



REPORT

JOINT RAC FOCUS GROUP MEETING ON DEEP WATER HABITATS AND SPECIES CNPMM, PARIS

Wednesday 21st of November 2012

This meeting was jointly organised and counted with the participation of four Regional Advisory Councils:

**North Western Waters RAC (NWWRAC)
Long Distance RAC (LDRAC)**

**South Western Waters RAC (SWWRAC)
North Sea RAC (NSRAC)**

Chair: Marc Ghiglia
Rapporteur: Monica Verbeek

1. Welcome and Opening

The Focus Group Chair, Marc Ghiglia, opened the meeting at 09:30 h.
The Chair welcomed all participants and speakers and invited them to introduce themselves.
The full list of participants is included as Annex I of the report.
The latest version of the agenda was adopted.

MORNING SESSION (9:30-13:00)

2. Presentation of the DEEPFISHMAN Project

Pascal Lorance (IFREMER - France), project coordinator, presented the EU FP7 DEEPFISHMAN project on management and monitoring of deep-sea fisheries and stocks.

The presentation can be found at:

http://www.nwwrac.org/admin/publication/upload/DEEPFISHMAN_RACs_21Nov2012.pdf

The main conclusions presented include:

- Definition of deep-water fish species: species with more than 50% of the biomass distributed deeper than 200 m. This definition matches well with Annex I and II of the current regulation 2347/2002, though species like conger and ling are not deep sea species according to this definition and should be deleted, while other species should be included.
- Deep sea stocks are not all data poor, and there are a wide range of data poor situations.
- Several stock assessment methods (many of them new innovative ones) were developed or adapted for various DEEPFISHMAN case studies, resulting in estimates of fishing mortality and absolute biomass for 4 stocks, and already used in ICES advice for 5 stocks.



- Not all assessments methods require survey data.
- Spatial analysis complements stock assessments. In this context, an example of trade-off analysis for fisheries management was given for blue ling, looking at blue ling fisheries on aggregations versus fishing more spread spatially. Fishing on aggregations results in much less by catch of deep sea sharks as compared to more spread out fisheries, but can wipe out a population in the absence of TAC or TAC set too high, i.e. the biomass level is unknown.

More information about results and follow-up of the project can be found on <http://deepseafishman.hafro.is/>

The presentation was followed by an exchange of views with the stakeholders present. The importance of this new definition of deep sea fish was highlighted by several stakeholders. The suitability of the new definition for areas where the shelf is very narrow was questioned, and Dr. Lorance indicated that the definition still has to be tested in some of these areas. The fact that survey data are not required by all newly developed assessment methods (e.g. for roundnose grenadier and blue ling) was highlighted, and Dr. Lorance explained that these new methods are integrated in ICES advice. The secretary of the NWWRAC posed a question about the possibility for ICES or STEFC to take preliminary outcomes into account of the assessment of seasonal closures for blue ling spawning aggregations in VIa. However, because the closures were introduced at the same time as the TAC reductions, and because fishing vessels are still allowed to fish on spawning concentrations, i.e. a vessel may fish in the protected areas until to catch 6 tons of blue ling, the conclusions are not very clear.

3. Presentation of the CORALFISH Project

Anthony Grehan (NUI Galway - Ireland), project coordinator, presented the EU FP7 CoralFISH project, which assesses the interaction between cold water corals, fish and fisheries, in order to develop monitoring and predictive modelling tools to identify cold water corals for ecosystem based management in the deep waters of Europe and beyond.

The project used acoustics and video to produce a high resolution map with the geomorphology of the Bay of Biscay. The maps were done using GIS to enable the extrapolation of results from canyons to other areas. The project also developed habitat suitability modelling, based on distribution data for coral species and environmental data, to map the hotspots and areas that need special attention for larger areas. It also developed a risk assessment method. By overlaying the maps produced through this modelling with maps identifying fishing activities through VMS data, a risk assessment can be carried out on known and potential areas with VMEs where fisheries take place (or not). Especially high resolution suitability models, based on high resolution multibeam bathymetry mapping at local scale are needed to capture smaller, ecologically important reefs and areas without reefs in the mapping exercise. Such high resolution suitability models can be a support tool for decisions on area closures. An example was given of areas that were closed to fishing in Icelandic waters to protect lophelia reefs. In that area much fishing was going on. Fishers then provided high resolution VMS data, allowing the managers to modify the boundaries of the closed areas in a way that did not affect fishing and still protected corals.

