

North Western Waters Advisory Council

REPORT

HORIZONTAL WORKING GROUP ON IMPLEMENTATION OF LANDING OBLIGATION (LO) [*"DISCARD BAN"*] AND TECHNICAL MEASURES

**Tuesday 25 March 2014
14:00 - 17:00**

Georges Hall, Dublin Castle

Deputy Chair:	Francis O'Donnell
Rapporteur:	Alexandre Rodríguez

1. Welcome and introductions

- Opening remarks from the Chair

In absence of Luc Corbisier, Francis O'Donnell acted as Deputy Chair. He welcomed all participants to the follow up meeting of this horizontal working group that was initiated in Dublin on September 2013. The list of participants is appended to the report.

Apologies were noted from Jacques Pichon (ANOP), Louis Morvan (FIPS-M), André Gueguen (OPOB), Victor Badiola (OPPAO), Jesús Lourido (Puerto de Celeiro S.A.), Paul Trebilcock (CFPO), John Hermse (Scallop Association) and Dominique Thomas (CME OP).

The list of participants is appended.

- Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted by consensus.

- Adoption of the report from the last meeting (Dublin, 18 September 2013)

The report was deemed a fair record of the meeting and was adopted without comments.

2. Setting the scene

2.1. Aims and objectives of this meeting

The Chair pointed it out to the attendees that the NWWAC has within its remit of work both a duty and a mandate to generate advice and evidence-based input to assist Member States in the development of a regional discard plan for mixed demersal fisheries in North Atlantic waters (VI-VII). The timeframe for consultation is quite short and the NWWAC would be expected to have its advice ready for the NWW Member States Group by this time next year (i.e. April/May 2015).

It is very important that we don't become observers in the process and work proactively as main stakeholders' advisory body within the context of regionalisation in the new CFP. The NWWAC needs still to frontload work on a number of questions such as defining the target commercial fisheries, initiatives to improve selectivity, levels of by-catches and "choke species", etc. The NWWAC will start drafting a general terms of reference and draw a clear work plan on a fishery by fishery basis, moving forward strategically in order to contribute to a meaningful consultation.

3. Implementation of landing obligation in North Western Waters

3.1. Reports on meetings and work progress in Q4 2013 and Q1 2014

- EC Seminar on CFP reform – regionalization (Brussels, 25 October 2013)

The NWWAC Chairman, Bertie Armstrong, briefly summarised the discussions held at the last EC Seminar on CFP reform (regionalization and technical measures) held on 25 October 2013. With the subsequent adoption of the CFP Regulation and entry into force on 1/1/2014 the industry has become more aware of the difficulties and size of challenges ahead in the years to come (2014-2019). Very important and substantial changes in the fleet behavior and selectivity patterns are likely to take place. Mr Armstrong added that there is no point at this stage in questioning the implementation of the landing obligation as this is enshrined in the CFP regulation.

- STECF EWG 13-17 "LO in EU fisheries II" (Dublin, 26-28 November 2013)

The NWWAC representative at the meeting, Barrie Deas, attended 2 out of 3 STECF EWG meetings held in the last 6 months on this topic. STECF (Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries) is an advisory body created by the Commission. The STECF EWG meetings are composed of a productive mix of scientists, economists, representatives of control authorities and stakeholders from the Advisory Councils.

Mr. Deas produced a detailed report which is available on the NWWAC website¹

The main conclusions reached at the meeting were:

- LO is a high political imperative which is being signed off and fishermen will have to deal with it. However, the LO may not be consistent with other long term management objectives.
- There is a need of unambiguous definitions of fisheries to help implementing landing obligations at different levels. For example, it is necessary to know what the fleet boundaries are in terms of areas fished, the number of vessels, how ship-owners and skippers define their fishing trips and access to certain exceptions.
- The European fishing industry has experience of regulations setting out perverse incentives and boundaries. It still remains to be seen what the (political) definition of high survival exemptions is and how they will be applied. STECF has drawn a set of guidelines here.

