



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR  
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES  
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN  
WATERS  
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA  
LAS AGUAS  
NOROCCIDENTALES

## MINUTES

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### The Main Conference Centre – Dublin Castle Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> of September 2016 11:00 – 15:30

##### 1. Welcome and introductions

The Chairman, Bertie Armstrong, welcomed the members and the attendees to the meeting. The full list of participants is included as an annex to these minutes. Apologies for absence were received from Jesús Angel Lourido García (Puerto de Celeiro, OPP-77), Sean O Donoghue (KFO), and Glenn QUELCH (observer from EFCA). The Chair also welcomed two new members of ExCom: Purificación Fernández who replaced Hugo González as representative of ANASOL (Spain), and Julien Lamothe who formally replaced Jacques Pichon as representative for ANOP (France). The Chair noted that these replacements mean that the positions of Vice-chairs and EFCA representatives that Hugo and Jacques filled previously would have to be discussed at the meeting under point 8.

With this comment, the agenda<sup>1</sup> was adopted as drafted. The following action points from the last meeting in Edinburgh (8<sup>th</sup> July 2016) had been completed:

- The Secretariat to draft a letter to Member States requesting that the AC receive as much support as possible from MS through 'Benefit in kind'.
- The Secretariat to inform the Irish RIFFs about the ICES benchmark in the Irish Sea.
- That ExCom be asked, by correspondence, for their decision on the proposal to establish a Focus Group on brown crab (FGCrab).
- That ExCom be asked, by correspondence, for their decision on the proposal to establish a Focus Group on Control and Enforcement.
- The Secretariat will ask ExCom for agreement by correspondence to add the EU transparency register to the application process and in case of agreement will contact all GA members to ensure that current members are also registered.

The last three points had been agreed by correspondence, due to a lack of quorum at the end of the last ExCom meeting. The Chair informed the meeting that last point would be implemented with immediate effect and the Secretariat would see to it that reimbursements would only be paid to those organisations that have sent in their EU transparency registration

The following action remained in progress this autumn:

- ACTION 1 The Secretariat to compile the input from Working Groups on the EC proposal on Technical Measures,
- ACTION 2 All members to send detailed comments on the EC proposal on Technical Measures to the Secretariat.

---

<sup>1</sup> All relevant documents to the meeting can be found on the NWWAC website: [link](#)

The Chair introduced the point on the Chair's tenure of the Executive Committee. As mentioned at the previous meeting and at the General Assembly, due to the result of the UK referendum, Mr Armstrong resigned as Chair of the ExCom because he did not feel that his Chairmanship could be reconciled with his position as representative of a UK organisation. This meant that the ExCom would be asked to nominate and elect a new Chair at the end of the meeting.

Due to the changes in the Vice-chair positions, the Chair asked the meeting to also consider new names for the positions previously held by Hugo González and Jacques Pichon. The position of Liane Veitch as Vice-chair did not change because her organisation represents EU based rather than a representative of the UK. The meeting was also asked to take into account that both Mr González and Mr Pichon were representatives for then NWWAC at EFCA meetings, and these positions should also be filled.

The meeting was reminded that ExCom had decided in 2014 on the team of Chair and Vice-chairs for a three year term (year 10 to year 12). The Chair indicated that the term of office for the vacant positions would be one year to fit in with the terms of office of other office bearers (Working Group chairs).

Marc Ghiglia asked the Secretariat to explain the exact procedure for the Chairmanship of the ExCom. The Executive Secretary (Conor Nolan) explained that to comply with EU rules, the AC was obliged to send out a tender. Remuneration for the position of Chair would remain the same: €10.000,- for time spent at and preparation for meetings, and a maximum of €5.000,- per annum for travel and per diem. In the case of the appointment of Mr Armstrong two years ago, the nomination was unopposed, which meant that the tender procedure was simple. The current procedure would depend on the nominations under agenda item 8.

