



## **Long Distance Advisory Council**

### **WORKING GROUP 1**

#### **Highly migratory stocks and relevant Regional Fisheries Organisations**

**Wednesday 21 October 2015**

**14:30 – 18:30 h**

**Martin's Hotel Central Park  
Schuman, Brussels**

**Chairman: Michel Goujon**

**Vice-Chair: Julio Morón**

#### **1. Welcome**

The Chairman opens the meeting and all attendees observe a minute's silence in memory of Antonio Cabral, Chairman of the LDAC from the very beginning, due to his recent passing.

#### **2. Approval of the minutes of the last WG1 meeting - Brussels, 11 March 2015**

The minutes of the last WG1 meeting are approved as they are considered to be true reflection of the discussions held and actions agreed.

#### **3. Approval of the agenda**

The agenda for this meeting is approved with no modifications or addition of new items.

#### **European Commission's information regarding discussions held within the Tuna-related RFOs**

#### **4. ICCAT**

##### **4.1. Update on the condition of tuna and shark stocks at ICCAT**

The Chairman, Mr. Goujon, gives a detailed presentation on the report issued by ICCAT Scientific Committee on the situation of the stock assessment to inform about the opinion of the LDAC with a view to the ICCAT Annual Meeting to be held in Malta the week from 10 to 17 November 2015. The said presentation is available on the LDAC web site.



#### 4.2. Conclusions drawn by the Commission on the preparatory technical meeting with Member States and stakeholders (Brussels, 13 October 2015)

The representative of the European Commission, Ms. Francesca Arena, makes the following general remarks on the work carried out by the Commission throughout this year:

- The EU supports the setting of harvest control rules (HCR) and of a management strategy evaluation (MSE) for ICCAT stocks.
- In terms of governance, the aim is to successfully conclude negotiations for the amendment and modification of the ICCAT Convention, with the inclusion of shark stocks in the scope of the Convention. This will facilitate adopting management measures aimed at the conservation of sharks.
- More ambitious control and monitoring measures. In this regard, the EU has sponsored a regional programme for observers which will be discussed at the ICCAT Annual meeting.
- Unlike in previous years, in 2014 the EU did not receive a letter of compliance. Ms Arena hoped to continue along this path of good performance and called on the support of the sector to comply with the ICCAT data requirements.
- The quantitative and qualitative improvement of the scientific data available remains a critical issue.

Regarding the situation of the bigeye tuna stock, there is a general understanding by all parties that action has to be taken and a series of measures have to be adopted to reverse the situation faced by this stock. This will inevitably lead to a reduction in current annual catches that will have an impact on all the fleets of the contracting parties. The issue relating to the high fishing mortality of bigeye tuna juveniles ought to be addressed.

The current time-area closure for bigeye tuna fisheries using FADs is not being effective. Therefore, the European Commission is considering two options:

1. Increase in the geographical scope of the closure and/or increase in the closure time period.
2. Total closure to all fishing activity, not only to fishing practices using FADs, including longliners as well.

In addition, the European Commission is considering a proposal to limit the number of FADs, but no exact figure has been put forward so far, not least because scientific advice is lacking on this point and data are not available for all ICCAT contracting parties. The ICCAT FAD Working Group has started working on this matter and progress is expected to be made leading to a recommendation or clear guidelines in this sense.



At the technical meeting held in Brussels, some of the stakeholders suggested that the fishing capacity should be limited for all fleets in order to prevent access from other Oceans (Atlantic and Indian). The European Commission is analysing and assessing this possibility.

There was also a proposal to reinforce the activity of observers by means of 100% coverage for EU tuna purse seiners, with the intention of extending it to other fleets, such as the longliners. A ban on transshipment on the high seas is also proposed for all fleets operating in ICCAT.

#### 4.3. Drafting of specific LDAC recommendations for the Annual ICCAT Meeting in Malta (10-17 November 2015)

##### **BIGEYE TUNA**

Messrs. Michel Goujon and Juan Pablo Rodriguez Sahagún present a joint proposal on behalf of ORTHONGEL and ANABAC for discussion within the LDAC on management measures for the bigeye tuna stock. They regret the little time they have to discuss and adopt the latter, but this is due to the recent publication of the proposal by the European Commission.