Recommendations include:

- Improve quality of and access to VMS data to define the fishing footprint.
- Improve mapping tools: use multi-beam data for the mapping of the seabed.



- Improve the management of VMEs; harmonise the EU impact assessments with the FAO guidelines (considered as best practice) and implement these also within the EU EEZ (and not just on the high seas).
- Develop a «one stop shop» with shared dynamic system for Geographical Information Systems integrating data, including on natural resources and socio-economic impacts, to allow deepwater maritime spatial planning. The Green Paper on Marine Knowledge 2020 should provide the basis for this, and the importance of EMODNET for this shared database was highlighted.

More information and results can be found on www.eu-fp7-coralfish.net

The presentation was followed by an exchange of views with the stakeholders present. Issues discussed included the relation between habitats and biomass which is difficult to assess and the impact of the different fisheries, where Dr. Grehan highlighted that trawling is by far the most damaging activity, referring to the complete destruction of coral reefs between 300-500 m in the Irish orange roughy fisheries, compared to long lining that damaged 1-2% of soft corals in the Azores – long lining is 70-130 times less destructive. Gillnetting results in an ongoing effect of ghost fishing by lost nets in coral areas. Several fisheries representatives emphasised the importance of mapping VMEs to allow continuation of fishing and conservation of VMEs. Given that VMS data have their limitations, the question arose if plotter data from fishers together with VMS data would provide a precise tool to define where fishing activities take place and a collaborative approach between fishers and scientists was suggested. Dr. Grehan mentioned that in STEFC meetings it is often clear that closures are not effective and when asked he delineated several reasons: sometimes the boundaries are not in the right place, but also due to derogations that undermine the closure, for example in the Irish sea there was a closure to protect cod while beam trawling for prawns with cod by catch was allowed; in an area closed to bottom trawling, pelagic trawling was still allowed but this gear can also fish very deep and disturb habitats, making it impossible to see how closure benefits stock recovery – main problem is often that the objective of the closed area is not clearly defined.

An industry representative from Finistère-Brittany explained that he had collated data on fishing activities of the French industry and offered Dr. Grehan to share these data and collaborate. Dr. Grehan indicated he was open to include the French data in the mapping of French fishing activities and proposed a date for a meeting in Brest.

4. Presentation of projects on Seabed mapping for the protection of VMEs in the high seas

Pablo Durán (IEO - Spain) presented four multidisciplinary seabed mapping projects that contributed to the management of deep sea fisheries in the high seas of the Atlantic:

- ECOVUL/ARPA, a pilot study of an area of 19,000 km² on the Hatton Bank in the NE Atlantic by Spain (2005-08);
- NEREIDA, a study of an area of 69,000 km² in the NW Atlantic area by Spain, Canada, UK and Russia (2009-10);
- ATLANTIS, a study of an area of 59,000 km² in the SW Atlantic by Spain (2007-2010); and
- RAP-Sur, a study of an area of 15,800 km² in the SE Atlantic by Spain and Namibia (2008-10).

The presentation can be found at:

www.nwwrac.org/admin/publication/upload/IEO_Spanish_Mapping_Programs_HighSeas_RACs_21Nov12.pdf



The main conclusions presented included:

- The programmes have resulted in the identification of VMEs within the NEAFC and NAFO Regulatory Areas (as well as within other high seas) and in the adoption of area closures to protect these VMEs against significant adverse impacts in accordance with paragraph 119b of UNGA resolution 64/72 from 2009 on the Hatton Bank (NEAFC and EC: 16,000 km²), the Grand Banks, Flemish Pass & Flemish Cap (NAFO: 8,500 km²), and in the SW Atlantic (Spain: 41,000 km²).
- Some nations are making efforts to compile information with the aim to feed the new international databases on VME indicators (e.g.: 2012 ICES coral/sponges Database; NAFO coral/sponges Database).
- By catch data (coral and sponges) are insufficient to produce the advice about closed areas: fishing effort (e.g. VMS), mapping data (e.g. multibeam), surveys and “absence” data are also recommended.

