

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

### Minutes

Wednesday, 4 February 2026 (14:30 – 18:00 CEST)

European Food Centre (Wandelaarkaai 7 / 61, 8400 Oostende)

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Benoît Thomassen

#### [Presentation](#)

Adoption of the agenda and of the last meeting's minutes (02.12.25): adopted

#### Action points

- **State-of-play of the action points of the last meeting – information**
- Labelling of fisheries and aquaculture products
  - Draft advice on the labelling barramundi products in international markets to be considered via a written procedure.
    - Advice adopted on 21 January 2026
- Common Market Organisation of Agricultural Products:
  - Draft advice on the potential impact of the restrictions to the use of “meat-related terms” to be considered via a written procedure.
    - Advice adopted on 27 December
- Competitiveness:
  - Focus Group on Competitiveness, Simplification and Reduction of Administrative Burden to be established, with the aim of further developing the draft advice.
    - Focus Group established on 12 December 2025

#### Consumer Information

- **Presentation of the Oceana report “the hidden cost of unlabelled seafood: the risk of consuming unethical and unsustainable seafood in Europe” by Marine Cusa (Oceana)**

#### [Presentation](#)

Marine Cusa (Oceana) highlighted that the Common Market Organisation Regulation is one of the best frameworks in the world, likely the best one, on the labelling of fishery and aquaculture products, but that it does not apply to prepared and preserved products or to restaurant dishes. According to data from the European Commission, these categories, represent nearly half of all seafood consumed in the EU. She



explained that the study used squid products as an example, since squid fisheries are generally unmanaged and unregulated, due to the lack of quotas and management measures. Some squid species are associated with IUU fishing and labour abuses, while representing a significant source of imports. According to a previous study, based on Automatic Identification Systems and satellite imagery, the majority of squid fishing take place in unregulated areas.

Ms Cusa further explained that her organisation, together with the University of Pisa, analysed 198 squid samples collected in restaurants and retail outlets in Brussels and Milan, combining genetic barcoding with trade data from EUMOFA to identify species and provenance. The study found that around half of the sampled products lacked any mandatory information, and that 90% of these unlabelled items originated from distant waters, primarily the Southwest Atlantic and Southeast Pacific - where squid stocks are poorly managed or unregulated. Sampling in restaurants showed similarly concerning patterns: many establishments claimed to serve “local” squid, yet 71% of items labelled as locally sourced were genetically identified as species from distant waters, most frequently the jumbo flying squid targeted by fleets operating in unregulated areas such as the Southeast Pacific. According to the trade data of EUMOFA, the jumbo flying squid is likely imported from China. She added that the Chinese fleet targeting squid largely operates in unregulated fishing areas and stocks, and that it was unclear whether the squid on the EU market was connected to illegal activities.

Ms Cusa emphasised that the issue is not the origin itself, but the absence of information available to consumers, especially given that certain squid fisheries have been associated with IUU fishing risks and labour abuses. She drew attention to issues of mislabelling, as restaurants claim to provide local products, when these actually originate from distant waters. In accordance with the traceability requirements of the Fisheries Control Regulation, restaurants should have access to the necessary information. Nevertheless, for restaurants, it can be challenging to access information from their suppliers. As recommendations, she called for labelling requirements for prepared and preserved products as well as for restaurants under the Common Market Organisation Regulation. She also called for the introduction of flag State information, as a way to improve transparency in cases where a single specie is exploited by multiple fleets with varying sustainability records.

- **Exchange of views**

Alessandro Manghisi (ASC) asked for Ms Cusa’s views on whether sustainability label, such as those providing full traceability of origin, could serve as an alternative solution to enhance transparency in fishery and aquaculture products, given their ability to precisely indicate where products come from.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) responded that mandatory labelling requirements and sustainability labels were not mutually exclusive. Ms Cusa acknowledged that certification schemes and labels were useful, but added that not all fleets afford certification. As an example, the Panamanian fleet targeting jumbo flying squid was unlikely to have the financial capacity for private certification. She argued that there should be consumer information on the label, particularly as there is no standardised sustainability label.