The said proposal addresses the following points:

- Reduction of fishing mortality of juveniles through catch limitations.
- Review of the current management measure pack contained in ICCAT Recommendation 14-01.
- Ban on transshipment on the high seas for all fishing gears and segments including longliners.
- Proposal to extend the geographical scope of the closure and to include purse seiners and longliners in the material scope of the latter.
- Expanding the labelling programme to this specie.
- Promotion and development of the Technical Working Group on FADs.
- Limiting the number of Fishing Aggregating Devices (FADs) including all countries.
- Setting the TAC on 70,000 t for 2016 with a catch reduction.

Mr. Juan Pablo Rodriguez recalls that the assessment on bigeye tuna in the summer season initially seemed to indicate that the stock was experiencing a recovery, but that was finally not the case. In any event, there is a very high level of uncertainty regarding the reliability of catch data, since many fleets are not reporting data to ICCAT in an efficient way, especially non-EU longline fleets but also some purse seiners. Regarding fishing with FADs and moratoria, he says that effective measures agreed by consensus within the sector ought to be applied to expand their geographical scope.



Mr. Juan Pablo Rodriguez declares that the longline fleet is primarily responsible for bigeye tuna catches (with 50% of the total number of catches), and therefore it should be the one taking a step forward. It does not make any sense to have situations that keep taking place over time such as transshipments on the high seas for non-EU longliners, since this leads to distorted and unreliable data due to the large number of non-reported catches that there are.

Questions and comments by the members with regard to the proposal put forward by Orthongel and ANABAC

Mr. Julio Morón shares his concern about the management of the tuna fleet capacity, as well as the need to set a reduction in catch limitations by means of safeguards. He suggests that it would be easier to manage a 1-month closure for all gears (and not only purse seiners fishing with FADs) aiming at bigeye tuna than a geographical extension of the closure, since control of and compliance with the latter would be difficult to put in practice.

He supports the ban on transshipments on the high seas to facilitate their task and prevent high-grading for economic reasons, since there are no data of recorded catches of tuna under 1 year old due to the fact that there is a lack of commercial interest as there is no market for them. The reason argued for the increase in average weight from 40kg to 60kg per tuna could be explained as a mere change of target fishery but it is the same fishing area, so the actual reason is the fact that there are non-reported discards. As for the campaigns of observers at sea, he defends the combined use of human and electronic observers and proposes similar monitoring level as that of other species such as bluefin tuna. Finally, he points out that the 5% observer coverage rates on many longliners are not met, and this is detrimental to the quality of data.

Regarding port sampling, he highlights that IEO and IRD have already got programmes in place. There are problems concerning the underreporting of catches by the longline fleet in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans and a compliance problem in ICCAT.

Concerning the fishing capacity, there has been a freeze on the actively fishing fleet. It does not make any sense to propose a fishing capacity limitation for a 5-year period to be reviewed on an annual basis.

Ms. Vanja Vulperhost points out that NGOs have not received the EU proposal on bigeye tuna.

Ms. Arena clarifies that the European Commission circulates draft proposals before their official submission to ICCAT only to the relevant authorities of the Member States and not to the stakeholders.



Ms. Mercedes Rodriguez declares that the situation of this stock turns it into a priority matter, and therefore any measures proposed have to be carefully reflected upon. She adds that, when issues such as transshipments and underreporting of catches by longliners are discussed, it should be made clear that reference is made to the non-EU longline fleet, and more precisely to the Asian one. There are non-EU longliners that have bigeye tuna as target specie, while European longliners do not have bigeye tuna as main specie but as bycatch (their target species being swordfish and sharks). Therefore, the text will have to be carefully drafted so that the introduction of restrictive measures is not only detrimental to the longline fleet, and that these measures are only applied to those longliners that have bigeye tuna as target specie (example in terms of fishing activity in the proposed area for closure).

Mr. Edelmiro Ulloa requests having the text or proposal of opinion in the three languages so that it can be properly analysed, as well as the EU text.

Ms. Juana Parada agrees with the opinions voiced by Ms. Mercedes Rodriguez and Mr. Edelmiro Ulloa, and insists that the longline fleet that does not have bigeye tuna as target specie should not be affected by these measures.

**ACTION: The Secretariat will distribute Orthongel's and Anabac's proposal in the three working languages of the LDAC (EN-FR-ES) and will include the comments made at the meeting in order for a common position to be agreed by consensus within the LDAC on recommendations regarding management measures for this specie (BET). Given the tight deadlines there are, the query will be carried out via e-mail among WG1 members for their subsequent assessment and, if appropriate, adoption by the Executive Committee.**



## **SHARKS**

The situation regarding blue shark is relatively stable, there is no overfishing in this stock and a precautionary approach is being followed.