## **2. Work programme year 12**

The Chair presented the main points that the NWWAC will need to concentrate on in Year 12:

Priority:

1. Landing obligation (LO)
  - Implementation and Advice for 2018 and beyond;
  - Control and enforcement;
  - Choke species toolbox.
2. EC proposals (Technical measures, NWW Multi-Annual Plan)
3. TACs and quotas
4. Management measures by species:  
Northern Hake, Anglerfish and Megrim, Nephrops, Sole, Skates and Rays complex, Seabass.
5. Preparation for the revision of the CFP in 2022

General work areas:

- a) Improving the quality of scientific and economic data
  - Irish Sea benchmark
  - MAREFRAME project
- b) Control and compliance
  - Technical Measures revision
  - EFCA
  - Cooperation with the Member States Control Expert Group (MS CEG)

- c) Regionalisation
  - The implications of the UK leaving the EU (Brexit)
- d) Working procedures
  - Improving the efficiency of the AC,
  - Communications and Outreach

The Chairman was asked why Brexit was introduced to this list. He explained that although the practical arrangements are not under the care of the AC, the AC should realise there is a potential big change for the share of North Western Waters under the CFP. A map of the UK EEZ was shown to give an idea of the size of the UK EEZ. Members of the group commented that the map shown was an older version which contained some disputed and outdated demarcation lines. The French industry commented that besides the legal details, the change of status of the UK would not change the way the NWWAC should deal with the management of, for example, brown crab or seabass. The NSAC also deals with stocks that are managed between the EU and Norway.

The Chair emphasised that the map as shown to reflect the rough share of the area under jurisdiction of the AC at the end of the process. The Secretariat (Mr Nolan) reinforced that the consequences of Brexit would be on the AC agenda, and that is why this point was introduced into the workplan for next year. A further discussion on Brexit was planned under agenda item 3.

Emiel Brouckaert noted that the consequences of Brexit were still mostly unknown, and the process before and after Art. 50 would be invoked could not be predicted. He suggested that since the AC agenda was already very busy with other issues, the AC should leave the matter of Brexit out of the workplan.

Purificación Fernández agreed with Mr Brouckaert that there was very little information available to be able to discuss future processes. She suggested the AC could wait for a request by the EC to produce an opinion about Brexit, but proposed that this point should not be part of the Workplan until such time. She noted that in those instances where conflicts could arise between UK and non-UK members of the AC regarding advice, the AC could make reservations on UK opinions in the AC advice, but emphasised that the AC should not discriminate against a member of the EU until Art 50 was implemented.

Johnny Woodlock noted that although the implications were important for management, the fish would not be affected by the changing of maps.

Lorcan O’Cinneide agreed with the previous speakers, and added that assumptions on the changes in scope or activity of the AC were premature, as was the resignation of the Chair. He noted that although there could be a complete Brexit, this might not apply to fisheries. Without any clear direction from the UK or EU, the point remained that these are shared areas of interest to all stakeholders around the table, and it would be prudent to keep looking for consensus of approach from stakeholders.

Stéphan Baucher agreed that any conclusions on the result of Brexit would be premature, and suggested that further discussions could take place after Art 50 would be applied, possibly in early 2017. He suggested to discuss the item at the next NWWAC meeting.

The Chair concluded that the workplan was agreed, but the point on Brexit would be deleted, and would be brought to the agenda of NWWAC meetings after the application of Art. 50.

The Secretariat (Sara Vandamme) presented the results of the Communication group discussions with the request for Excom to decide on items proposed by the Communication group. She reminded the meeting that membership for the Communication group is open for members interested in internal and external communication by the AC.

The group had identified the need to improve knowledge about, and transparency on the AC membership and proposed the following:

- To use the EU transparency register as a basis for an 'AC factsheet' that all members (both fisheries and other interest groups) should fill in to inform potential project partners for example;
- To increase the visibility of AC members by including contact details and logos to the member list of the General Assembly on the website. Information on the President, Chairs, Vice-chairs and the Secretariat should also be added.
- To inform the European Parliament (EP) Peche committee on advice released by the AC.

**The meeting agreed** to implement these points, and suggested that for the last point, it would be important to target the Peche committee only on advice directly relevant to them. The meeting considered it important to inform the EP about the activities of the AC, which may reach further than the advice alone. The Secretariat suggested to decide on the relevance of forwarding on a case-by-case basis.

The Chair concluded that in future, ExCom would be asked for agreement if advice should be forwarded to the Peche committee. Mike Park agreed to contact the NSAC for more information on the list of members of the Peche committee.

