

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

Minutes

Friday, 12 June 2026 (09:30 – 13:00 CEST)

Zoom

Interpretation in EN, ES, FR

Welcome from the Chair, Benoît Thomassen

[Presentation](#)

Adoption of the agenda and of the last meeting's minutes (24.03.26): Adopted.

Action points

- **State-of-play of the action points of the last meeting - information**
- EU-UK Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement:
 - Draft advice on “Negotiation of the EU-UK SPS Agreement” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
 - Advice adopted on 24 March 2026
- Competitiveness
 - Draft advice on “Negotiation of the EU-UK SPS Agreement” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
 - Draft advice on “Competitiveness of the EU Market of Fishery and Aquaculture Products – Upcoming studies on the Fisheries Control Regulation” to be considered by the Working Group via a one-week urgent written procedure.
 - Advice on “Competitiveness of the EU Market of Fishery and Aquaculture Products – Simplification and reduction of administrative burden” adopted on 24 March 2026
 - Draft advice on “Competitiveness of the EU Market of Fishery and Aquaculture Products – Upcoming studies on the Fisheries Control Regulation” adopted on 26 May 2026
- Nutrition
 - Draft advice on “Biochemical Interaction between Selenium and Mercury in Fishery and Aquaculture Products” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
 - Advice adopted on 24 March 2026
- Contaminants



- Draft advice on “Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)” to be put forward to the Executive Committee for consideration and potential adoption.
- At a future meeting, agenda point to be scheduled on contamination in fishery and aquaculture products due to chlordecone.
 - Advice adopted on 24 March 2026
 - Agenda point on contamination due to chlordecone scheduled (11h45)

Contaminants (Chlordecone)

- **Presentation on measures to address chlordecone contamination by Maria Tabernero (SANTE E4)**

Presentation

Maria Tabernero (DG SANTE) presented the regulatory framework and current situation regarding chlordecone contamination, recalling that pesticide residues in food are governed by Regulation (EC) No 396/2005. Ms Tabernero outlined that chlordecone is a highly persistent organochlorine insecticide, which was never approved at EU-level, but was authorised for a limited period in the French Antilles before being banned in 2004. Due to its persistence and fat-soluble nature, it remains present in the environment and can accumulate in food, particularly in animal fat tissues. It is also listed as a persistent organic pollutant under the Stockholm Convention. The Codex Alimentarius does not foresee values for the substance. No information is available about authorised uses in third countries.

Ms Tabernero explained that, following the detection of elevated contamination levels, in 2019, France adopted emergency measures to protect consumers in Guadeloupe and Martinique, notably by proposing lower maximum residue levels (MRLs) for animal products based on advice from ANSES (French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety). These measures were subsequently assessed at EU-level by EFSA, which confirmed their appropriateness. As a result, the EU established MRLs for chlordecone in certain animal products at 0.02 mg/kg through a 2021 regulation, aligned with the French national emergency measure. These limits are temporary and subject to review within ten years, with a reassessment foreseen by 2031.

Ms Tabernero provided an overview of the monitoring activities at EU and national levels. Overall compliance with EU pesticide residue limits remains high, with approximately 98% of samples meeting the legal thresholds. However, chlordecone remains among the most frequently detected pesticide residues in animal products, particularly in fat tissues, with a number of exceedances recorded. The 2023 EU Report on Pesticide Residues in Food confirmed that chlordecone is one of the most identified residues in animal commodities originating from the affected regions. At national level, France implemented dedicated monitoring programmes, confirming that contamination remains present, particularly in animal products, and to a lesser extent in fruit and vegetables, with occasional cases identified in bananas. Regarding fishery products, no EU-wide MRLs are currently established, although Member States may set national limits. France applies a stricter threshold of 0.01 mg/kg for seafood, while EFSA continues collecting and analysing data on contamination levels in fish across the EU.



Ms Tabernero informed that, under the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF), notifications related to chlordecone increased since 2018. According to the Commission representative, the described trend reflects improved detection and monitoring rather than a deterioration of the contamination situation.