At the meeting with stakeholders, it was unanimously agreed that a motion for a resolution addressed at conservation measures for porbeagle be proposed based on the opinions of the ICCAT Scientific Committee. A series of proposals will be included such as the improvement of the quality of data or the ban on keeping this specie on board, and the setting of HRC will be boosted as soon as possible. Some degree of reluctance is expected from other contracting parties, especially from Asian countries.

Ms. Parada highlights the European Commission's fruitless efforts in expanding the adoption of the European attached fin policy (or ban on finning) to ICCAT. In addition, she shows concern for the Commission's proposal to freeze the fishing effort during 5 years and limit catches of blue shark. The risk lies on the fact that a now targeted and sustainable fishery may be restricted, and Olympic-style fishing may arise among contracting parties that are not reporting to obtain catching rights. If the adoption of HCR is proposed, the SCRS should establish catch dates for a historical period as well as limitations of catches by flag.

Mr. Edelmiro Ulloa points out the importance of the fact that when the freezing or limitation of the fishing capacity takes place in the case of blue shark, it should be borne in mind that there will be an inevitable outburst of data from CPs that have not been providing data so far. Therefore, some of the uncertainties of the Scientific Committee will be cleared. This could be an argument in favour of the European Commission. Regarding transshipment on the high seas by non-European longliners, he says that there is an absolute lack of data not only relating to catches of bigeye tuna but also of sharks. He gives the example of the chartering of a Brazilian vessel with Korean capital.

Mr. Raúl García claims that measures should go beyond partial ones such as the fins attached policy and aim to develop management plans for the shark species mentioned. This will only be achieved by including sharks in the material application scope through the reform of the ICCAT Convention.

Mr. Morón requests the Commission to require ICCAT contracting parties that Resolution 11-16 be met by all countries. He recalls that it has been in force for 5 years. He highlights the importance of all NGOs showing their absolute support.

#### 4.4. Current situation of the discussion on FAD management



The representative of the European Commission explains that knowledge on the appropriate number of FADs is limited and that the EC is waiting to receive indications from the ad hoc Working Groups created to address this issue. The same number of FADs as in the Indian Ocean (550 per vessel) has been temporarily proposed, although they are aware of the fact that the situation is completely different to that in the Atlantic Ocean and the average number could be smaller here.

Mr. Raúl García asks whether there are any arguments for the 550 FAD limit per vessel in terms of costs, profitability or scientific data. There is an argument which is the great discrepancy there is within the scientific community in the ad hoc WGs, with a variation from 200 to 1000 in the use of FADs depending on the purse seiner. If there is no technical basis to make a decision, such as a report by the ICCAT SCRS, it is difficult for NGOs to support a specific figure.

Mr. Goujon suggests that the EC should not quantify the number of FADs while there is a limited level of certainty, and that the initial proposal should simply be to limit the number of FADs.

Finally, it is conveyed that the LDAC organised an information session on FAD management in collaboration with the Permanent Representation of the Spanish Government to the EU. This event was held in Brussels on 22 September and was addressed at the members of the Committee of Permanent Representatives of the Member States of the EU (COREPER). Representatives of the LDAC carried out a series of presentations both from the point of view of the Spanish (OPAGAC-ANABAC) and French (ORTHONGEL) fisheries sector and from that of environmental NGOs (WWF). It was considered a positive and useful event and it was pointed out that many members of the Council COREPER had limited or even non-existing knowledge regarding the use and types of FADs in tuna fisheries with purse seiners, as well as of their impact on the fishing activity and the marine environment.

#### **ACTIONS:**

***The members of Working Group 1 agreed that it would be convenient to consider carrying out an updated review of the LDAC book on FADs (published in 2012) in the light of the recent changes that have taken place in the last few years. To this end, an editing or drafting group will be set up that will work on this review for its subsequent distribution among the members of WG1 so that they can send comments and, if appropriate, submit it to the Executive Committee for its approval and official adoption.***

***The presentations made in Brussels will be made available to all members requesting so by the Secretariat via email-web.***



## 5. IOTC

The representative of the European Commission informed about the meeting schedule and work plan of the IOTC, which is available on the organisation's website: <http://www.iotc.org/meetings>

The LDAC will remain vigilant with regard to compliance with the IOTC resolution on the distribution of fishing capacity among the contracting parties. It is considered unacceptable that some Asian countries (particularly South Korea) use a system for the calculation of tonnage in GTs different to the gross register tonnage (GRT) which is internationally accepted. In addition, further clarity and transparency is required for the transfer or exchange of fishing modalities and segments or categories in terms of global capacity.