Mr. Deas also noted that all proposals of discard plans will be run past first through STECF for comment before they are adopted. This is likely to be very significant in terms of how the joint recommendations from MS will be shaped and presented and whether they will be adopted or not by the European Commission. There are also uncertainties regarding the removal of the exception to carry/retain onboard less than 50 kilos of by-catches recorded on a haul by haul basis.

This meeting overall served its purpose to advance thinking in drawing a checklist of reference points to evaluate future discard plans. STECF did not provide all the answers but will remain for foreseeable future the benchmark to measure any proposal and/or advice.

- EFCA Workshop on Control Aspects of Landing Obligation (Dubrovnik, 16 Jan 2014)

Luc Corbisier and Francis O'Donnell attended this meeting as NWWAC representatives and provided a comprehensive written report that can be downloaded on the NWWAC website².

The link between regionalisation and implementation of landing obligation is a whole new and "unknown" territory which will require a "learning by doing" exercise. There is a need to deploy observers and coordinate a sound control strategy to verify that discard plans are credible and fit for purpose.

¹

http://www.nwwac.org/fileupload/Minutes%20and%20Reports/2014/NWWAC_Report_STECF_Landings_Obligation_Dublin_Nov2013_BD_EN.pdf

²

http://www.nwwac.org/fileupload/Minutes%20and%20Reports/2014/EN_NWWAC_Summary_Report_EFCA_Seminar_Control_Landing_Obligation_Dubrovnik_16Jan2014.pdf

The Chair gave the floor to the EFCA representative, Glenn Quelch, who provided a comprehensive overview and update of the EFCA work after Dubrovnik to develop a control framework for the implementation of LO.

The presentation is available for consultation on the NWWAC website³.

There were three main recommendations presented as overarching objectives:

1. To ensure compliance with the requirements for accurate recording of discards.
2. To assist MS in the development of practical control and monitoring tools for the enforcement of the landing obligation.
3. To support the development of specific discard plans with recommendations to facilitate the controllability of the landing obligation.

The key conclusions of the Dubrovnik seminar were:

- EFCA will initiate coordinating the implementation of discard recording obligations in the framework of JDPs.
- The control would be enhanced through a combination of tools, recognizing that no one tool alone would be effective.
- A general consensus emerged on a more proactive approach towards the industry involvement, including voluntary compliance approaches.

The immediate measures the EFCA has worked on is to develop and implement a pilot project to monitor compliance with existing obligations to record discards, as well as building up information on catch composition; through the JDPs in three areas: Baltic, Western Waters and Mediterranean Sea. For the mid-term, is it envisaged to work further on risk analysis methodologies.

A mapping exercise will be carried out as it is important to understand where discards occur, what the extent in the fishery is and what the causes are. Some of the causes identified (e.g. “choke species”) will not have identifiable solutions while others may work through implementing projects in JDP (e.g. work initiated at the Baltic Sea).

The project objectives were described in detail; highlighting the tasks assigned and the expected deliverables. A roadmap and milestones for 2014 and 2015 were also explained. A matrix has been developed to be completed and used during the life of the project. Voluntary compliance and incentives linked to specific commitments of the industry on selectivity, control tools, risk management may be encouraged as a contribution to compliance. Industry involvement and buy-in is considered key for a successful implementation of a discards plan within the new results-based management CFP: the concept of “*reversing the burden of proof*” needs to be considered here.

3

http://www.nwwac.org/fileupload/Papers%20and%20Presentations/2014/EFCA_Recommendations_LO_March2014_GG.pdf

The Chairman thanked Mr. Quelch for the excellent presentation provided and opened the floor for comments.

Liane Veitch asked for more details on how to develop the concept of “*reversing the burden of proof*”. Mr. Quelch explained that rather than the traditional control structure to prove non-compliance it would be for the industry to prove or demonstrate compliance. This idea has been floating around in the air for some years but its exact extent remains to be agreed.

Kara Brydson asked if the EFCA has any defined position on how to meet the objectives to assist MS to develop management tools for NWW. Mr. Quelch replied that before choosing mitigation measures, first you need to have a clear understanding of what the issues are.