Stefan Meyer (Fischverband) drew attention to the education programmes undertaken by the German control authorities. Under the EU legislative framework, it was clear that mislabelling fishery and aquaculture products was strictly prohibited. Mr Meyer acknowledged that it could be challenging to depend on the



individual capacity of the restaurant's staff, but recalled, under the requirements of the Fisheries Control Regulation, restaurants should have the information. From 10 January 2026, would be receiving the mentioned information in a digital way. He suggested the undertaking of further research to follow-up on the implementation of the new obligations in restaurants.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) stated that digital traceability requires time for a full implementation. In her view, it would be relevant to redo the study in one or two years. Ms Cusa recalled that, as costumers do not necessarily ask for the information, restaurants might not see the value in keeping the information. Even though it was illegal to mislabel, the lack of requirements to provide the information, contributed to mislabelling.

Janne Posti (Conxemar) drew attention to the small geographical sample of the study, expressing concern about the use of the limited samples for EU-wide recommendations. Mr Posti highlighted the different channels, products and species across the EU, which meant that the recommendations could be overgeneralising. He wondered whether the lack of labelling was not actually an issue of national enforcement, recalling that Article 35 of the Common Market Organisation Regulation covered fishmongers.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) recognised that implementation of labelling requirements, including fines, depended on the Member States. In the case of Milan, there was a very good implementation of the labelling requirements for fishmongers, while, in the case of Brussels, the implementation was not so good. Ms Cusa added that cultural elements could also impact whether costumers asked many questions about the products or not. She explained that Milan was selected, as Italy is the second biggest consumer market in the EU. Brussels was selected due to the location of the EU policymakers. The aim was to avoid duplication of another ongoing study on the Spanish market. She acknowledged that the situation varied across the Member States. Oceana was working with the University of Pisa to formally publish the study as a scientific publication. In that work, Oceana would make sure to avoid generalising for the entire EU.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) expressed doubts about the aims of the study, wondering whether it aimed to assess the entire traceability chain up to the consumer. Mr Murphy emphasised the high level of compliance requirements falling primarily EU producers. He wondered about the alleged lack of capacity from the fleets of third countries to undertake private certification.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) highlighted that, if a consumer, in a supermarket, wants to purchase EU products, it was generally impossible to know the origin. In the case of processed fishery products, there was no requirements for the products to include a label with the information. In line with the existing internal traceability requirements, the processing factory had the information, but then the information was not made available to the consumer at the retail or restaurant's levels. Ms Cusa acknowledged that some sellers made the information available in a voluntary manner.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) requested more information on the policy aims of the study, particularly weaknesses of the existing framework. Mr Murphy underscored that EU fishers comply with stringent reporting rules, while the transmission of information across the next stages was outside their control.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) responded that her organisation aimed for prepared and preserved fishery and aquaculture products as well as restaurants to be included under the mandatory information requirements of the Common Market Organisation Regulation, ensuring the same information as for fresh and frozen



fishery and aquaculture products. While traceability requirements were in plan, the information did not necessarily reach the end consumer.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) recalled that the EU legislator required that all information on fresh and frozen fishery and aquaculture products. At the fishmonger's level, the consumer had a right to access the information, which meant that operators faced potential sanctions for lack of compliance. On the other hand, in the case of prepared and preserved fishery and aquaculture products as well as in the context of HORECA, the information was not legally required. Ms Álvarez that, in the context of the supply chain of fresh products, it was actually harder to provide the information than in the other cases, as fishmongers updated their products every day. In her view, the existing legislative framework contributes to an uneven level-playing-field and a lack of consideration for the interests of consumers. She recalled that around 30% of fishery and aquaculture products are consumed in restaurants, but that restaurants were only legally required to provide information on allergens.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) expressed agreement with Ms Álvarez.

Hommel Kasa (SNCE) recalled that several EU instruments, such as the IUU Regulation, addressed illegal fishing, even though the level of controls could always be discussed. In the case of restaurants, there was national legislation against fraudulent information, which was transposed from EU legislation. Mr Kasa emphasised the importance of public authorities enforcing the existing legislation. He suggested that awareness-raising may be needed for small restaurants unfamiliar with their obligations. In his view, consumers should not be placed in a position of choosing between compliant and non-compliant products, as ensuring fair competition and market integrity is fundamentally the responsibility of regulators. He underscored the importance of proportionality in the requirements for information transmission, since there could be high levels of complexity.