***ACTION: The LDAC will request the Commission that the EU adopts a consistent and unmistakable strategy to coordinately address the limitation of fishing capacity in the four main tuna RFMOs given the ample mobility and displacement of the fleets targeting tropical tuna.***



## **6. Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)**

### **6.1. Presentation of the current state of play by the European Commission**

The representative of the EC, Mr. Stamatios Varsamis, apologises on behalf of his colleague Angela Martini, who is away from Brussels in a mission.

An updated presentation is provided regarding the state of play of tropical tuna fisheries in the Western Pacific regulatory area. Reference is made to the annual catch volume as well as to its distribution and composition in terms of species. Although a reduction of the fishing effort is observed, there is an increase in the total number of catches. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the surface longline fleet is very large, with the presence of 6 vessels of the European longline fleet in the area. Moreover, a summary is made of the work and conclusions drawn by the WCPFC Scientific Committee, that has problems in terms of catch data compilation and reliability for the correct assessment of the stocks by the scientific observer programmes on board the fishing vessels.

### **6.2. Questions and comments voiced by the members**

Mr. Juan Pablo Rodríguez declares that the EU was not able to have an influence on the improvement of the data in the area due to the limited presence of its fleet. The proposal of a moratorium for the use of FADs might not be applicable or effective there, but it is so in other areas such as the Indian or Atlantic Oceans.

The representative of the Commission stresses the fact that the EU considers it important to have an active role in WCPFC since it is in that area where the main tropical tuna fisheries are in the world, of which the EU imports a considerable amount. Given its relevance in market terms, it is essential to try and ensure that these fisheries are sustainable and to achieve good practices that can be extended to other RFMOs of which the EU is a contracting party.

Mr. Julio Morón requests the European environmental NGOs have a more active presence and engage in the Western Pacific area supporting the proposals of the Commission and the fishing sector, to ensure the sustainable management of stocks such as bigeye tuna or bluefin tuna of the Northern Pacific area. He regrets that NGOs have nothing to say regarding the failure to comply with resolutions and the lack of agreements of PNA countries that even obtain MSC certification for some fisheries without the necessary safeguards. He says that it is a problem that in the medium term is going to affect all tuna fisheries around the world and that the scientific observer programme and their reports are not satisfactory and do not send the data required in many cases. He adds that the situation is critical regarding these stocks and that it cannot be ignored. Action has to be taken, as it happened in the past with bluefin tuna in the Western Mediterranean area.



### 6.3. PNA model for the Pacific Ocean: LDAC letter and EC reply

The LDAC sent a letter in mid-2015 requesting the EC to work with the PNA countries and the monitoring and control committee on the enhanced transparency of the Vessel Document Scheme (VDS) system. The authorities of the country of the vessel flag have requested the PNA countries to inform in real time, if possible, of the use their fleets make of their fishing days.

It seems that new developments have taken place in the fight against IUU fishing in countries such as Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands, but it is necessary to continue doing this work.

Mr. Morón claims that the distribution of GTs should be similar to that allocated by IOTC, with a limitation of capacity for developed countries. The current system is unacceptable since there are unclear calculations of GTs that differ from the international gross register tonnage and also regarding the substitution or transfer of categories from trawlers to purse seiners by countries such as South Korea.

The EU should have a clear policy and define its strategy in the four main tuna RFMOs to address the capacity issue: in the tropical tuna fleet there is a serious problem of overcapacity and fleets move to another area in a few days' time, so their surveillance becomes very complicated.

The representative of the EC, Mr. Orlando Fachada, explains that the change in category from longliners to purse seiners and vice versa is legal. In theory, vessels catching swordfish cannot change for tropical tuna, but Koreans have always reported their catches as tropical tuna, so they can do it. As for the calculation of the origin capacity by Korea, the number of reference vessels for the year 2000 is included (unlike the rest of the fleets, which include data for 2006), as well as the determined gross register tonnage and the capacity has been corrected.

Mr. Raúl García enquires whether there is a process for the development of harvest control rules (HCR) for these fisheries similar to that of ICCAT with collaboration between scientists and policy-makers.

Mr. Fachada responds that that is not exactly the case, that measures are discussed at a scientific level but not at a commercial or managerial one.

