach, fishers leave their nets at sea and then transfer the fish into pens. The approach is more worker-friendly, as it requires less handling of large weights. It requires investments in well-boats and holding pens. Mr Espersen Schrøder recognised that, to be applicable to larger vessels, it would be necessary to analyse further on how to maintain the fish alive or how to ensure improved freezing processes onboard.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) argued that the existing EU legislative framework imposed restrictions on fishing gears and quotas.

Søren Espersen Schrøder (Eurofish) responded that he was not a legal expert, but that the case in Greenland was providing positive results. Mr Espersen Schrøder encouraged the members to provide policy advice on the topic, which would be particularly relevant for small-scale coastal fishers.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) expressed concern that, under EU legislation, the license to maintain fish in pens to achieve lean fillets would take eight to twelve years.

### Vision for EU Fisheries for 2040

- **Consideration of draft advice on a vision for EU fisheries, aquaculture and their markets**

The Secretary General highlighted that Commissioner Kadis, under his mission letter, was committed to the preparation of a “vision for the fisheries sector with a 2040 perspective”. The Secretary General recalled that, at the April 2025 Inter-AC meeting, a roundtable exchange with the Commissioner on the planned vision had taken place. The draft advice had been prepared based on the priorities previously identified by the Executive



Committee in the context of the preparations for the mentioned meeting. He proceeded with an overview of the draft advice, including preliminary feedback sent by the members.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP), regarding section 3 “recognition of the scientifically demonstrated health and environmental benefits, including lower comparative carbon footprint, of fishery and aquaculture products”, suggested to change the order of the reference to the benefits of omega-3.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA), concerning the reference, under the second paragraph, introduced by WWF as preliminary feedback, to the impacts of the sector, called to include also the positive socio-economic impacts.

Laure Guillevic (WWF) argued that the beginning of the paragraph already illustrated the positive impacts. The aim of the last sentence was to balance the paragraph.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) expressed agreement with Mr Pivetta and added that he would favour deleting the reference to negative impacts.

Guus Pastoor (Visfederatie) argued that it was challenging to react on the preliminary feedback sent by WWF, since it was not shared in advance.

The Secretary General recalled that all members were allowed to introduce amendments during the meeting. Therefore, WWF was not required to send their suggestions in advance. Nevertheless, the Secretariat appreciated the effort to do, as it made the integration into the document easier.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) suggested to add, under the last paragraph, a reference to the impacts on the budgets available to public authorities to address health policy.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) suggested to add a call for the sector to enhance the positive impacts. Regarding section 4 “recognition of the fisheries and aquaculture value chain as strategic to ensure food security in the EU and globally, while also accounting for the global competition for aquatic proteins”, expressed doubts that the EU’s internal market was the third largest market in terms of consumption of fishery and aquaculture products, as he was under the impression that it was the second.

The Secretary General responded that the reference came from the 2023 edition of the EUMOFA “The EU Fish Market” report. He suggested to redraft to “one of the largest markets of fishery and aquaculture products in the world.”

Pierre Commère (PACT’ALIM), regarding the preliminary feedback of WWF under section 4 “ensuring sustainable and sufficient supply through the sustainable exploitation of fishery resources and the sustainable growth of aquaculture”, highlighted that the information flow goes from the beginning of the value chain to the end.

Sylvie Becaus (VVV) suggested to reformulate to “from the fisheries and farms of origin”.



Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) asked for WWF to explain the reasoning for the reference to “collective responsibility” in section 5 “ensuring a level-playing-field in the EU market and trade with fair conditions, including on the application of equivalent environmental and social standards to products imported from third countries”. Mr Commère argued that, when considering trade statistics, trade was usually undertaken by SMEs, which did not destabilise the situation in third countries. He argued that fisheries and aquaculture was usually an important economic sector for the countries of origin.

Laure Guillevic (WWF) stressed the importance of not destabilising local markets in third countries that are heavily dependent on fishery and aquaculture products. Ms Guillevic argued that external actions and trade dynamics must consider the socio-economic reliance of certain regions on these resources.