- **Exchange of views**

The Chair wanted to know why France applied a stricter MRL for fishery products in comparison with other products.

Christine Absil (Good Fish) recalled that MRLs are based on risk assessments linked to consumption patterns. Therefore, exposure levels were likely higher in areas where fish consumption was more significant, such as in Martinique.

Maria Tabernero (DG SANTE) agreed that it was likely the case.

The Secretary General informed that, later in the year, the Outermost Regions Advisory Council (CCRUP) would be addressing the issue of chlordecone contamination, including the corresponding restrictions affecting aquaculture producers and fishing activities in the French Outermost Regions. Under joint MAC-CCRUP advice, the food safety perspective (e.g., exposure assessments, monitoring programmes, MRLs, consumption advice) could be combined with the primary production perspective (e.g., financial support and compensation mechanism for operators, environmental remediation, guidance to producers).

Maria Tabernero (DG SANTE) responded that consumption advice was based on national risk assessments and may target specific species. Ms Tabernero suggested contacting ANSES for more detailed information.

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) expressed concern about the situation of producers already operating in the affected areas. Mr Murphy wanted to know what measures were in place in case of detected contamination after production was already established and whether there was a protection framework for producers. He expressed support for the development of advice with the CCRUP.

Maria Tabernero (DG SANTE) responded that she lacked the mentioned information.

- **Way forward**

The Chair proposed to proceed with the development of joint advice with the CCRUP on the matter.

Food Fraud (EU)

- **Presentation of the TraceMap traceability tool by Eva Siegener (SANTE G5)**

Presentation

Eva Siegener (DG SANTE) provided an overview of developments in the Alert and Cooperation Network (ACN), noting that 2025 data was still in the finalisation stage. Ms Siegener explained that the system relies on several databases and that the Administrative Assistance and Cooperation (AAC) system has been split into different components to ensure appropriate contact points for different types of issues. She highlighted



that fish and fish products are among the top 10 categories notified in the ACN, representing around 4% of all notifications. She stressed that ACN data only reflects cases reported by Member States and does not capture undetected fraud. In 2025, 67 cases of suspected fraud were flagged for fish and fish products. Monthly reports on EU agri-food fraud suspicions are produced to monitor trends and support risk analysis, helping authorities better understand exposure and emerging issues

Ms Siegener explained that TraceMap was developed as part of the broader EU Vision for Agriculture and Food, which emphasises consumer access to authentic and trustworthy products. TraceMap aims to improve cooperation and make better use of existing data. The tool integrates and connects previously separate systems, notably iRASFF (used for alerts) and TRACES (used for tracking movements and certificates), thereby enabling a more comprehensive analysis of supply chains. TraceMap allows for enhanced traceability and investigation by combining fragmented datasets into a structured and searchable system. It supports fraud detection, speeds up investigations, and improves the efficiency of recall processes. The tool builds links between operators, consignments, and certificates, enabling authorities to identify connections and patterns that were previously difficult to detect. The Commission representative highlighted various practical benefits, including faster responses, improved supply chain transparency, and enhanced support for import controls. TraceMap can help identify repeat offenders, map the entire journey of products, and accelerate both fraud investigations and food safety responses. It can also support internal recalls by quickly identifying the origin and distribution of products.

Ms Siegener informed that access to TraceMap was, at the time, linked to existing access to iRASFF, with certain limitations depending on the user and national scope. The system was expected to further enhance cooperation between authorities and improve the overall capacity to address food fraud and safety issues in the EU, particularly in high-risk sectors such as fisheries.

- **Exchange of views**

Hommel Kasa (SNCE) welcomed the development of an AI-based tool enabling improved linkage and traceability of data. Mr Kasa wondered about the structure and quality of the underlying data, since Member States could report information in different formats. Issues were faced in relation to the information about Vibrio contamination. He wanted to know whether the Commission was considering standardising the data or whether, alternatively, TraceMap would be capable of distinguishing and addressing inconsistencies in the datasets. He also wanted to know whether TraceMap would become accessible to operators, enabling them to carry out their own risk analysis and monitoring activities.