There were no questions or discussions after the presentation.

5. Presentation of the HERMIONE project

Dr. Phil Weaver (NOC Southampton), project coordinator, presented the EU FP7 HERMIONE project on deep sea ecosystems and their goods and services, and the impact of human activities on the seabed. The presentation can be found at http://www.nwwrac.org/admin/publication/upload/HERMIONE_results_RACs_21Nov2012.pdf

The main study areas were in the North East Atlantic (OSPAR areas) below 200m. An impact study of human activities in 2005 (research, cables, chemical weapons, radioactive waste, oil and gas industry, bottom trawling) on the seabed showed that even the most conservative estimate of the impact of bottom trawling (expressed in km² seabed affected) was more than the total impact of all other human activities combined.

Impacts of deep sea fishing were studied by comparing scientific trawl results before (1977-1989) and after (1997-2002) deep-sea fishing started in ICES sub area VII (b,c,j and k). Total abundance of the target species orange roughy, roundnose grenadier and black scabbard fell from 25,000 fish per square kilometre before fishing started to 7,225 fish per square kilometre after fishing started, with fishing effects evident to a depth of over 3000 m even though the maximum fishing depth was 1500 m. The latter is due to the fact that by catches occur of all 78 fish species that appear in the depth range of the fishery at 500-1500 m, but that also live at greater depths, thus impacting an area 2.74 times the fishing area.

Key points of the presentation included:

- At present deep sea bottom trawling has a greater impact on ecosystems than all other marine activities combined.
- Deep sea fisheries have a disproportionate impact on non-target species and affect areas outside of the fished area.
- The deep sea is poorly known but new scientific data consistently shows it is very complex and often slow to recover from human impact.
- Scientific research is very expensive and until recently has not focussed on fisheries issues, but can provide critical information.

More information and results can be found at <http://www.eu-hermione.net>



The presentation was followed by an exchange of views with the stakeholders present. Several industry representatives questioned the impact study of deep sea fisheries comparing scientific trawl data, pointing out that on the Porcupine Seabight deep fisheries at 500 m already started before 1989. Weaver explained that the results presented combined data of several areas, not just the Porcupine Seabight that while some fishing might already have taken place early it was certainly at much lower levels, there was still a very stark contrast between low fishing intensity in the first period and high fishing intensity in the second period. Weaver added it did not really matter as the point he wanted to make was that the total area impacted by fisheries is much larger than the fishing area. Another question was if besides a reduction in abundance of fish there was also a decrease in biodiversity. Dr. Weaver indicated that there was no loss of species, though an NGO representative noted that many species impacted by fisheries are long-lived, so the time span of 15 years of the study is too short to tell the long term impact on species and the overall impact on the community structure. He also noted it would be interesting to see how closed areas are doing since the closure, mentioning the potential for recovery of long lived species or habitats where fishing has already incurred within the footprint.

Dr. Weaver indicated that the area closures were too recent to be able to measure recovery: there was no re-growth of corals in the 7-8 years that the Darwin Mounds are closed. Highlighting the difference between impacts of trawling versus long lining, the NGO representative asked about the possibility to shift from trawling to longlining for some species. Weaver indicated that a recent article by Morato with data of the Azores made an economic comparison between longlining and trawling, showing that due to less fuel use, better quality fish and higher level of employment longlining performed better economically.

Regarding the study comparing impacts of all human activities it was noted that data from 2005 were used, when the UNGA resolution on protection of VMEs was not yet implemented and areas with VMEs were not yet closed to bottom trawling, questioning whether the situation today will not give an entirely different result. Weaver agreed that things have changed since 2005, e.g. deep sea mining has increased, but stressed that the scale of difference in impact between bottom trawling and all other human activities will remain the same, especially given that the minimum impact of trawling was presented due to lack of VMS data. Mr. Durán and several industry representatives pointed out that the study comparing impacts of human activities used the spatial extend of such activities on the seabed (km^2) as the only impact indicator, not including the quality of the impact – therefore a radioactive area of 1 m^2 would be considered less impact than a trawl area of 1000 km^2 . But to compare the impacts of different activities it is necessary to know both the spatial extent and the quality of the impact. Dr. Weaver confirmed that the study did not include the quality of the impact, but measured the footprint of the human activities on the seabed in one year in terms of area of the seabed physically disturbed, as there was only little time and money for the study. He agreed it would be good to also add data on impacts on the water column.