Sean O’Donoghue made a question in relation to art 15 of the new CFP Regulation in force: this provision requires that LO applies to TAC and quota species but it is not clear from a control point of view if this will mean to land all TAC and quota species only and if there is undersized species not subjected to TAC and quota they can be discarded. Mr. Quelch argued that a comprehensive mapping exercise is necessary to take place in the first Instance.

René-Pierre Chever said that he has heard a lot about new mapping initiatives and that he would be interested to know more about the existing ones. Mr. Quelch explained that a fisheries discard atlas had been published by the Marine Institute in Ireland. The meeting was informed that this would be presented this afternoon to the NWWAC.

Kara Brydson asked what voluntary compliance of the LO means. Mr. Quelch highlighted the example of participating in reference fleet schemes; these being new concepts that will require further discussions.

Thierry Lepretre asked if the risk analysis assessment mentioned for control activities is based on species or on vessels. Mr. Quelch noted that this is still to be decided but that the methodology will probably be a risk based approach based on the concept of métier.

Jane Sandell asked about the situation of the Scottish fleet on the West Coast and how the compliance evaluation will be done when there is not an adequate sampling size and to overcome this will require increased funding. Mr. Quelch replied that the Scottish fleet definition would be a decision for the competent MS. A mapping exercise would be valuable.

Barrie Deas reminded that this “big bang” approach of LO is not entirely new. The Norwegians did it over 30 years in a gradual process starting with cod; and they are still discarding but their coastguards have the flexibility and responsibility to apply the discard policy in Norwegian waters with a considerable degree of discretion.

The EU is not likely to arrive to that situation given the multiple jurisdictions and MS involved. Mr. Deas showed his concern about the fact that we have a potential problem of serious infringement in one side; and the inability to solve in due time all problems that come up in the other (e.g. removal of 50 kilos exemption). He wondered if the EFCA had any comments on this. Mr. Quelch replied that EFCA is developing some procedures for coordinating control activities: risk assessment may indicate that some areas are of higher risk than others. Attention should be paid to those high risk areas and look also at the drivers for discarding. No comments on policy issues.

Sean O'Donoghue asked if the EFCA has looked at the controllability of the “*de minimis*” provisions. Mr. Quelch replied that there is a lack of clarity on what *de minimis* may mean in practice. To develop a control strategy in this area is likely to be extremely difficult. For management plans currently under development there are proposals to be discussed under *de minimis* for the Baltic. These proposals must be straightforward and easy to control: they might work for the Baltic Sea but for other areas this remains unclear.

Emiel Brouckaert asked about EFCA views on the timeframe for implementation of LO. Mr. Quelch reminded that EFCA is assisting MS to draw up discard plans in two regional groups (BALTFISH – Baltic and Scheveningen – North Sea), but the control aspects remain unknown. The *de minimis* provisions make the development of effective control measures even more difficult. Discard plans should be flexible enough to deal with the application of the *de minimis* rules. It is for the MS Regional Groups to decide for themselves the management options they are going to propose to the Commission.

Liane Veitch advocated for the MS to assess high risk métiers in compliance with their obligations under the LO. She asked if there is any way to ensure coordination and transparency in decision making at MS level. Mr. Quelch suggested more inter-regional dialogue between MS, ACs and also neighbouring regions and a closer coordination with the Commission, which is the institution entitled to assess the effectiveness of risk management from a control perspective. The new CFP advocates for a more direct engagement of stakeholders, and there are small technical groups at regional level looking at issues involving all competent control authorities and national administrations.

3.2. Regional discards plans

- Update by DG MARE on regulatory framework and state of play

Dominic Rihan (DG MARE official) explained the ongoing work at MS regional level. Regarding the Baltic Sea, BALTFISH (MS Working Group) has discussed several drafts for a discards plan, and a pre-agreed version has been assessed by STECF in February. The thinking is well advanced but there is lack of actual level of detail in the plan (e.g. exemptions for survival, de minimis provisions...).

The Baltic Sea AC met at the end of February and went through the BALTFISH plan. A dialogue with the MS Group was established afterwards and the Commission is waiting to see what it comes from there.