### **3. Consequences of the UK referendum, Bertie Armstrong**

This point was discussed in the General Assembly and during the previous point on the workplan for year 12, and the Chair concluded that what remained was for ExCom to look at the position of UK chairs in the AC. Apart from the re-election of the ExCom Chair, the following positions were discussed:

- The chair of the HWGLO is currently a position for the ExCom chair.  
The meeting agreed that this should remain the case for the future ExCom chair.
- Working group 1 (Ross Dougal)  
The meeting was informed that due to health reasons, Ross Dougal would not be able to continue as chair for this group and a new chair should be elected by the group.
- Focus Group on Seabass (Barrie Deas).  
The meeting agreed that this position should be discussed once the position of the UK in relation to Brexit would be clarified.

Barrie Deas commented that the results of the referendum must be respected, but will not be clear until Art 50 is implemented. The main point was that the UK will no longer be part of CFP, and access to waters, markets, and quota would need to be renegotiated. This would mean that UK stakeholders would prepare their input in this discussion in cooperation with the UK politicians. He could foresee an existential crisis for the stakeholder cooperation within the AC on this matter. In the short term a number of CFP measures, such as the LO and even Technical measures were likely to have consequences for UK stakeholders as well, mainly because post-Brexit bi-lateral or multi-lateral agreements for UK waters would likely be tailored on the basis

of CFP legislation. UK engagement would therefore be very important, for short term issues at least. On the longer term it would be relevant to consider what the preferred type of management and institutional arrangements would be, considering that responsibilities for instance with regards to the UNCLOS would not change. He advocated a cautious, step-by-step approach in dealing with the results of Brexit.

Marc Ghiglia agreed with Mr Deas's comments but would not favour the AC to provide input on the negotiations on governance, since that would anticipate on a discussion that stakeholders are not part of.

The Chair agreed that the AC should concentrate on the discussions that the AC would be asked to give advice on. He asked the meeting if there were specific examples where an observer status for UK members might have to be considered.

Emiel Brouckaert referred to a comment made by Ms Fernández, indicating that for the time being the AC should not continue with business as usual, but await a request to provide advice on this matter.

Mike Park commented that involvement of UK stakeholders should still shape management relevant to all AC members, since "until a divorce was settled, all the rules apply". He stressed there was still a common cause within the AC, and noted that that cause would probably not change, even after Brexit.

The Chair concluded that decisions on the involvement of UK members in AC processes should be taken on a case-by-case basis.

#### **4. NWWAC draft letter on Article 39 (email 23 July 2016)**

The Chair reminded the meeting that the previous HWGLO had proposed to draft a letter to the European Commission asking them to clarify if there is a contradiction between Article 39 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and Article 15 of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) Basic Regulation, which was agreed by ExCom. The NWWAC Secretariat drafted a letter which was sent to ExCom for comments (email 23 July 2016). A memo by ClientEarth on this topic was made available on the website ([link](#)).

Liane Veitch introduced the comments by ClientEarth explaining that the letter actually asks the Commission for an interpretation of a legal text, which is something only the European court of justice could answer. ClientEarth therefore argues that it is not appropriate to ask the European Commission these questions as they are not in a position to provide the answers. More other interest groups agreed that asking this type of question would cause some reputation damage because of the incorrect addressee.

Ms Fernández commented that ANASOL had also added comments to the letter, which had been sent round by the Secretariat, asking for additional explanation on apparent inconsistencies between Art 15 and 16 of the CFP. She considered it was important to get an explanation on the implementation of the different texts. Ms Veitch noted that this question would fall in the same category as the current letter and that this type of question could not be answered by the Commission.

The Commission (Evangelia Georgitsi) was asked to comment on the proposed request. Ms Georgitsi noted that all EU proposals for legislations were considered in the light of other EU legislation and that in legal terms, the EU court of justice would be the competent authority to answer this type of question. The only reply the Commission could give would be that the proposal for the CFP was based on a legal check which means there should not be inconsistencies between articles. Although sending a letter of this sort would not cause reputational damage, the AC could not expect a meaningful reply from the Commission.

Some members considered that based on the answer given by the Commission, there was no need to send the letter, while other members considered there was a need to test the effects of the legislation by the European court of justice once the implications of the landing obligation would become clear. This might be done by strengthening the letter with examples of choked fishing possibilities.