In answer to the question whether Dr. Weaver was in favour of banning trawling at a certain depth in general or by area, protecting sites with VMEs, he noted that there are two problems with deep-sea trawling: 1) the large by-catch and the vulnerability of deep sea species which allows only a low level of catches to ensure sustainability; and 2) the impact on VMEs. Identifying areas with VMEs is very difficult and expensive, and once identified and closed you still have by catch problems. This sparked the statement of an industry representative that one needs to look at trade-offs, highlighting that if many fishing activities would be banned, other production methods need to be increased which could also have an environmental impact.



6. Towards an enhanced collaboration between scientists and stakeholders to achieve a balance between the protection of vulnerable ecosystems and habitats and a sustainable exploitation of the deep-sea stocks

The chair suggested that several points on collaboration were already raised after each presentation, and invited the rapporteur to summarise and come up with suggestions.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE MORNING SESSION

Key points of the presentations picked up by the rapporteur were that DEEPFISHMAN had come up with a definition of deep-sea fish: those species with 50% of the biomass below 200m, which was largely in line with the current Annex I and II of the regulation. The project had shown that also for data limited stocks assessments are possible. CORALFISH showed that through modelling and fine tuning with VMS data it is possible to identify areas with corals (and possibly also other VMEs) and where to close areas to reduce the impact of fishing on those corals. In the projects presented by Duran, scientists actually went out to identify and designate areas with VMEs which resulted in closures. And HERMIONE clearly showed that bottom trawling has impacts on bottom habitats as well as on many deep-sea fish species through high by catch levels, and that these impacts are much wider and deeper than expected.

Both rapporteur and chair concluded from the presentations and discussions that there are still gaps in knowledge, and invited the scientists to consider specific requests for collaboration with the RACs. They suggested that with the upcoming discussions it could be useful to give more publicity to the results of the different research projects and send summary reports or conclusions to the relevant policy makers.

LUNCH BREAK (13:45-14:30 h)

AFTERNOON SESSION (14:30-17:00 h)

7. Presentation on the MPA process in UK and Scotland

Tom Blasdale (JNCC) presented the state of the MPA process in UK and Scotland, highlighting that this will be of interest for the NWWRAC in the near future.

For the Natura 2000 process the UK has notified five new Natura2000 sites to the Commission, all in Scottish offshore waters, of which three in deep waters: Hatton Bank, outside Rockall and Anton Dohn. JNCC does not expect to notify more sites as they consider the obligations for SACs in offshore waters are now fulfilled. The next step is to recommend appropriate fisheries management measures for the marine Natura2000 sites to the Commission. To this end JNCC plans to have meetings and get scientists, regulators and industry stakeholders together, share data and come up with management measures that have least impact on the industry but still protect the site. JNCC wants to invite the RACs, if possible the actual fishers, in the hope they can share as much data as possible (plotter, VMS etc.) to explore areas where fisheries can coexist with conservation. Dr. Blasdale will contact the NWWRAC early 2013 to align these meetings with the RAC.



In addition, there are national UK designations both in England and Scotland to fulfil the obligation under OSPAR and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive to establish an ecologically coherent network of Marine Protected Areas, representative of species and habitats. These include not only VMEs but also sand, gravel and mud of which the impact on fishing activities is likely to be much lower. For the UK sites there will be consultations next year as well as pre-consultation meetings with the NWWRAC.

The chair asked if the JNCC has a map with the different habitats of the British waters and if it can be disseminated to stakeholders. Dr Blasdale indicated they do not have a multibeam map of their EEZ like the Irish government has, but a GIS data base containing points of information and modelled information in between those points (he will check with his institute if the data base can be shared) but expects it can be made public.