Mr. Juan Manuel Liria agrees with Mr. Morón regarding the fishing capacity situation of Korean vessels and recalls that there is an International Treaty in force for over 20 years that takes into account all closed volumes of vessels exceeding 24m long to calculate the GT and that it is unacceptable that Korea modifies them.



Mr. Fachadain insists that Korea has corrected the calculation mistakes of their GTs and that the EC has no competence to sanction them in any case.

## **7. The role of the LDAC in RFMOs: request of observer status**

### **7.1. Presentation by the Secretariat of the LDAC and by the European Commission**

The Secretary General, Mr. Alexandre Rodriguez, includes this item communicating the request by some members of the LDAC to study the possibility of requesting the formal observer status in some RFMOs of strategic interest for the LDAC. Although, in theory, this is not possible, the members are reminded that there is currently a fruitful working and collaboration relationship with the European Commission and smooth communication in the negotiating EU positions at the annual NAFO and ICCAT meetings. The representatives of the LDAC channel their participation through the preparatory technical meetings with the EC and the Member States and also attend as part of the EU delegations respecting the established procedures. The Secretary highlights that some organisations which are members of the LDAC are already independent observers at the mentioned RFMOs and suggests reflecting upon this matter before taking a final decision among the members of the LDAC.

The representative of the EC confirms that the simultaneous adoption of two roles is incompatible in order to prevent a conflict of interest and that the LDAC ought to choose whether to provide guidance to the European Commission and be part of the EU delegation, or to freely attend as a fully-fledged independent observer of the RFMOs. He suggests members carefully weigh pros and cons before taking a decision and points out that this same issue has come up with other non-governmental organisations such as WWF.

### **7.2. Comments by the members**

Mses. Juana Parada and H el ene Boursin invite the attendees to consider all the implications that this proposal has before taking a hurried decision. There is confidence on the neutral role of the Secretariat in its representation of the LDAC as an organisation and acting as coordinator before members of the sector and the NGOs. The existing input of and collaboration with the EC are also acknowledged that enable the latter to defend a common position reached by consensus given the diversity of interests represented within the LDAC.

***ACTION: It is agreed that for the time being the LDAC as an organisation will continue as part of the EU delegation, strengthening its internal methods and capacities to respond to the consultation needs of the EC and to be able to attend the main preparatory technical and scientific meetings of the RFMOs of which the LDAC carries out a specific follow-up or issues opinions (e.g. ICCAT or NAFO).***



## **8. LDAC International Conference on the External Dimension of the CFP (Las Palmas, 16 and 17 September 2015)**

### **8.1. Overall assessment and results**

The Secretary General of the LDAC introduced this item thanking the members of the organising committee, made up of members of the LDAC and of the Secretariat, and the external sponsors (Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment, Island Council, Regional Ministry of Fisheries of the Government of the Canary Islands, FEDEPORT, PROEXCA and Grupo Miquel, among others) for their commitment and contribution that turned this event into a success in terms of attendance and participation. He reported that this event was attended on-site by over 150 delegates from 15 European and African countries, as well as by 100 virtual attendees that followed in streaming. Among the profiles of speakers and participants, there were senior officers and representatives of the European Commission and the European Parliament, national administrations, scientific community and a wide representation of members of the LDAC from the European catching and processing fishing sector, small-scale fishing communities from African coastal countries, and representatives of environmental and cooperation development NGOs.

In addition, an external communications team was hired for the management of contents and press releases, and three more European correspondents specialised in fisheries management issues were invited (Fishing News International, Industrias Pesqueras and REJOPRAO) that, together with the local and national media (press and radio) provided wide information coverage of the event in their editions for August, September, October and November 2015.

In brief, the event was considered very positive and it consolidated the institutional image of the LDAC as the only European organisation representing the stakeholders with great abundance of opinions and practical knowledge of the reality of fisheries. Furthermore, the event fulfilled its purpose of making the advisory work in terms of fisheries management in non-EU waters clearly visible. In addition, a document was agreed by consensus which contains a series of strategic recommendations to reinforce the application of the external dimension of the CFP, which will be the driving force of future opinions to be developed in the next few years.