Marine Cusa (Oceana) recognised that there were several pieces of legislation at play and that effective implementation of the existing rules was essential, since consumer information is one part of the overall framework. Ms Cusa stressed that the study focused on the final step of chain, particularly on ensuring that the information transmission actually reaches consumers. In her view, it was feasible to transmit and communicate the information.

The Chair recalled that, at previous opportunities, the MAC adopted advice on the consumer information requirements of the Common Market Organisation, including the requirements for restaurants.

## Contaminants

- **Presentation of the EEB report “Forever Chemicals’ poisoning Europe’s waters and fish: The tip of the PFAS iceberg” by Sara Johansson (EEB)**

### Presentation

Sara Johansson (EEB) explained that her organisation is as a network of nearly 200 environmental NGOs across Europe. While the organisation does not work directly on marine or fisheries policy, it monitors PFAS pollution under the Water Framework Directive, which applies to coastal waters up to one nautical mile from the shore.



Ms Johansson outlined the scope of the study, which compiled PFOS data reported by seven Member States under the Water Framework Directive. PFOS has been listed as a priority substance since 2013. The analysis compared measured concentrations in wild fish with both the current environmental quality standard and the new, significantly stricter standards for PFAS under negotiation. She highlighted the scale of PFAS pollution, describing it as a family of around 10,000 extremely persistent chemicals used widely in consumer and industrial products. More than 100,000 potential PFAS emission sites have been identified across Europe, and EU production and use remain significant, contributing to almost one million tonnes of PFAS placed on the market annually. Human exposure is already above safe thresholds set by EFSA, especially for children and infants, and the estimated health-related cost burden ranges from €50 to €84 billion per year.

Ms Johansson outlined the concrete consequences for fisheries, referring to the case of the 3M factory in Antwerp, where PFAS emissions severely contaminated the Scheldt estuary. PFAS levels in seafood from the Western Scheldt exceeded Dutch safety norms by up to 800-fold, prompting Dutch fishers to suspend fishing activities and seek compensation. She mentioned that seafood consumption is a major source of human PFAS exposure—up to 90% according to German authorities—making contamination patterns in fish particularly relevant. Therefore, limiting further PFAS pollution would be key to limit human exposure via fish and seafood consumption as well as protecting drinking water

Ms Johansson explained that data collection proved challenging. Member States are not obliged to report PFAS data centrally and submissions to the European Environment Agency remain voluntary, inconsistent and delayed. In several cases, EEB had to request national datasets directly. Reported results revealed widespread exceedances of the existing PFOS environmental quality standards, with up to 40% of samples surpassing the limit depending on the country. When compared with the forthcoming PFAS environmental quality standards, nearly all samples exceeded the proposed thresholds, sometimes by factors of several hundred or several thousand. Hotspots were typically located near industrial sites, waste facilities, airports and military bases. She stressed that differences in monitoring methodologies and analytical capacity make cross-country comparisons difficult, but the overall pattern confirms that PFAS pollution is pervasive and likely underreported. Moreover, current monitoring covers only PFOS, whereas Member States will soon be required to monitor 24 PFAS substances.

Ms Johansson emphasised that, while EU food regulations now set limits for PFAS in fish, the thresholds remain high and do not align with EFSA exposure guidelines. For some fish categories, compliance would limit consumption to only a few grams per week, creating a contradiction between food safety policy and national dietary recommendations encouraging fish consumption.

Ms Johansson, as policy recommendations, called for, under the Water Framework Directive, Member States to be required to control both diffuse and point-source pollution from priority substances. The new PFAS environmental quality standards – once formally adopted – will strengthen obligations to monitor and reduce PFAS emissions, potentially including bans, stricter discharge limits or pollution fees. She cautioned that the Water Framework Directive was under increasing political pressure, as recent legislative negotiations have already introduced new exemptions, and the European Commission announced plans to review the Water Framework Directive in 2026 in connection with access to critical raw materials, raising concerns about a potential weakening of the framework.