One industry representative noted that for data to be used well the system has to be receptive to change if that change can be substantiated. His experience with JNCC was that 15 years of industry data on the East Rockall bank that was provided with the suggestion to adjust a closed area to still allow for fishing was ignored. Dr Blasdale indicated that management measures for the area will be discussed and perhaps fishing can be allowed in parts of the site.

8. Presentation on the state of the deep sea stocks

Tom Blasdale (chair of ICES WGDEEP) also presented the ICES advice on deep sea TACs for 2013-2014.

The presentation can be found at:

http://www.nwwrac.org/admin/publication/upload/ICES_Advice_Deepwater_Species_RACs_21Nov2012.pdf

Dr Blasdale explained the MSY framework for the advice and within that context the ICES approach to data limited stocks. He gave examples of the application of this approach for various stocks of haddock, black scabbard, ling, roundnose grenadier and orange roughy, as well as a summary of the ICES single stock advice for the different regions and stocks.

The presentation was followed by several questions. One question concerned the interaction between ICES working groups WGDEEP (deep sea fisheries) and WGDEC (deep sea ecosystems), and Dr Blasdale indicated that contacts are limited, but a benchmark workshop for Celtic seas deep water systems is proposed for 2014 on the wider ecosystem impacts of fisheries.

An NGO representative asked if ICES is planning to provide advice in the near future for the around 20-30 species on Annex I and II and the NEAFC deep sea list for which currently no advice is provided. Dr Blasdale indicated that stock assessments are dictated by the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) of ICES and the Commission, but it is periodically reviewed so it could be included in future advice. The DEEPFISHMAN project recommended a list of species to be included into the advice which will be taken up by ICES and the Commission.

Several questions by NGO representatives concerned the ICES advice of a 77% increase of TAC for roundnose grenadier in areas VI, VII, XII even though the biomass is close to $MSY_{Btrigger}$ and the presentations of today clearly indicated that with such increase the impacts on a wide range of other deep sea species of which the status is unknown will also increase. Also the advice of an increase for black scabbard was questioned given that it was based on 2012 data when the catches were much higher than the landings and the TAC was overshot.



Dr Blasdale explained that the TAC of 2000 tonnes for black scabbard was set for EU waters, while the catch of 3000 tonnes included Faroese waters where the black scabbard catches had increased substantially – this was incorporated in the advice. Lorange stated that the TAC increase for roundnose grenadier was not a real increase but mainly due to changes in areas. Dr Blasdale added that ICES is recommending increases in TACs but the level of fishing is still much lower than the level of fishing 10 years ago, so the footprint of the fishery will be increased but from a very low level.

An NGO representative highlighted the problem of single stock advice for a mixed fishery with a high level of by catch of vulnerable species, which has become more acute now that ICES has increased possibilities to provide (single stock) advice. Dr Blasdale indicated that at the moment the ICES advice is single stock due to the MoU with its clients. On by catch species he noted that a decrease in the general fish community of 70% from pre-exploitation levels tallies well with the work they did on exploited species. The EU target is exploitation at MSY levels which correspond to about 50% of virgin levels. Data he has indicate that for many species the mark was overshoot and catches need to be reduced to recover the stock – the stocks are now at a stage where they are showing recovery. He expected by catch species to show the same levels of decline.

9. Commission's proposal on the deep sea fisheries access regime

The chair noted that there was only one hour left and proposed to skip the Commission's presentation of the proposal for the access regime, assuming all stakeholders present were familiar with the proposal. He invited the participants to ask the Commission representative (Mr. Nieto-Conde) questions and to keep them brief.

The first question by a Spanish industry representative was whether article 9 of the proposal (the trawl ban) was really needed. Mr. Nieto-Conde answered that there will be a debate with the European Parliament to see to what extent the proposal can be amended, but that for the time being the Commission did not envisage changes of the basic elements of the proposal such as article 9.

When asked why the Commission did not present the proposal for the revised access regime in the LDRAC in May 2012 when they were invited to do so, Mr. Nieto-Conde said he was not sure and noted the protest. He pointed out that the current regulation in force contains an obligation to review the framework in 2005, which was done in 2007 when the Commission identified the failings of the current system. In 2009, the drafting of the proposal was started and the RACs were consulted at the time. The secretary of the SWWRAC pointed out that given the presentations of the day it should be considered to change the list of species, as was also suggested by the SWWRAC in their reaction to the consultation early 2010. He wondered what happened in between, as in his opinion the proposal was very different from what the RAC was consulted on.