The Chair noted that it seemed the important question being asked was: can the fisheries be closed due to the implementation of the landing obligation, and is that in contradiction with Art 39 of the TFEU. Ms Veitch agreed that this was the relevant point, but that co-legislators had been aware that fisheries may be closed as a result of the landing obligation, when the decision was made. The consequences of the landing obligation should be seen as part of the balance between the social, economic and environmental effects of fisheries.

The Chair concluded that, accepting the verbal answer from the Commission, it would be most relevant to address the question further based on practical examples. The meeting agreed that examples should be collated by the Secretariat based on input from members. The results should be discussed at the next meeting.

**ACTION:** The Secretariat will compile a list of choke examples in preparation for the next meeting of the HWGLO, in order to discuss how to address the questions surrounding the compatibility of Articles 15 and 16 of the CFP and Article 39 of the TFEU.

## **5. Request for additional compensation for fishermen representing small-scale fleet organisations**

The Secretariat (Barbara Schoute) briefly presented a request made by the Irish Islands Marine Resource Organisation (IIMRO), who were accepted as a member of the General Assembly in the beginning of September 2016. In their application, they indicated that due to limited resources they would be grateful if the AC could consider contributing to the costs and loss of income that participation in the AC may entail. This is arranged in the Delegated Regulation (2015/242) under Article 6.1:

*Each Advisory Council shall offer additional compensation to **fishermen representing small-scale fleet organisations** for their **efficient participation** to its work on top of the reimbursement of their travel and accommodation expenses. Such **compensation shall be duly justified** for each case.*

The Chair asked the Commission for guidance considering this request. Ms Georgitsi indicated that this provision was drafted to give a legal possibility to grant additional compensation if the AC considers that this organisation contributes added value to the meeting and does not have the funds to attend otherwise. On the other hand, this should also depend on the budget the

AC has available, for example in the Mediterranean AC it was decided that budget did not allow for this type of compensation.

The Chair subsequently asked Enda Conneely, secretary of the IIMRO, to present the organisation. Mr Conneely explained that the IIMRO was a small organisation based on volunteers that was set up in 2006, to represent stakeholders on islands at the west coast of Ireland with fishing vessels under 8 meters. Their main fisheries concerned non-quota species, and they hoped to engage with EC and other industry to adapt the system of heritage systems for quota options, in order to allow fisheries to continue on small islands. The organisation operated on the basis of membership fees, without any funding at present, and their request was not for compensation as such, but they asked the AC to consider their financial status and the extra travel time their remote location would cause (at least one extra night at the beginning/end of each meeting).

The Secretariat informed the meeting that other Advisory Councils had also been consulted on this topic and they indicated that they would be interested to come to a common procedure that allows a 'level playing field' between ACs. The meeting was also reminded that the AC budget is finite and agreement on compensation would have ramifications for other AC tasks. The budget requirements for additional compensation were not known yet.

Some members argued that there are more fishermen that joined AC meetings, and that the AC could not discuss internal Irish matters. Although AC reimbursement was available for meetings it often did not cover the actual costs and most member organisations have had to pay the difference. Some members considered it was the responsibility of AC members to accrue funding for this, while other members argued that for smaller volunteer organisations, representing an under-represented group such as small-scale fishermen, this might be difficult and help should be considered.

The Chair reminded the meeting that IIMRO, as member of the NWWAC General Assembly, was making use of the EU rules to find compensation. One possible arrangement seemed to be to amend the rule, maximising the number of per diems to 2 nights, for fishermen representing small-scale fisheries.

Discussing this option, some members considered that allowing one exemption might lead to an uncontrollable system. Even for justified requests it would be necessary to stay within the allocated budget. Other members reasoned that it was important for the NWWAC to ensure representation is fair, irrespective of the wealth of the stakeholder organisations. A request was made to look into the budget consequences of the request. The meeting agreed that it was important to come to agreement on a general rule between the ACs.

The Chair noted that the legislation allows the AC to provide compensation under Art. 6.1, if the AC deems it affordable and possible. The AC could only make a decision on the basis of a more precise proposal. He thanked the meeting for the informative discussion and asked the IIMRO and the Secretariat to present a more detailed proposal on the scale of compensation required, as well as the development of a general rule between the ACs.

**ACTION:** IIMRO and Secretariat were asked to prepare a proposal describing the scale and general rules for compensation of fishermen representing small-scale fisheries at AC meetings. The Secretariat was asked to develop the proposal for general rules in cooperation with the other AC Secretariats.