Ms Johansson stressed the need for the swift adoption of the new PFAS priority substances list, firm protection of the Water Framework Directive against dilution, effective enforcement by Member States, and an ambitious horizontal PFAS restriction under chemicals legislation to curb future emissions.

- **Exchange of views**

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) expressed deep concern about the potential portrayal of the fishing sector as harmful. Mr López emphasised that, even though fishery and aquaculture products provide scientifically recognised nutritional benefits, these were being portrayed as responsible for health issues, including for children. While it was important to recognise the impact of analysing water quality and contaminants, it was important to avoid negative messages that depict EU fisheries as a harmful sector to public health.

Anne-Mette Bæk (EFFOP) highlighted that the fishmeal and fish oil industry had been working on the topic for a significant amount of time, since costumers would demand PFAS-free products. Ms Bæk argued for pollution to be stopped at the source, particularly by the industries that release PFAS into the environment, which should be a priority for the national seafood agencies, rather than by downstream food and feed operators. She informed that her organisation provided multiple samples to EFSA. Due to the differences across fishing areas and continued environmental contamination, it would become increasingly challenging to produce fishmeal without PFAS.

Tamas Eisenbeck (Seafood Europe) wanted to know how it was possible for Hungary to appear, in the presented diagram, among the Members States with the highest exposure to PFAS, when Hungarians consume the least amount of fishery and aquaculture products in the EU, since seafood was presented as the main dietary source of PFAS. Mr Eisenbeck requested clarification of how these two findings could be reconciled and on other potential exposure pathways to explain the elevated levels of exposure in Hungary.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) emphasised that contamination from PFAS was a major concern for the shellfish sector. The sector is exposed to land-based pollution and faces cumulative sanitary risks when contaminants interact. Mr Pivetta called for stronger action to reduce pollution at source. He informed that that his organisation as well as the Aquaculture Advisory Council had submitted recommendations in relation to the Water Framework Directive. He urged DG MARE to take a bottom-up, more inclusive approach.

Pieter Roden (Foodrise EU) wanted to know whether the study considered potential differences between farmed and wild fish, particularly open-net pen aquaculture, in terms of PFAS accumulation.

Paulien Prent (Visfederatie) informed that Seafood Europe has previously issued a position paper to the European Commission on PFAS, stressing that the contamination originates from external industrial sources and creates major challenges for a fisheries sector that depends on a clean environment. Ms Prent emphasised that discussions on PFAS must consider not only contamination risks but also the high nutritional value of fish, which remains an essential component of public health.

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) expressed concern about potential general statements that could alarm consumers. Mr López stressed that fishery products should not be presented as unsafe. He drew attention to the scientific consensus on the nutritional benefits of fishery and aquaculture products, in line with international and national nutritional guidelines.



Sara Johansson (EEB) clarified that the report does not attribute PFAS contamination to the fisheries sector, emphasising that that pollution from external industries poses a growing threat to fishers, seafood producers and drinking-water providers alike. In her view, pollution from PFAS was undermining the fisheries sector, creating a risk of the general public becoming scared of consuming fishery products, which meant that it was necessary to stop pollution at its source. She recalled that, in Sweden, due to pollution issues in the Baltic Sea, there were already cases of fishery products not being allowed for exports.

Ms Johansson, regarding the exposure levels in Hungary, explained that the data originated from an EFSA publication, which covered testing of various products and pathways, including water, and eggs. Concerning the potential differences between farmed and wild fish, she responded that the study was based on the available data on the implementation of the Water Framework Directive, so it would likely be more related to wild products. Ms Johansson expressed agreement with Mr Tibetta's statement, as DG MARE should pursue stronger and more effective measures to reduce pollution at source. She expressed availability to collaborate with the fisheries sector.

- **Way forward**

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) emphasised the importance of taking action on contamination from PFAS, particularly the fisheries and aquaculture supply chain was not the perpetrator.