Eva Siegener (DG SANTE) acknowledged that there could be inconsistencies in the reporting by Member States, since different national legislation applied, even though there was an EU reference. Ms Siegener emphasised that, in the recent years, significant improvements took place, as Member States became more experienced with the system, which translated into more structured data. Ms Siegener explained that TraceMap extracted and organised the available data. No harmonisation was foreseen, as it would require a



separate legal basis. Discussions were ongoing with EFSA and FAO to improve the existing open and integrated data systems. TraceMap would eventually be made available to companies.

Hommel Kasa (SNCE) called for access to be provided to representative associations, so that these organisations could assist the companies. Mr Kasa encouraged the provision of broader access to TraceMap for monitoring purposes.

Eva Siegener (DG SANTE) stated that she would share Mr Kasa's suggestions internally. Ms Siegener recalled that it was up to the Member States to decide on who has an underlying reason to access the data systems.

The Secretary General asked whether the artificial intelligence could process handwritten data.

Eva Siegener (DG SANTE) confirmed that TraceMap was able to process handwritten data, including signatures. Furthermore, TraceMap was able to process all languages, even though accuracy rates varied.

Contaminants (Mercury)

- **Presentation of EFSA's scientific report on frequency of consumption of different fish, crustacean and mollusc species contributing to methylmercury exposure and consumer awareness of national advice on their consumption by Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA)**

Presentation

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) presented the results of a large-scale two-phase survey on fish and seafood consumption and consumer awareness of national advice related to methylmercury exposure. Ms Ioannidou recalled that EFSA's earlier scientific work had established a tolerable weekly intake for methylmercury and recognised both the health benefits and risks associated with fish consumption. While fish consumption is generally recommended, particularly for its nutritional benefits, concerns remain regarding exposure to mercury, especially for high consumers and vulnerable groups such as pregnant women. In this context, EFSA was tasked with conducting a comprehensive study to better understand consumption patterns and awareness of related risks and guidance across Member States.

Ms Ioannidou explained that the project began in 2022 with the development of a harmonised questionnaire and the launch of a procurement process for data collection. The first survey was conducted between May and July 2023 across 27 Member States as well as Iceland and Norway, while a second survey took place in late 2024 in selected countries, including those that had updated national advice. The methodology relied on representative samples across different population groups, including adults, adolescents, and pregnant women. Overall, around 500 respondents per country were included, with targeted efforts to ensure participation of specific groups such as pregnant women.

Ms Ioannidou informed that the results showed that fish and seafood consumption is widespread, with around 60% of respondents identifying as consumers. An increase in consumption frequency was observed between the two survey points, including for species with higher mercury levels. Notably, about one-third of



consumers, including pregnant women, reported consuming fish species with higher mercury content three or more times per week. This increase occurred both in countries with and without updated national advice, suggesting that factors other than official guidance, such as dietary trends or preferences, may play a significant role in influencing consumption.

Ms Ioannidou further informed that, in terms of awareness, the survey revealed relatively low knowledge among consumers regarding contaminants in fish and seafood. While mercury was the most recognised contaminant, only about half of respondents were aware of its presence, and overall knowledge of risks was significantly lower than knowledge of health benefits. Awareness of national dietary advice was also moderate, with around 40% of respondents indicating that they had heard of such guidance, including among pregnant women. The findings further showed that information is most frequently obtained through informal channels such as family, friends, and media, while official sources play a more limited role in influencing behaviour.

Ms Ioannidou highlighted that the analysis of the impact of national advice indicated that, while awareness of guidance can influence consumption decisions to some extent, its overall impact is limited. In some cases, individuals aware of advice still report high consumption of fish species with elevated mercury levels. This suggests that communication strategies may need to be strengthened or adapted to better influence behaviour. At the same time, the promotion of fish consumption for its health benefits appears to remain an important driver, potentially outweighing concerns related to contaminants.