## 6. Sole management plan advice

Emiel Brouckaert asked ExCom to discuss the progress and planning for advice on the different sole stocks:

- Sole in 7.d  
The NWWAC presented a management strategy proposal in December 2015, which had not been presented in ICES advice for 2017. This point had been reiterated in the NWWAC response on the TAC consultation for 2017 ([link](#)). The other interest groups stressed that the AC advice was not unanimous and this was reflected in the texts. The French industry urged other Member States to take additional measures in order to recover the stock, considering that France had had measures in place for the past years (increased minimum size, use of VMS etc).  
The Commission indicated that in principle, the EU proposal would be based on the MSY principle, unless a reason would be presented to deviate from this point. The AC advice from the industry would be to restrict TAC variation by 15% (considered precautionary in the STECF evaluation), while the other interest groups agreed to use the MSY target.
- Sole in 7.fg  
The NWWAC drafted advice for management strategy options, and the Commission had informed the meeting that scientists were preparing an evaluation ([link](#)).
- Sole in 7.hjk  
The NWWAC had received a reply from the Commission ([link](#)) on the request to test the effects of removal of the TAC for marginal bycatch species. This stock has become an example of a choke species for the Belgian fleet in this area. The Commission indicated that this proposed solution would be evaluated in 2017.

## 7. Preparation of meeting between ACs and ICES (MIACO)

At the meeting in Paris (2<sup>nd</sup> February 2016), ExCom had agreed to discuss the preparation of agenda items for the MIACO meeting planned for January 2017. At previous NWWAC meetings, ICES was specifically asked to improve the use of stakeholder information in their assessments, for example by:

- Development of a generic self-sampling protocol;
- Finding ways to incorporate short time-series of data (within 3 instead of 5 years for example)

Barrie Deas considered this an important point, and suggested that the use of mobile phones should be considered as a tool to improve contribution of industry input for science, for instance providing information on stomach content. It would be interesting to know the progress ICES is making there, and what the AC could do to improve data delivery.

Johnny Woodlock reaffirmed his organisation's point of view that fully documented fisheries would be an excellent way to gain insight in fishing operations.

The French industry stressed the impact of the landing obligation on working conditions on board fishing vessels. They expressed their unease about the reduction of resting time and considered this would not allow for extra survey activities on board. Sharing of information should therefore be done in a time-efficient way. Olivier Leprêtre, who had informed the meeting in July about the recent CRPMEM – EODE pilot study on the effects of the landing



obligation in the Eastern Channel and North Sea ([report](#) - French only), explained that the report had been sent to the Commission but he had not yet received a reply.

Julien Lamothe also noted the impact of the landing obligation on the scientific results. Changes in gear selectivity and fishing patterns will influence the validity of the assumptions made by science about fisheries in the year of the assessment. He stressed the need for cooperation between fishermen and scientists to avoid bias in the intermediate year assumptions.

The Commission noted that the points made were particularly relevant for mixed fisheries, and asked the AC to bring issues forward to the EC as well as ICES.

The Chair concluded that this information would be summarised and presented to ExCom for decision as a mandate for AC input to the MIACO meeting.

**ACTION:** The Secretariat will summarise the information for MIACO and present this to ExCom for decision as a mandate for AC input to the MIACO meeting.

## **8. Election of chair**

Following the resignation of the Chair, Bertie Armstrong (agenda item 1), the ExCom was asked to nominate a new Chairperson with a one year term of office to fit in with the terms of office of other office bearers (e.g. Working Group chairs). Emiel Brouckaert was asked to comment and he indicated that it was difficult to respond to the resignation of the Chair with immediate effect, but that he was willing to consider his candidacy, conditional on agreement from his organisations. He asked the ExCom to allow him one week to see if he could confirm his candidacy.

The Chair thanked Mr Brouckaert for his nomination, and, considering there were no other nominations, he asked the meeting if they could agree to elect Mr Brouckaert as Chair if his organisations could confirm their agreement within a week. This would mean Mr Brouckaert could take up his position from the start of year 12, 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016. The meeting agreed with the proposed procedure and ratified the nomination by acclamation.