Another question of a French industry representative concerned the timing of the proposal: why did the Commission not wait until the DEEPFISHMAN project was ended? Mr. Nieto-Conde indicated that Commission representatives did attend DEEPFISHMAN meetings on the new methods developed to assess stocks and on management strategies and monitoring, and that results can of course be taken into account in the negotiations. DEEPFISHMAN was foreseen to end in 2012 and is not directly related to the revised management regime.

Several industry representatives questioned the consistency of the proposal and specifically article 9, wondering also whether the Commission wants to map VMEs or do away with trawling. The chair stated that the Commission never defended the prohibition of trawling but in this proposal it is defended, and wondered how the Commission sees the overall management if the proposal is adopted.



Mr. Nieto-Conde explained that article 9 states the phase out of targeted deep sea trawlers. One of the elements that came out of the consultation was the need for a better distinction between targeted deep sea fisheries and deep sea by catch. The phase out only concerns targeted deep sea trawlers and gillnetters. The aim is to protect VMEs and make fisheries more selective. This is in line with the UNGA recommendations.

Several questions and comments of industry representatives concerned the list of species in the Commission proposal, wondering what the rationale was for the list, whether species can be removed from the list if it was proved they are not occurring at very great depth, and especially questioning the disappearance of Annex II and the introduction of new species. Mr. Nieto-Conde explained that the rationale for the list was to align it with the NEAFC list of deep sea species.

Another comment concerned the use of TACs, and especially a TAC of zero which only means ignoring what happens with the species concerned – prohibiting fisheries for certain species may falsify the results due to discards. Mr. Nieto-Conde answered that it needs to be negotiated if fishing opportunities are to be set by effort only or by both effort and TACs.

The chair then noted that there was only half an hour left for discussions and proposed to have a quick exchange of views to assess common positions for a joint RAC response. He highlighted that the joint position of the North Atlantic fishing industry is that they agree they need to improve things and better protect VMEs, and that they want to keep the existing licensing system with the regulation of access by zones.

The Chair then invited an NGO representative to explain the NGO position. The NGOs agree with the Commission proposal, though have some concerns about the species listed in the proposal. When asked by the chair the NGO representative confirmed that NGOs never called for a ban on bottom trawling, but always only for a ban on deep sea bottom trawling because of the impacts on VMEs and the wider ecosystem. The NGOs support the ban. They are not clear whether the definition in article 4 (on deep sea fisheries) is the best approach and they are open to suggestions in that respect, but they find the justification of the Commission sound. There will never be sustainable deep sea bottom trawling and costs to get the information to regulate the fishery effectively is huge – the presentations of Drs. Grehan, Lorange and Weaver showed that it is expensive to regulate according to UNGA and FAO standards.

The NGO representative noted that a joint RAC position may not be possible, but that there might be elements that could be agreed on.

Dr. Grehan noted that there seemed to be a problem with the definition of deep sea – one for ecosystems and one for deep sea fish stocks, and he highlighted that the definition on VMEs is below 200m, which means that also more shallow fisheries measures need to be taken to protect VMEs that was not reflected in the proposal. He called on all stakeholders to submit responses to the green paper on marine knowledge.

A Spanish industry representative expressed his disappointment on the lack of debate at this meeting.

A debate on the possibility to come to a RAC compromise position and possible next steps followed.



10. Summary of actions points and conclusions

The chair proposed that the NGOs produce a short joint position paper on the Commission proposal, as well as the industry. The RAC secretaries will then extract common elements for a joint RAC position. This joint RAC position will be circulated to the different RACs, so that the Executive Committees of the RACs can discuss it and see if they can agree and adopt. The aim is to have a joint RAC compromise position by the end of January/early February.

The chair closed the meeting at 17:05 h.