Ms Ioannidou added that EFSA also provided recommendations for improving communication strategies, including focusing on clearer messaging about both risks and benefits, promoting lower-risk species, and tailoring advice to specific target groups. The recommendations highlighted the importance of using more effective communication channels, including media and trusted intermediaries, to reach consumers more effectively. She acknowledged several uncertainties in the study, including limitations related to self-reported data, seasonal variations, and sampling constraints, which may influence the interpretation of the results.

- **Exchange of views**

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) wondered about the consistency between the survey results and the official data of EUMOFA on per kg consumption of fishery and aquaculture products, as the trends on consumption frequency did not seem to align.

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) explained that the survey showed, across the participating countries, an increase in consumption frequency between the two survey points across all species under MRLs. Nevertheless, the study did not quantitate data, only frequency. Therefore, the results should be interpreted with caution and ideally combined with other datasets. Ms Ioannidou exemplified that in countries with high consumption, such as Spain, it would be possible to combine quantitative and frequency data, allowing for some correlations.

Iñigo Azqueta (ANFACO-CYTMA) drew attention to the limitations of the study, particularly in relation to the absence of quantitative data and seasonal variations. For certain species, such as fresh tuna, which was generally available in the Summer, seasonal variations could have a significant impact on consumption. Mr Azqueta called for caution, since incomplete parameters could transmit misleading messages on consumer



perception. He recalled that, according to the latest Eurobarometer survey and the data of EUMOFA, the consumption of fishery products was declining. Therefore, he warned against unnecessary fears towards fish consumption.

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) acknowledged the mentioned concerns, adding that the limitations were explicitly addressed in the study. In accordance with the mandate provided to EFSA, the study was not meant to assess overall consumption patterns, but frequency during a specific period. The main aim was to analyse the relationship between consumption frequency and awareness of national advice on risks and benefits.

Iñigo Azqueta (ANFACO-CYTMA) commented that, while both risks and benefits were covered, discussions on fish consumption tended to emphasise the risks.

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) highlighted that the survey showed that consumers were increasingly aware of the benefits of consuming fishery products.

Christine Absil (Good Fish) recalled that consumption advice encouraged the consumption of species with more benefits, such as small pelagic species, so she wanted to know if the consumption of these species had evolved. Ms Absil wanted to know whether transparency and awareness raising on the risks and benefits had a positive impact on the consumption of fishery and aquaculture products. In her view, increased transparency and awareness were beneficial. Nevertheless, there were operators concerned that increased information on the risks could negatively impact consumption.

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) explained that consumption advice, due to the accumulation of mercury, usually called for avoidance of predatory species and the consumption of smaller species. Within the limited timeframe of the study, the frequency data showed increases in consumption across all species, including anchovies and sardines. Ms Ioannidou informed that several Member States were planning updates to the consumption advice. Some Member States were afraid of aversive impacts on fish consumption. Member States needed to consider the corresponding national consumption levels and the consumption patterns. For examples, Member States with very low consumption of fishery products might not want to emphasise the risks. In her view, communication on risks and benefits needed to be balanced. For that purpose, it was important to involve social scientists.

María Luisa Álvarez Blanco (FEDEPESCA) expressed concern about the potential impact of the communication of the study's results via the media. In her experience, when the media publishes about risks, consumption significantly decreases for at least one week. Ms Álvarez expressed support for transparency, but added that the impact on sales should also be acknowledged. She exemplified that, when the Spanish national agency published their advice on mercury contamination, fishmongers faced one month of intense media scrutiny. When media articles were published on the risks of *Pangasius* fish, there was an impact on the sales of all fishery products.

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) acknowledged the issues raised by Ms Álvarez. Ms Ioannidou informed that EFSA was monitoring the information shared in the media across the EU. The media tended to emphasise more the risks, as it attracted more readers / viewers. She underscored the importance of science-based guidance information for public authorities to communicate effectively. Data should be made available via experts,



including nutritionists and doctors, and via official websites, so that consumers can have access to accurate and contextualised information.