In relation to the pelagic species, the Pelagic AC developed their own way of working within both the Scheveningen North Sea MS Group and the NWW Group. A full proposal of a discards plan is expected within matter of weeks but for the time being more development in terms of specifics and in the definition of possible exceptions.

In the case of the Mediterranean, there is dialogue between Italian, Slovenian and Croatian administrations for the Adriatic pelagic species. Preliminary discussions have taken place between France and Spain for the Gulf of Lion. Most of the discussion has centered on defining a de minimis exemption for the pelagic fisheries. However, it is not clear as yet whether MS will submit any joint recommendations.

In terms of way forward, the concerned Member States will need to submit a joint recommendation for the relevant fisheries by June 2014 so the Commission has at least 6 months to put this in place the delegated acts to enact the joint recommendations into law in time for the landing obligation entering into force on 1/1/2015.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Rihan for the update and opened the floor.

Emiel Brouckaert asked what would happen if the joint recommendations are not submitted in due time or are rejected by the Commission. Mr. Rihan replied that, being that the case, the Commission would have the possibility to adopt by own initiative *de minimis* rules. However, there is a high chance that something is going to come soon and Commission is prepared to look at it. He also pointed that there is a legal commitment that *de minimis* implementing rules should come into force before the discards plan are approved.

Barrie Deas reflected about the role of STECF in approving discards plans. This work would be quite critical in regionally cooperating Member States as it provides scientific and economic evaluation for discard plans.

In view of this, both MS and ACs should try to frontload work as much as possible. If STECF does not validate a discards plan, there might need to go to a different forum (not sure what) and will get into the political arena.

Dominic Rihan reminded that discard plans are composed of 5 elements:

1. Definition of fisheries
2. Survival exemptions
3. De minimis justifications
4. Minimum Reference Conservation Sizes
5. Control and compliance aspects

Miquel Ortega wondered that if there is an agreement between concerned MS, will these plans be presented to the Commission by each of the national governments or will there be a joint approval collectively by the MS Group. Mr. Ortega also asked what are the implications on the LO of the delay by the EP in adopting the “Omnibus Regulation” until next mandate. Dominic Rihan replied that joint recommendations should be submitted jointly by the MS Group. The Mediterranean regulation talk about national management plans but it might be regarded as special case.

Regarding the Omnibus Regulation, it does not have necessary implications for the discard plans. Even if the Omnibus Regulation is not in place the 1/1/2015, the LO will enter into force.

Sean O’Donoghue asked if tuna will be included for consideration within the remit of work of the NWWAC in relation to discard plans. Dr. Rihan replied that tuna is not meant to be included here but it is for the external dimension of the CFP. Where there is a clear obligation to discard in the RFMO then that obligation must continue to apply and the Commission must derogate any rule clashing, as international rules prevail over EU rules. If nothing is mentioned about discarding, then the LO may apply in those circumstances.

Sean O’Donoghue pointed that it means that EU vessels and international vessels will work under different rules in a same fishery. Art 15.2 specifically put the *onus* on the Commission under international obligations at ICCAT: it is up to the Commission to transpose and implement that into EC rule. He showed concerns about some tuna (albacore tuna) fisheries being caught in North West Waters (VI-VII).

Mr Rihan said that a study has been commissioned to identify all international obligations stem from RFMO and SPA legally binding agreements.

Francis O’Donnell asked if Channel Sprat and Argentine VI-VII stocks would be included in the discard plans for pelagic species. Mr. Rihan replied that this topic was raised at the Scheveningen Group (North Sea) but there is no indication whether these fisheries will be included or not.

ACTIONS:

This Horizontal Working Group agreed to put in place an action plan about how to develop regional discard plans for mixed demersal fisheries in NWW (ICES VI-VII). These plans will be brought down to the four existing Working Groups. The NWWAC will adapt the Pelagic AC template and structure in combination with the 5 elements described by Mr. Rihan.

The NWWAC will seek to organize, where feasible, a/some steering group/s composed of 10-12 members (namely WG Chairs, key scientists and fishing industry representatives, and eNGOs) for each relevant fishery.