The Chair asked for further nominations for the Vice-Chair positions of Hugo González and Jacques Pichon. Purificación Fernández indicated that ANASOL would be happy to stay on as first Vice-Chair. Julien Lamothe indicated that l'ANOP would also agree to stay on in the position as Viced-Chair. They both agreed to serve as representatives at EFCA meetings as well.

The meeting agreed with these candidates by acclamation.

## **9. Summary of actions agreed and decisions adopted by the Chair**

Action	
1	The Secretariat to compile the input from Working Groups on the EC proposal on Technical Measures
2	All members to send detailed comments on the EC proposal on Technical Measures to the Secretariat

3	The Secretariat will compile a list of choke examples in preparation for the next meeting of the HWGLO, in order to discuss how to address the questions surrounding the compatibility of Articles 15 and 16 of the CFP and Article 39 of the TFEU.
4	IIMRO and Secretariat were asked to prepare a proposal describing the scale and general rules for compensation of fishermen representing small-scale fisheries at AC meetings. The Secretariat was asked to develop the proposal for general rules in cooperation with the other AC Secretariats.
5	The Secretariat will summarise the information for MIACO and present this to ExCom for decision as a mandate for AC input to the MIACO meeting.

The Secretariat thanked Mr Armstrong for the cooperation and teamwork between the Chair and the Secretariat.

NWWAC Document  
Chairman: Bertie Armstrong  
Rapporteur: Barbara Schoute

## Annex 1 – List of Participants

<b>NWWAC members</b>	
Emiel Brouckaert	Rederscentrale
Julien Lamothe	Association Nationale des Organisations de Producteurs
Marc Ghiglia	Comité National des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins
Patrick Murphy	Irish South and West Fish Producers Organisation
Geert Meun	Stichting van de Nederlandse Visserij (Dutch Fisheries Organisation) (2)
Purificación Fernández	Asociación Nacional de Armadores de Pesca de Gran Sol
Barrie Deas	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
Lorcan Kennedy	AIPCE-CEP
Bruno Dachicourt	European Transport Federation
John Crudden	European Anglers' Alliance
Despina Symons	European Bureau for Conservation and Development
Debbie Crockard	Seas at Risk
John Woodlock	Irish Seal Sanctuary
Alex Kinninmonth	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, representing Birdlife International
Liane Veitch	ClientEarth
<b>Observers</b>	
Evangelia Georgitsi	European Commission
Robert Griffin	European Commission
Jonathan Shrives	European Commission
Alan Coghill	Orkney Fish Producers Organisation
Mike Park	The Scottish White Fish Producers Association
Daniel Lefèvre	Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins de Basse Normandie
Dimitri Rogoff	Comité Départemental des Pêches et des Élevages Marine: CDPMEM 14
Dana Miller	Oceana
Francis O'Donnell	Irish Fish Producers Organisation
Gonzague de Moncuit	Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie
Brendan Price	Irish Seal Sanctuary
Irene Kingma	Dutch Elasmobranch Society
John Lynch	Irish Fishermen's Organisation
John Richardson	The Shark Trust
Kevin McDonnell	West of Scotland Fish Producers Organisation
Louis Vantorre	Rederscentrale VZW
Lydia Chaparro	Fundació ENT
Mathieu Vimard	OPN
Olivier Leprêtre	Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins de Bretagne
Paul Duane	Sea-Fisheries Protection agency
Richard Brouzes	OPBN
Stéphan Beaucher	Consultant
Caroline Gamblin	Comité National des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins
Vera Coukho	The Pew Charitable Trusts
Siobhán Egan	BirdWatch Ireland
Sinéad Cummins	BirdWatch Ireland
Paul Fletcher	Scottish Fishermen's Organisation
Jim Portus	South Western Fish Producer Organisation
Marina Le Gurun	Blue Fish
Franck Le Barzic	OP COBRENORD
Pascal Coquet	Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins de Haute-Normandie
Vincent Lamidel	Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins de Haute-Normandie
Francois Hennuyer	FROM Nord
Serge Larzabal	Comité Local des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins de Bayonne
Emmanuel Kelberine	Comité Départemental des Pêches Maritimes et des Élevages Marins des Côtes d'Armor

<b>NWWAC Secretariat</b>	
Conor Nolan	Executive Secretary
Barbara Schoute	Deputy Executive Secretary
Sara Vandamme	Project Development and Communications Manager
Aoibhín O Malley	Financial Administrator and Event Manager