Esther Garrido (FAO) highlighted that the FAO and the World Health Organisation had recently published a study on the risks and benefits of fish consumption. New data showed that the interaction between selenium and mercury was important for the health outcomes. Some caution was needed, since the referenced studies came from only one research group. Ms Garrido wanted to know how the mentioned research could be follow-up by EFSA and guide consumption. She added that messages on risks disseminated more easily, but that information on benefits could also have an impact on consumption.

Sofia Ioannidou (EFSA) informed that EFSA received a new mandate from the European Commission to study the risks and benefits of seafood consumption, which would take into account the study mentioned by Ms Garrido. Ms Ioannidou emphasised that scientific work would continue to support better understanding and guidance on the consumption of fishery products.

The Secretary General recalled that, in March 2026, the MAC adopted advice to the European Commission asking for further studies of the relationship between selenium and mercury. According to the response provided by the Commission, the new EFSA study would be published by 31 December 2027.

Food Fraud (FAO)

- **Presentation of the FAO's publication "Food Fraud in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector" by Esther Garrido Gamarro (FAO)**

Presentation

Esther Garrido Gamarro (FAO) presented the main findings of a recent FAO report on food fraud in the fisheries and aquaculture sector. Ms Garrido recalled the definition of food fraud as a deliberate act aimed at deceiving consumers for economic gain and stressed its particular relevance in the fisheries sector, given its complexity, the large number of species traded, and the global nature of supply chains. The estimated probability of fraud in this sector is around 21%, which is significantly higher than for other food products.

Ms Garrido explained that the most common types of fraud are species substitution and mislabelling, which occur at all stages of the value chain, and are particularly prevalent towards the final stages where traceability becomes more difficult. Several studies were presented to illustrate the scale of the issue, including evidence that around one-third of seafood in mass catering in the EU is mislabelled, that fraud affected 43% of samples in Peru, and that misidentification rates reached over 75% in some studies conducted in China. A global study was also cited showing that approximately one in five seafood samples tested worldwide were mislabelled.

Ms Garrido further explained that food fraud encompasses a wider range of practices, including adulteration, counterfeiting, simulation, diversion, misbranding, and theft. These practices are often motivated by price differentials between species, creating financial incentives for operators to substitute higher-value products with cheaper alternatives.



Ms Garrido underscored the potential food safety implications of fraud, noting that certain practices, such as adulteration or substitution, can expose consumers to health risks. Examples include the use of substances like carbon monoxide to improve the appearance of fish or substitutions with species containing toxins or higher levels of contaminants such as mercury.

Ms Garrido highlighted that, to address the described challenges, the report lists a range of tools and approaches for authorities and stakeholders, including improved use of taxonomy, traceability systems, standards (such as the Codex Alimentarius), legislative frameworks, and analytical methods such as DNA-based techniques. She stressed the importance of strengthening capacity across countries, particularly as the identification of species remains complex, with over 36,000 finfish species described globally.

Ms Garrido emphasised that addressing food fraud requires a coordinated effort across the value chain, including stronger traceability systems, improved analytical capacity, and greater awareness among both authorities and industry. She also informed members of ongoing FAO work, including the development of dedicated tools and upcoming outreach activities, such as a webinar scheduled on 18 June 2026, aimed at further engaging stakeholders on this issue.

Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation

- **Update on the limit values for PFAS in food-contact packaging by Ioannis Antonopoulos (ENV B1)**

Ioannis Antonopoulos (DG ENV) presented the state of play regarding the implementation of Article 5 of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation, which foresees restrictions for PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) in food-contact packaging. Mr Antonopoulos recalled that the regulation establishes the legal framework for PFAS, with a key milestone set for 12 August 2026, after which food-contact plastic packaging containing PFAS above the limits established in Article 5 of the PPWR will no longer be allowed on the EU market.