Anne-Mette Bæk (EFFOP) expressed support for the development of advice on PFAS.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) highlighted the significant risks faced by the fisheries and aquaculture sector. Mr Pivetta argued that it was important to signal these risks to DG MARE, particularly in the context of the Water Framework Directive.

The Chair proposed to proceed with the preparation of draft advice by the Secretariat, which should take into account the presentation and the exchanges held.

## Nutrition

- **Presentation of the Interfish decalogue “fish consumption, health and sustainability” by Juana Parada (OR.PA.GU.)**

### Presentation

Juana Parada (OR.PA.GU.) informed that Interfish is Spain's only interbranch organisation representing the fisheries sector, being composed of OPP-7, OPP Burela, OPROMAR, OR.PA.GU and CONXEMAR. Ms Parada explained that the decalogue was developed in response to the significant decline in fish consumption in recent years, prompting the organisation to consult medical and scientific experts to assess the health and nutritional value of fish independently of sectoral interests. Spain was chosen as the focus given its traditionally high fish consumption and one of the highest life expectancies in the world.

Ms Parada outlined the Advisory Board of six recognised specialists, which covered biochemistry, paediatrics, cardiology, geriatrics, chemical engineering and sustainability, who jointly examined the nutritional components of fish (including proteins, omega-3 fatty acids, vitamins, minerals, selenium and DHA) and their



importance across all stages of life, from pre-pregnancy to old age. The scientific evidence presented confirms that fish consumption is beneficial for foetal development, childhood growth, cognitive performance during adolescence, mental health, prevention of chronic and inflammatory diseases in adulthood, and healthy ageing. Several experts stressed that fish is an essential food during the first 1,000 days of life and that nutritional guidance for women of childbearing age and pregnant women should be strengthened accordingly.

Ms Parada highlighted the cardiological benefits associated with regular fish consumption, such as lower rates of cardiovascular mortality, coronary events, sudden death and stroke, and drew attention to evidence showing that the selenium naturally present in fish can mitigate the toxic effects of mercury by forming compounds that are eliminated rather than stored in fatty tissue. She pointed out that the latest scientific studies, including on the selenium-to-mercury benefit ratio, have not been incorporated into current dietary recommendations, leading to guidance that may be outdated or overly cautious. Data presented in the study show that even for species with higher mercury levels, estimated weekly intake remains well below tolerable thresholds once selenium content is considered.

Ms Parada underlined the need to update EU recommendations to reflect recent scientific findings, arguing that risk assessments should incorporate both contaminants and protective nutrients. She also stressed that fisheries have a comparatively low carbon and water footprint relative to other protein sectors, underscoring their importance for a sustainable and healthy food system.

Ms Parada outlined the ten key conclusions of the decalogue, which promote fish consumption across all life stages, emphasising that the health benefits substantially outweigh potential risks. The recommendations call for a revision of national and EU dietary guidelines for vulnerable groups, integrating the substantial body of scientific evidence produced over the last 15 years. She encouraged the members to consult the full document, available in English and Spanish, and called for a more balanced communication approach that recognises fish as a healthy, sustainable product rather than focusing disproportionately on toxicity concerns.

- **Exchange of views**

The Secretary General encouraged the members to share their views on the potential relevance of developing advice on the presented topic. The Secretary General recalled that the issue of the interactions between mercury and selenium had been raised several times before. As an example, potential future advice could call on the European Commission to request a scientific assessment on the mentioned interactions. If there was interest from the Working Group, a draft could be considered at the next meeting.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) thanked Ms Parada for the useful and positive presentation.

Caroline Gamblin (PACT'ALIM) asked Mr Heinen whether the European Commission requested an update to the EFSA scientific opinion on the benefits and risks of fish consumption. If so, she wanted to know when the updated assessment would be made available.

Gerd Heinen (DG MARE) informed that he would have to follow-up internally with DG SANTE.

Sergio López García (OPP Burela) expressed support for the development of advice, which should particularly focus on the interaction between mercury and selenium.



- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to proceed with the development of advice. The Chair informed that the Secretariat would be collecting inputs from the members. A draft text would be considered at the next meeting. He expressed availability to, if relevant, arrange a follow up presentation with relevant organisations, including scientific ones.

### Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

- **Presentation of proposal of draft advice on farmed bivalve molluscs and the EU-UK Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement by Thibault Pivetta (EMPA)**

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) explained that the proposal followed up on advice previously adopted by the MAC in 2021, which called for an agreement between the EU and the UK on the sanitary and phytosanitary conditions for the trade of bivalve molluscs. Mr Pivetta highlighted that, following the UK's withdrawal from the EU, significant administrative burdens and trade disruptions emerged, particularly regarding the movement of live bivalve molluscs between Ireland, the UK and other EU Member States, including transit flows that were previously routine.

Mr Pivetta emphasised that the intention was to re-establish the smooth trade conditions, similarly to before the UK's withdrawal, through the alignment of sanitary and phytosanitary requirements, while also continuing to apply equivalent standards. He argued that the improved political context between the EU and the UK provided the opportunity to call for a stable and formalised agreement.

- **Consideration of the proposed draft advice**

The Secretary General informed that, prior to the meeting, preliminary feedback was submitted by two members. The IS&WFPO requested to broaden the references to "farmed bivalve molluscs" to cover also wild bivalve molluscs. ANFACO-CYTMA suggested the addition of an additional paragraph to acknowledge the legal constraints that prevent the UK, as a third country, to export bivalve molluscs from class B waters under the current EU rules. The addition from ANFACO-CYTMA aimed to anticipate the issue by urging the Commission to find a pragmatic solution, such as reinforced guarantees or strengthened traceability, including the possibility of enhanced control arrangements for consignments moving between authorised establishments.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) wondered about the possibility to broaden the draft advice to cover other fishery and aquaculture products requiring sanitary and phytosanitary certificates, for example on histamine levels. Mr Simonnet wanted to know whether simplification of sanitary and phytosanitary requirements has been addressed at the latest EU-UK summit. He underscored the importance of monitoring the ongoing negotiations and of maintaining pressure for progress.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) explained that the draft advice focused on live bivalve molluscs because of their perishability and associated sanitary risks, which required rapid handling, in line with the 2021 advice. The text aimed to reflect current concerns in the industry.



The Secretary General stated that, depending on the preference of the Working Group, the draft advice could be adopted as proposed and, later, complemented with a second advice on other fishery and aquaculture products. Alternatively, if there was flexibility in the timing of EMPA, the draft advice could be amended to broaden the scope.

Adrien Simmonet (UMF) emphasised that fresh fishery products faced the same challenges related to delays and recognition of sanitary and phytosanitary documents.

Thibault Pivetta (EMPA) stressed the urgency of addressing barriers related to sanitary and phytosanitary requirements for bivalve molluscs, particularly for producers in Ireland and the UK. Mr Pivetta expressed preference for moving forward with the draft advice under consideration, while following up with another advice on other fishery and aquaculture products.

John Lynch (Irish South & East Fish Producers Organisation) informed that, since the UK's withdrawal from the EU, his organisation faced significant operational and financial difficulties related to sanitary and phytosanitary barriers, as landings of scallops in the UK had been affected. Mr Lynch expressed support for the proposals of Mr Pivetta. He expressed disappointment that previous requests for EU-UK realignment on sanitary and phytosanitary requirements had not yielded positive outcomes.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to, considering the urgency, put forward the draft advice on bivalve molluscs to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption. The Chair proposed the circulation of a questionnaire by the Secretariat on the sanitary and phytosanitary requirements for other fishery and aquaculture products to prepare an additional draft advice for consideration at the next meeting.

*The Working Group reached agreement on the draft advice on “Bivalve Molluscs under the EU–UK SPS Agreement”.*

### Focus Group on Competitiveness, Simplification and Reduction of Administrative Burden

- **Update on the establishment and work of the Focus Group by Pedro Reis Santos (Secretary General)**

The Secretary General recalled that, in December 2025, the Working Group agreed to the establishment of the Focus Group through the adoption of Terms of Reference. The Secretary General informed that the Focus Group met three times, specifically on 9, 19 and 30 of January 2026. A fourth meeting would be scheduled soon. In line with the feedback from the Working Group, the original document was divided into two separate documents. A first document took a general approach covering various pieces of legislation, which was refined, and was pending final contributions. A second document was focused on the upcoming studies on the Fisheries Control Regulation.