The NWWAC will look at compiling fisheries/discards information and looking at potential management measures for Channel (VIId) Sprat and Argentine VI-VII. The aim is to be able to provide a document/advice to the NWW MS group before the joint recommendation is issued.

- New “De Minimis” Regulation replacing Regulation No 875/2007
This consultation was inserted here by error and was not dealt with.
- Pelagic Advisory Council – Example of document structure for a discard plan

Sean O’Donoghue introduced this topic. The outline of contents agreed by the PelAC could be uniformly used, if agreed, for all Advisory Council.

The outline is the following:

1. Introduction: biology, stock size and distribution, management, catch data...
2. Fisheries data: area, gear type, mesh size, vessel type and number, season, tonnes caught (by country);
3. Existing discard data (ICES, STECF);
4. Discard measures in place: official and industry initiatives (both mandatory and voluntary);
5. Problems and solutions;
6. New requirements of the CFP, implementation of discard measures, incentives (13 points or sections here in art. 15.2, difficult interpretation);
7. Implementation and control and enforcement;
8. Conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. O’Donoghue explained that the MS Scheveningen Group demanded the PelAC to present its recommendations/proposal for a discard plan by 20 February 2014.

The Pelagic AC submitted a partial version of the document within the agreed deadline, with the section missing on de minimis rules; it subsequently continued with their work aiming to agree its full proposal in April. This is work in progress, but good advance has been made and they will put forward their own set of recommendations/advice on the following species: herring, mackerel, horse mackerel, blue whiting and boarfish.

The legal interpretation of arts 15 and 16 might be different for pelagic than for demersal and shellfish fisheries. For example, the de minimis exemption will be an issue of disproportionate cost for the pelagic fleets. Something similar is likely to happen with the survival rates or the 9% inter-species flexibility.

The Chairman thanked Mr. O'Donoghue for the presentation and opened the floor.

John Woodlock asked if the fisheries data included in the Pelagic discards plan can be transferred to the NWW demersal species. Sean replied that his presentation only was intended to provide a template for drafting a discard plan but the content should follow the 5 elements indicated by Dominic Rihan.

Siobhan Egan asked if proactive measures for reducing discards have been put in place or at least included in the plan and if there was a good level of communication between the MS Groups and the PelAC. Mr. O'Donoghue stated that the Commission was very helpful to the PelAC but the interaction with MS groups to date has been less than satisfactory; notice times provided to submit advice have been short and participation in the debates anecdotic.

Barrie Deas asked whose responsibility is to produce advice, and proposed that, in parallel to the Working Groups, a coherent approach is adopted for consistency. The five elements described seem to fit there with the addition of quota flexibility and choke stocks.

ACTION: The members endorsed the use of the Pelagic AC outline of contents as guide or reference for developing NWW discard plans;

The key five elements for inclusion in a discard plans for NWW will be:

- 1. Definition of fisheries**
- 2. Exemptions of survivability**
- 3. De minimis rules**
- 4. Provisions on documentation of catches**
- 5. Fixing of Minimum Conservation Reference Sizes**

The NWWAC will provide a progress report its intended plan of action at NWW MS Group.

4. Technical conservation measures in a reformed CFP

The DG MARE main representative, Dominic Rihan, provided an update on the EU public consultation on a new framework for technical measures and the state of play of the “Omnibus” Regulation. Both presentations are available for consultation on the NWWAC website⁴.

4.1. EC Public Consultation on New Framework for Technical Measures

There have been several attempts in the past to review the current Technical Measures Regulation (EC Reg. 850/98). With the entry into force of the new CFP (MSY objectives, elimination of discards, etc.) and the regional approach to fisheries management, a new legislative framework with common rules and standards (e.g. baseline/reference gears) is required. To this end, an EU public consultation was launched early in the year with a deadline for contributions that has been extended to mid-May 2014.

The main challenges are:

- Implementing the CFP through simple and clear rules
- Incentives to comply
- Making regionalisation work
- Integrating ecosystem measures

The following key questions were posed:

- Simplification
 - Are there redundant measures?
 - Are there unnecessary measures?
 - How do we ensure we keep things simple?
- Control and trust
 - How can you demonstrate that what you say is what you do?
- Incentives
 - How and what incentives will work?
 - What about soft law?
- Industry buy-in
 - How to use industry knowledge in the right way?