Mr Antonopoulos explained that the Commission was working to support the practical implementation of these requirements. A dedicated task force, composed of Member States and Commission experts, including from the Joint Research Centre, was established to develop a credible and harmonised methodology for compliance assessment to be applicable across the EU. In the preceding month, a dedicated meeting was organised to inform Member States about the steps required to implement the envisaged methodology, while further discussions took place within an expert group meeting on 20 May 2026. He indicated that the main reference document for the time being is the guidance published on 30 March 2026. He stressed that market surveillance authorities at national level would be responsible for verifying compliance with PFAS limits.

Mr Antonopoulos acknowledged that challenges remained, in particular due to the absence of a fully harmonised methodology. However, the Commission has outlined in the published guidance an approach for PFAS testing/measurement.



Mr Antonopoulos highlighted the close cooperation between DG ENV, DG SANTE, industry stakeholders and Member States aimed at ensuring a consistent and operational implementation across the EU. Work within the task force and expert networks would continue in the following months to finalise the methodology and support harmonised enforcement.

- **Exchange of views**

Patrick Murphy (IS&WFPO) referred to a presentation delivered at the North Western Waters Advisory Council on contamination from plastics. In the case of samples of molluscs products, molluscs in a cooker showed a higher concentration of PFAS than in the water. Mr Murphy wondered about the robustness of the science underpinning the policy, including the testing of the water. He exemplified that, in the case of cucumbers, plastic packaging was useful to preserve shelf life. Therefore, the sector could be facing disproportionate constraints in comparison with the risks.

Ioannis Antonopoulos (DG ENV) responded that the aim was to proceed with the implementation of existing legal obligations, adding that the provisions of Article 5 were not put forward by the Commission. Mr Antonopoulos explained testing was a pre-requisite for the placing of packaging in the market. Operational details would still need to be clarified; however, the guidance published on 30 March remained the reference document. With regards to testing, it might be that economic operators would not have to test every packaging but rather a representative sampling.

Tamas Eisenbeck (Seafood Europe) highlighted that the regulation did not distinguish between international and non-intentional presence of PFAS. Mr Eisenbeck wanted to know the type of documentation that suppliers would need to demonstrate compliance, including whether additional analysis would be required.

Ioannis Antonopoulos (DG ENV) emphasised that the obligations applied to packaging to be placed on the market, including compliance with the PFAS limits. The requirements applied to the packaging unit. The regulation did not distinguish between international or non-international presence. Instead, a risk-based assessment was considered. It would be up to the competent authorities to verify compliance.

Adrien Simonnet (UMF) expressed concern about the lack of harmonisation, particularly on the responsibilities of Member States, which could arise due to different legal interpretations. Mr Simonnet argued that the French authorities were not recognising the guidelines published by the Commission.

Ioannis Antonopoulos (DG ENV) stated that he took note of the mentioned issue. Mr Antonopoulos emphasised that the Commission was continuously holding meetings, including via the task force, with the Member States to promote harmonisation.

Linne Verhoeven (Seafood Europe) recalled that Article 39.8 of the regulation required a declaration of conformity. Ms Verhoeven asked whether a standardised EU template would be published, expressing



concerns about the risk of duplication and increased administrative burden. She wanted to know about the legal requirements on packages placed on the market before the deadline, particularly differentiating between empty and filled packages.

Ioannis Antonopoulos (DG ENV) informed that the European Commission would not be providing a template. The annex of the regulation provided a general layout. Mr Antonopoulos recalled that the issue of previous stock was addressed in the guidance document issued by the Commission. The decisive criterion is when the product is placed on the market, not whether it is empty or full.

Hommel Kasa (SNCE) wanted to know, for importers, what stage did the deadline apply, particularly whether it was the moment that the product is made and imported or when it is placed on the market.

Ioannis Antonopoulos (DG ENV) clarified that the relevant criterion is the moment of placing on the EU market, not the moment of manufacturing.