--END--



ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Joint RAC Focus Group on Deep-sea Habitats and Species: CNPMM Paris, 21 November 2012			
NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION	CATEGORY
North Western Waters RAC			
Marc	Ghiglia	UAPF (France)	Focus Group Chairman
R��n�� Pierre	Chever	CDPMEM29 (France)	Fishing Industry
Caroline	Gamblin	CNPMEM (France)	Fishing Industry
Hugo	Gonz��lez	ANASOL-ARVI (Spain)	Fishing Industry
Jacques	Pichon	P��cheurs de Bretagne (France)	Fishing Industry
Despina	Symons	EBCD (EU)	Other Groups of Interest



Joint RAC Focus Group on Deep-sea Habitats and Species: CNPMM Paris, 21 November 2012

NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION	CATEGORY
South Western Waters RAC			
Víctor	Badiola	OPPAO-CEPESCA (Spain)	Fishing Industry
Julien	Lamothe	ANOP-PMA (France)	Fishing Industry
Carlos	Macedo	Artesanal Pesca (Portugal)	Fishing Industry
Jeronimo	Rato	AAPA (Portugal)	Fishing Industry
Francisco	Teijeira	Asoc. de Armadores de Marín (Spain)	Fishing Industry
Monica	Verbeek	Seas at Risk (EU)	Other Groups of Interest
Elise	Petre	WWF (France)	Other Groups of Interest



Joint RAC Focus Group on Deep-sea Habitats and Species: CNPMM Paris, 21 November 2012

NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION	CATEGORY
Long Distance RAC			
Antonio	Cabral	ADAPI (Portugal)	Fishing Industry
J. Manuel	Liria	FEOPE-CEPESCA (Spain)	Fishing Industry
Iván	López	AGARBA-ARVI (Spain)	Fishing Industry
J. Manuel	Trujillo	ETF (Spain-EU)	Fishing Industry
Bjorn	Stockhausen	Seas at Risk (EU)	Other Groups of Interest



Joint RAC Focus Group on Deep-sea Habitats and Species: CNPMM Paris, 21 November 2012

NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION	CATEGORY
North Sea RAC			
Barrie	Deas	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (UK)	Fishing Industry
Mike	Park	Scottish Fishermen's Federation (UK)	Fishing Industry
Francois	Hennuyer	From Nord (France)	Fishing Industry
Bruno	Leduc	UAPF (France)	Fishing Industry
Matthew	Gianni	Seas at Risk / Deepsea Conservation Coalition	Other Groups of Interest

RAC SECRETARIATS

Carlos	Aldereguía	Long Distance RAC Secretariat	LDRAC Secretariat
Benoit	Guerin	South Western Waters RAC Secretariat	SWWRAC Secretariat
Alexandre	Rodríguez	North Western Waters RAC Secretariat	NWWRAC Secretariat



INVITED EXPERTS / OBSERVERS			
Tom	Blasdale	ICES WGDEEP	Scientific Expert
Fernando	Nieto Conde	DG MARE - European Commission	EC Expert
Ramón	De la Figuera	MAGRAMA - Spanish Administration	MS Observer
Philippe	Des Granges	DPMEM - French Administration	MS Observer
Perrine	Ducloy	CNPMEM (France)	Observer
Pablo	Durán Muñoz	Instituto Español de Oceanografía (Spain)	Scientific Expert
Anthony	Grehan	NUI Galway (Ireland) - CORALFISH	Scientific Expert
Jesús	Iborra	EP Fisheries Committee Secretariat	EP Observer
Pascal	Lorance	IFREMER (France) - DEEPFISHMAN	Scientific Expert
Sidónio	Paes	Liga para a Protecao da Natureza (Portugal)	Observer
Phillip	Weaver	N.O.C. Southampton - HERMIONE	Scientific Expert



APOLOGIES			
Martin	Brebner	NSRAC Secretariat	Secretariat
J. Carlos	Corrás	Pescagalia-Arpega-Obarco	Fishing Industry
Debbie	Crockard	MSUK - Rep. Seas at Risk (UK)	Other Groups of Interest
Joao	Lopes	Fed. Associaoes Ops do Sul (Portugal)	Fishing Industry
Conor	Nolan	NWWRAC Executive Secretary	Secretariat
Jane	Sandell	Scottish Fishermen's Organisation (Scotland-UK)	Fishing Industry