Pierre Commère (PACT'ALIM) responded that he would not oppose the addition, as it was important to have balance. Mr Commère emphasised that fishery and aquaculture products ensure the livelihood of thousands of people in the countries of origin. He exemplified that, through trade, the shrimp sector created significant economic activity and supported entire supply chains.

Bertrand Charron (ASC) drew attention to the issue of externalisation of costs, as both social and environmental consequences were displaced to outside of the European Union. In that context, it was important to consider, for example, the Forced Labour Regulation and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) suggested to refer also to responsible sourcing.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA), regarding section 6 “the contribution to the economy and culture, including gastronomic traditions, of rural and coastal communities”, called for further detail in the reference to the gastronomic traditions, arguing that these are closely linked to cultural identity. Ms Álvarez emphasised that, in the context of globalisation of food, fishing and its cultural role should be protected, as part of preservation of heritage and local identity.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) expressed agreement with Ms Álvarez, and recalled the importance of the sector, in terms of employment, in coastal communities.

Katarina Sipic (AIPCE-CEP), regarding the reference to the “fisheries and aquaculture sector” as a key pillar of the EU’s blue economy, wanted to know whether the reference to “sector” meant only primary production or the entire value chain.

The Secretary General replied that it was meant to refer to the entire value chain. The footnote referenced the European Commission’s “The EU blue economy report”, which provides figures for the “marine living resources sector”, covering fisheries, aquaculture, processing, and distribution.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA), regarding section 7 “generational renewal, including through the increase of attractiveness of the sector, skills development, and investments in modernisation and better





working conditions”, suggested to include a reference to the lack of reputational prestige of the sector among the general society.

Pim Visser (NOVA) regarding recommendation b) on the development of a low and harmonised VAT tax rate, recalled that fiscal policy was under the competence of Member States, not of the European Commission.

Sergio López García (OPP7 Burela) suggested to reformulate the mentioned recommendation to “encouraging the application by Member States...”.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) expressed scepticism on the implementation of the reference to “healthy and sustainably sourced” products, as, in practice, it would be challenging for national tax authorities to differentiate.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) emphasised that the issue was part of a broader discussion on healthy fiscality. Ms Álvarez emphasised that it was necessary to account for the impact of food choices on health policy costs, adding that the issue was particularly urgent in developed countries. In her view, healthy products should be exempt from VAT.

- **Way forward**

The Secretary General suggested, as a way forward, to proceed with an urgent written procedure for the consideration of the remaining text.

### Animal Transport

- **Consideration of draft advice on the legislative proposal on the protection of animals during transport and related operations**

The Secretary General recalled that, at the previous meeting, a DG SANTE representative delivered a presentation of the legislative proposal. At that meeting, it was agreed, as an action point, that draft advice on the topic would be developed. The Secretary General provided an overview of the draft advice.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA), regarding section 1 “background”, asked about the definition used for “aquatic animal”, which did not include bivalve molluscs.

The Secretary General responded that the mentioned section was meant to explain the Commission’s legislative proposal, so the definition used was the same as in the proposal. He added that the views of the members concerning the definition were outlined in section 3.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF), regarding subsection 2.2. “transport by farmers of their own animals”, suggested to include a reference to the fisheries sector, since fishers also operated in sites with distances higher than 50 km.



Javier Ojeda (FEAP) suggested to move the addition proposed by Mr Simonnet to a footnote, since it was outside the scope of the legislative proposal.

Pim Visser (NOVA), regarding section 3 “definition of “aquatic animals” (Article 3)” expressed concern about the implications of including bivalve molluscs in the definition.

The Secretary General clarified that, under the Commission’s legislative proposal, bivalve molluscs were outside of the scope. In the view of EMPA, legal definitions of “aquatic animals” should include bivalve molluscs, while still maintaining them out of the scope of this specific piece of legislation.

Javier Ojeda (FEAP) commented that the issue of animal welfare of bivalve molluscs was gaining some prominence, adding that the issue was being addressed by the Aquaculture Advisory Council.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) agreed with Mr Visser, expressing worry about potential unintended consequences.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) argued that shellfish farming was not always well identified in legal terminology. Therefore, for his association, it was crucial to fully recognise bivalve molluscs as part of “aquatic animals”.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) suggested the addition of an additional sentence to clarify.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) drew attention to the complexity of animal welfare in fisheries and aquaculture, particularly in the context of bivalve molluscs. Mr Pivetta expressed preference for maintaining the text as it was, to avoid further complicating a sensitive matter.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) suggested to delete the explicit reference to “lobsters and crabs” in the title of section 5 “decapods”.