Summary of action points

- Contaminants (Chlordecone)
 - o Joint draft advice on measures to address contamination to be developed with the Outermost Regions Advisory Council (CCRUP).



Attendance list

Representative	Organisation	Role
Adrien Simonnet	UMF	Member
Alen Lovrinov	PRODUCER ORGANIZATION OMEGA 3	Member
Alexandre Bonneau	SNCE	Member
Alonso Abreu	ASOCIACIÓN DE ARMADORES DE PUNTA DEL MORAL	Member
Amandine MENU	PACT'ALIM	Member
Anna Rokicka	POLISH ASSOCIATION OF FISH PROCESSORS	Member
Aodh O'donnell	IRISH FISH PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION (IFPO)	Member
Benoît Thomassen	FEAP	Chair
Bertrand Charron	AQUACULTURE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL (ASC)	Member
Christine Absil	GOOD FISH	Member
Corine Vroom	VISFEDERATIE	Member
Cristina Borges	PORTUGAL	Observer
Daniel Voces De Onaindi	EUROPÊCHE	Member
Dominic Rihan	KFO	Member
Emiel Brouckaert	EAPO	Member
Esther Garrido Gamarro	FAO	Expert
Eva Siegenger	EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Expert
Gerd Heinen	EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Expert
Hommel Kassa	SNCE	Member
Iñigo Azqueta	ANFACO	Member
India Kennedy	IRISH FISH PRODUCERS ORGANISATION (IFPO)	Member
Ioannis Antonopoulos	EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Expert
Isabel Alonso Cabezas	SPAIN	Observer
Javier Ojeda	FEAP	Member
Jean-Marie Robert	LES PÊCHEURS DE BRETAGNE	Member
Jens Høj Mathiesen	DANISH SEAFOOD ASSOCIATION	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
João Pereira	FRUCOM	Member
John Lynch	ISEFPO (IRISH SOUTH & EAST FISH PRODUCER ORGANISATION)	Member
José Carlos Escalera Aguilar	FECOPESCA	Member
Jose Basilio Otero Rodriguez	FEDERACION NACIONAL DE COFRADIAS DE PESCADORES	Member
Juan Manuel Trujillo	ETF	Member
Jules Danto	EAPO	Member
Julien Daudu	EJF	Member
Julien Lamothe	ANOP	Member
Katarina Sipic	SEAFOOD EUROPE	Member
Linda Zanki Duvnjak	RZ FRISKA RIBA P.O.	Member
Linne Verhoeven	SEAFOOD EUROPE	Member
Luís Sousa	ALIF	Member
María Luisa Álvarez Blanco	FEDEPESCA	Member
Maria Tabernero	EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Expert
Mariano García García	FEDERACION ANDALUZA DE COFRADIAS DE PESCADORES	Member
Martin Van Brakel	COLEAD	Observer
Matthew Gréant	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION (EJF)	Member
Monika Kołodziejczyk	POLAND	Observer
Nicolas Fernández Muñoz	OPP72	Member
Pablo Cadarso Rebolledo	CONXEMAR	Member
Patrick Murphy	IRISH SOUTH & WEST FISH PRODUCERS ORGANISATION	Member
Pedro Luis Casado Lopez	OPP80	Member
Pedro Reis Santos	MARKET ADVISORY COUNCIL	Secretariat
Pim Visser	NOVA DUTCH FISH AUCTIONS	Member
Poul Melgaard Jensen	DANISH SEAFOOD ASSOCIATION	Member
Sarah Hautier	EUROCOMMERCE	Member



Representative	Organisation	Role
Sergio Lopez Garcia	OPP PUERTO DE BURELA	Member
Sofia Ioannidou	EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY	Expert
Tamas Einsenbech	SEAFOOD EUROPE	Member
Violaine De Neef	MARKET ADVISORY COUNCIL	Secretariat
Yobana Bermudez Rodríguez	SEAFOOD EUROPE	Member