The said document containing the recommendations can be found together with the programme and the list of papers, presentations and a file with photos and videos on the web site created to this end:

<http://ldac.chil.me/ldac-edcfpconference2015>



## 8.2. Report of the European Parliament

Recently, the rapporteur of the European Parliament Committee on Fisheries, Ms. Linnéa Engstrom, presented a draft report on the application of the external dimension of the CFP. The main advisor of The Greens, Michael Earle, explained the content of the latter and declared that the rapporteur had waited to have the conclusions drawn at the Conference in Las Palmas to bear them in mind and include some of the elements. The final report agreed by consensus with the shadow rapporteurs is expected to be presented at the next meeting of the EP-PECH planned for 9 November. It will be subject to vote at this body in the session to be held in December and it will be voted on at the EP plenary session in January 2016.

The report expressly acknowledges the work of the LDAC in this field and contains the following proposals and demands:

- Need to have more scientific data (quantitative and qualitative) in waters of Coastal Third Countries.
- There is EU funding (EMFF and other development funds) to carry out these studies, there are no budget-related problems.
- A regional management approach ought to be adopted (at Fisheries Regional Subcommittee level and also at RFMO level) to work on the sustainable management of small pelagic stocks in Western Africa.
- Use of objective criteria in the distribution and allocation of quotas, in conformity with article 17 of the basic Regulation of the CFP.
- The EU ought to promote the inclusion of a regulatory framework for joint ventures and fisheries investments in third countries in sustainable partnership agreements (SFPAs). In this sense, it would be possible to develop a European database of joint ventures or fisheries investments in third countries.
- For agreements like the one with Mauritania, it would be positive to improve governance and transparency, and the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process. In this sense, the creation of stakeholder groups is proposed to carry out the follow-up of the use made of the funds for actions and projects aiming to provide sector-based support.
- There should be a clear and consistent definition of what the European long distance fleet fishing in non-EU waters is. There is some confusion and disparity regarding the figures and segments of the industrial fleet in long distance waters. There is a lack of consistency between the Eurostat data and the studies of the EC or the databases presented by some NGOs.
- There is a problem regarding excessive re-flagging that ought to be solved.
- Inclusion of compliance with the European regulations in the fight against IUU fishing in the negotiation, renewal or discussion of trade agreements.



In this sense, the recent withdrawal of the “yellow card” to South Korea is of great concern.

#### **9. Information exchange about tuna-related external meetings (LDAC members).**

Attention is drawn to a meeting between stakeholders and the members of the Council of Ministers at the end of September at the headquarters of the Permanent Representation of the Spanish Government in Brussels to improve knowledge about existing initiatives by the European tuna industry on the use and management of Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs), for European purse seiners targeting tropical tuna species.

In addition, a meeting of the Confederation of small-scale fisheries held in mid-October is mentioned.

#### **10. Date and place of the next meeting.**

The next WG1 meeting will probably take place in Brussels in March. The Secretariat will confirm the date and place of the next meeting throughout the last quarter of the year.

The Chairman thanks the members and observers for their participation, the Secretariat for their coordination work and the interpreters for their efforts and formally closes the meeting at 18:30 h in conformity with the planned schedule.

A summary of the actions agreed by the members of Working Group 1 is included as Annex I.

**--END--**



## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### MEMBERS OF WORKING GROUP 1

1. Michel Goujon. ORTHONGEL
2. Erik Olsen. Living Sea
3. Sandra Sanmartin. EBCD
4. Julio Morón. OPAGAC
5. Béatrice Gorez. CFFA-CAPE
6. Helene Bours. CFFA-CAPE
7. Mercedes Rodríguez. OPP-Lugo
8. Emil Remisz. NAPO
9. Caroline Mangalo. CNPMEM
10. Juan Manuel Trujillo. ETF
11. Juan Manuel Liria. FEOPE/CEPESCA
12. Raúl García. WWF
13. Björn Stockhausen. Seas at Risk
14. Edelmiro Ulloa. Anapa / Anamer / Acemix / Agarba
15. Irene Vidal. EJV
16. Juan Pablo Rodríguez. ANABAC
17. Juana Parada. ORPAGU
18. Rob Banning. Dutch pelagic freezer trawler association
19. Katarina Sipic. CONXEMAR
20. Vanya Vulperhorst. OCEANA

### OBSERVERS

21. Stamatis Varsamos. EC (WCPFC)
22. Francesca Arena. EC (ICCAT, FADS)
23. Orlando Fachada. EC
24. Priit Ojamaa. PE
25. Michael Earle. PE
26. Carmen Paz. PE
27. Jesús Ibarra. PE
28. Alexandre Rodríguez. LDAC
29. Marta de Lucas. LDAC