⁴ EU Public Consultation on New Framework for Technical Measures
http://www.nwwac.org/fileupload/Papers%20and%20Presentations/2014/Technical_Measures_Con_sultation_DGMARE_March2014_DR.pdf

EC Proposal of Omnibus Regulation – Technical and Control Measures
www.nwwac.org/fileupload/Papers%20and%20Presentations/2014/Omnibus_Reg_nwwac.pdf

- Reducing unwanted catches!
 - In which fisheries there are problems?
 - What alternative measures/tools can be used? (e.g. real time closures, “moving on” provisions, gear selectivity...)
- Ecosystem approach to fisheries management
 - How to include them?
 - General measures or regionally specific?
 - Trade-offs and balance must be found between legitimate business activities and conservation of the stocks.

Technical measures could serve as vehicle for regionalisation and can be inserted mainly through multiannual management plans but perhaps we need other mechanisms.

The governance structure will need to be more adaptable and responsive.

ACTION: The members will submit to the Secretariat their contributions and comments to the EU public consultation within the shortest delay with the view of producing a NWWAC advice on the subject.

4.2. “Omnibus” Regulation

Mr. Rihaan went in detail through the following aspects:

- Basic principles
 - Temporary solution
 - No renegotiation of Art 15
 - Separate to alignment proposals
 - Minimum amendments
 - Pandora’s box still closed
 - All fisheries covered (not just 2015) – aim: to avoid temporary regulations
 - LO will come into force regardless if it is adopted the Omnibus Reg.
- Legislative framework – regulations involved that will be amended or repealed
- Logic / rationale
 - Move from regulating landings to catches
 - All catches landed and counted against quota
 - Concept of unintended catches
 - *"Unintended catches shall mean incidental catches of marine organisms the fishing for which is prohibited in the relevant circumstances"*
 - Avoid legal conflict/confusion
 - Timing not explicit

- Current situation and new situation: changes
- Provisions to change
 - Minimum landing sizes (change to minimum conservation reference size)
 - Catch composition rules
 - By-catch provisions within restricted areas
- Main modifications/amendments in Control Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009
 - Accurate documentation/recording of catches along the production chain
 - Additional tools as far as required under new CFP
 - Prevention of use of catches below MCRS for direct human consumption
 - Deterrence for discarding

Mr. Rihan stressed that the logic behind the Omnibus Regulation is to avoid any legal incentives to discard and to allow vessels having a right catch composition.

The Chairman thanked again Mr. Rihan for the presentation and opened the floor for questions.

Sean O'Donoghue asked about the requirement for separate storage of catches and said that there might be not possible to comply in occasions due to limited storage capacity of smaller vessels. He also asked what is going to happen on the 1/1/2015 when you might have two conflicting regulations: implementation of LO and TCM EC Reg. 850/98.

Mr. Rihan explained that the proposal is under negotiation by the Council and the European Parliament and it is likely that some provisions may be deleted from the final agreed Regulation. Regarding possibility of conflict between regulations, the Commission is trying to ensure this does not happen through the timely adoption of the omnibus. However, if it is not adopted in time then legally art 15 of CFP Reform would supersede the TCM Regulation and the general provisions in article 15 would apply.

Purificación Fernández posed the question of how the original concept of “discard ban” evolved to “landing obligation” and if it carries another meaning from a control and monitoring point of view regarding the exact moment/action considered when talking about “landing” of catches onboard, mainly in what is referred to boats that have landings in ports other than its base ones. She suggested for convenience to include a clear definition of “landing obligation” in the new Regulation.

Mr. Rihan recalled that the LO term was agreed to replace “discards ban” because the later carried a negative connotation. The definition is generally embedded in art 15.1. of the CFP Regulation. The notion of “level playing field” has been largely discussed but it is important that same treatment is applied by MS. In relation to the moment of landing, he said that it would refer to the one when the fish caught is either landed at port or transshipped. He also took note of this question and said he would consult it with his relevant colleagues.