Patric Murphy (IS&WFPO) wanted to know the source for determining that decapods must be provided with water in sufficient volume and quality during transport.

The Secretary General clarified that the Commission’s legislative proposal foresaw the provision of water in sufficient volume and quality for all aquatic animals during transport. Several members were concerned about the practical implications for the transport of decapods.

Sylvie Becaus (VVV) argued that, unlike put forward by AIPCE-CEP, decapod crustaceans could be transported in water tanks while maintaining their welfare. Ms Becaus emphasised that there were such commercial solutions available and supported by scientific research.

Paulien Prent (Visfederatie) argued that studies in the Netherlands showed that transport in water had negative welfare impacts for decapods during long distance transport.

- **Way forward**



The Secretary General recalled that the interinstitutional negotiations on the legislative proposal were expected to begin soon, so it was important to conclude the advice as soon as possible. The Secretary General suggested to hold informal exchanges with Ms Beaus and Ms Prent to conclude the pending point and then proceed with a formal urgent written procedure.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) asked to be included in the informal exchanges.

**AOB**

None.

DRAFT



### Summary of action items

- Vision for EU Fisheries for 2040
  - Remaining sections of the draft advice on “Vision for Fisheries, Aquaculture and their Market in 2040” to be considered via an urgent written procedure.
- Animal Transport
  - Following informal exchanges with the most interested members, draft advice on “legislative proposal on the protection of animals during transport and related operations” to be considered via an urgent written procedure.

DRAFT



## Attendance List

Representative	Organisation	Role
Adrien Simonnet	Union du Mareyage Français (UMF)	Member
Alen Lovrinov	PO Omega3	Member
Alessandro Manghisi	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)	Member
Anna Rokicka	Polish Association of Fish Processors (PSPR)	Member
Aodh O'Donnell	Irish Fish Producers Organisation	Member
Benoît Thomassen	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	Chair
Bertrand Charron	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)	Member
Camille Maisonneuve	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Caroline Gamblin	PACT'ALIM	Member
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation	Member
Daniel Voces	Europêche	Member
Dominic Rihan	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation (KFO)	Member
Fabian Schäfer	Bundesverband der deutschen Fischindustrie und des Fischgrosshandels e.V.	Member
Felicidad Fernández Alonso	ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Giuseppe Scordella	COPA-COGECA	Member
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie	Member
Hommel Kassa	SCNE	Member
Iñigo Azqueta Ruiz-Gallardón	ANFACO-CECOPECA	Member
Isabel Alonzo Cabezas	Spain	Observer
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member
Javier Ojeda	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	Member
Jean-Marie Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne	Member
Jennifer Reeves	Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)	Member
John Lynch	Irish South and East Fish Producers Organisation (ISEFPO)	Member





Representative	Organisation	Role
Jules Danto	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Katarina Sipic	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE) / European Federation of National Organizations of Importers and Exporters of Fish (CEP)	Member
Laure Guillevic	WWF	Member
Marek Danikowski	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE) / European Federation of National Organizations of Importers and Exporters of Fish (CEP)	Member
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA	Member
Mariano García García	FACOPE	Member
Mikel Ortiz	OPPAO	Member
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation	Member
Paulien Prent	Visfederatie	Member
Pedro Luis Casado López	OPP80	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pierre Commère	PACT'ALIM / Eurothon	Member
Pim Visser	NOVA	Member
Rosalie Tukker	Europêche	Member
Sarah Hautier	EuroCommerce	Member
Sergio López García	OPP7 Burela	Member
Sylvie Becaus	VVV	Member
Tamas Eisenbeck	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE) / European Federation of National Organizations of Importers and Exporters of Fish (CEP)	Member
Tanguy Chever	EUMOFA	Expert
Thibault Pivetta	European Molluscs' Producers Association (EMPA)	Member
Wiebe Kolkman	Visfederatie	Member