The Secretary General further recalled that, in line with the Terms of Reference, the aim was to finalise both documents ahead of the meeting of the Working Group in March 2026. He highlighted that DG MARE had already contracted a consultant to be doing the work on the studies. The consultant would soon organise workshops with operators. At a future opportunity, DG MARE would encourage the MAC to suggest suitable



companies to participate in the workshops. Representatives of the Advisory Councils would also be invited to participate in the workshops.

The Secretary General thanked the members of the Focus Group for their extensive work. He expressed commitment to having the draft texts ready in advance of the March 2026 meeting.

### AOB

None.



## Summary of action items

- Contaminants
  - Draft advice on PAFS contamination to be considered at the next meeting.
  
- Nutrition
  - Draft advice on nutrition, particularly focused on the interaction between mercury and selenium, to be considered at the next meeting.
  
- Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
  - Draft advice on “Bivalve Molluscs under the EU–UK SPS Agreement” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
  - Secretariat to circulate a questionnaire on the EU-UK SPS Agreement concerning other fishery and aquaculture products.



## 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
Alexandre Bonneau	SNCE	Member
Alonso Abreu Lozano	Asociación de Armadores de Punta Del Moral	Member
Angels Segura Unió	AECOC	Member
Anna Rokicka	Polish Association of Fish Processors (PSPR)	Member
Arthur Yon	FROM Nord	Member
Benoît Thomassen	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	Chair
Bertrand Charron	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)	Member
Caroline Gamblin	PACT'ALIM	Member
Christine Absil	Good Fish Foundation	Member
Emiel Brouckaert	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Falke de Sager	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Gerd Heinen	European Commission	Expert
Guus Pastoor	Visfederatie	Member
Hommel Kassa	SNCE	Member
Janne Posti	Conxemar	Member
João Pereira	FRUCOM	Member
John Lynch	Irish South and East Fish Producers Organisation (ISEFPO)	Member
José Maria Gallart	OPP Almería	Member
Juana Parada	OR.PA.GU.	Member
Juan Manuel Trujillo Castillo	ETF	Member
Jules Danto	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO)	Member
Julien Daudu	Environmental Justice Foundation	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
Julien Lamothe	European Association of Fish Producers Organisations (EAPO) / ANOP	Member
Juliette Margueritte	ESSA	Member
Katarina Sipic	Seafood Europe	Member
Laura Harpøth	EFFOP	Member
Laure Guillevic	WWF	Member
Linda Zanki Duvnjak	OP Friska Riba	Member
Linne Verhoeven	Seafood Europe	Member
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA	Member
Marine Cusa	Oceana	Member
Mariola Valero de Juan	Spain	Observer
Matthew Gréant	Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF)	Member
Nicolás Fernández	OPP72	Member
Olivier Hottlet	FRUCOM	Member
Patrick Murphy	Irish South & West Fish Producers Organisation	Member
Paulien Prent	Visfederatie	Member
Pedro Hernández Saez	CARBOPECA	Member
Pedro Luis Casado López	OPP80	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
Pieter Roden	Foodrise	Member
Pierre Commère	Seafood Europe	Member
Pim Visser	NOVA	Member
Sara Vandamme	VVV	Member
Sarah Hautier	EuroCommerce	Member
Sergio López García	OPP7 Burela	Member
Stefan Meyer	Fischverband	Member
Tamas Eisenbeck	Seafood Europe	Member
Thibault Pivetta	European Molluscs' Producers Association (EMPA)	Member





Market Advisory Council

Representative	Organisation	Role
Thomas Kruse	Danish Pelagic Producer Organisation	Member
Vanya Vulperhorst	Oceana	Member
Violaine De Neef	Market Advisory Council (MAC)	Secretariat
William Morr�	Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)	Member
Xavier Pires	ALIF	Member
Yobana Berm�dez	EU Fish Processors and Traders Association (AIPCE)	Member