5. Summary of conclusions and actions by the Chairman

The Chair, Francis O'Donnell, recapitulated on the conclusions and reminded the actions agreed. He expressed his thanks to the participants at the meeting for their assistance, the interpreters, the technical staff in Dublin Castle and the NWWAC Secretariat for their work, support and dedication.

The meeting was adjourned at 17:00.

ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NWWAC MEMBERS		
<u>Name</u>	<u>Surname</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
Francis	O'Donnell	Irish Fish Producers' Organisation – Focus Group Chair
Bertie	Armstrong	NWWAC Chairman
Jose Manuel	Beltrán	Organización de Productores Pesqueros de Lugo
Jacques	Bigot	France Pêche Durable et Responsable
Emiel	Brouckaert	Rederscentrale Belgium
Richard	Brouzes	Copeport Marée OPBN
Kara	Brydson	RSPB – Birdlife International
René-Pierre	Chever	CDPMEM Finistère
Alan	Coghill	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
Juan Carlos	Corrás Arias	Pescagalicia-Arpega-Obarco
Debbie	Crockard	Seas at Risk
John	Crudden	European Anglers Alliance – Rapporteur
Dave	Cuthbert	New Under Ten Fishermen's Association
Bruno	Dachicourt	France Pêche Durable et Responsable
Barrie	Deas	National Federation of Fishermen' Organisations
Anton	Dekker	Dutch Fisheries Organisation
Siobhán	Egan	BirdWatch Ireland



NWWAC MEMBERS (cont.)		
<u>Name</u>	<u>Surname</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
Purificación	Fernández	ANASOL – ARVI (<i>replacing Hugo González</i>)
Caroline	Gamblin	CNPMEM
Marc	Ghiglia	UAPF – GA President
Konstantinos	Kokosis	European Bureau for Conservation and Development
Daniel	Lefèvre	CRPMEM Basse Normandie France
Olivier	LeNezet	CRPMEM Bretagne
John	Lynch	Irish Fishermen's Organisation
Alan	McCulla	ANIFPO / NFFO – WG4 Chairman
Kevin	McDonnell	West of Scotland FPO
Geert	Meun	Dutch Fisheries Organisation
Eduardo	Míguez	European Association of Fishing Ports and Auctions
Sean	O'Donoghue	Killybegs Fishermen's Organisation
Eibhlín	O'Sullivan	Irish South & West FPO
Miquel	Ortega Cerdá	Fundació ENT
José Luis	Otero González	Lonja de La Coruña, S.A.
Jane	Sandell	Scottish Fishermen's Organisation
Liane	Veitch	ClientEarth
Antony	Viera	CRPMEM Nord / Pas de Calais / Picardie
John	Woodlock	Irish Seal Sanctuary



NWWAC OBSERVERS		
<u>Name</u>	<u>Surname/s</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Stéphan	Beaucher	Fisheries Consultant
Isobel	Bloor	Bangor University
Richard	Curtin	Bord Iascaigh Mhara
Ramón	De la Figuera	MAGRAMA – MS Spain
Karin	Dubsky	Coastwatch
Robert	Griffin	DG MARE - European Commission
Irene	Kingma	Dutch Elasmobranch Society
Michael	McLeod	Marine Scotland
Laurent	Markovic	DG MARE – European Commission
Rémi	Méjecz	Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie – MS France
Sean	Murray	DAFM – MS Ireland
Stéphanie	Newman	Institute for European Environmental Policy
Brendan	Price	Wildlife Consultant
Glenn	Quelch	European Fisheries Control Agency
Dominic	Rihan	DG MARE – European Commission - Presenter
Cathrine	Schirmer	The Pew Charitable Trusts
Sara	Vandamme	ILVO Belgium



NWWAC SECRETARIAT		
Michael	Keatinge	NWWAC Director
Conor	Nolan	Executive Secretary
Joanna	McGrath	Executive Assistant, Administration and Finances
Alexandre	Rodríguez	Executive Assistant, Policy and Communication