



Demersal Working Group Edinburgh 18th February 2011

Rapporteur: Tony Hawkins

1. Introduction and apologies

- 1.1 Barrie Deas opened the meeting and welcomed participants. He thanked the Scottish Government for hosting the meeting and providing lunch. Apologies had been received from Bertie Armstrong, Peter Breckling and the European Commission. The agenda was agreed with some additions.
- 1.2 The report of the previous meeting, held in November 2010, was agreed. Most of the matters arising would be dealt with under agenda items, including discussion of cod recovery with the Director General and discussions with Member States over CFP Reform. There had been a suggestion from Edgars Goldmanis of the Commission at the previous meeting that because Member States were not taking up their full days-at-sea allocations there was no need to discuss effort controls. That point was invalid and would need to be raised at future discussions with the Commission.
- 1.3 Several problems had arisen over recent months because of the bureaucratic changes to the NSRAC imposed by the Commission. A number of initiatives had not been followed-up, and we would now have to deal with each of these. We had not sent a letter to the Commission seeking greater transparency within the EU/Norway discussions. Although there had been some progress in 2010 there was still scope to go further, whilst negotiations of necessity had their own dynamic and requirements. A letter pressing for a more central role for the NSRAC should now be sent. The paper prepared on Real Time Closures in November should be sent to the Commission. The letter to the Director General on whiting and problems with the scientific advice should be re-sent.
- 1.4 Niels Wichmann said that a meeting of the RAC Directors and Working Group Chairs had not yet been convened. It should now take place, as there is a need to set out future priorities for the NSRAC. Key items would include the future of the RACs in the context of CFP Reform.

2 The review of the Cod Recovery Plan

2.1 The Cod Recovery Plan had been one of the most significant burdens upon North Sea fisheries. It was now to be reviewed and we would need to find out how best to participate in this process. There had already been a Benchmark meeting on management plans including those for various cod stocks by ICES, which Rory Campbell had attended. STECF and ICES were holding a joint scoping meeting at the end of February that we should attend. There would be further meetings of STECF/ICES in June and October. Council meetings in April, October, and November could be significant in providing a policy steer. It was not yet clear whether firm decisions could be taken in November or whether the issue would be subject to co-decision taking with the Parliament, with the prospect of long delays. Points we might wish to get across during the course of the scientific re-evaluation of the plan would be:

- the need to recalibrate the TACs for cod;
- adjustments to targets;
- and the nature of any future effort regime.

We also needed to consider whether another cod symposium was required – the last one had influenced policy on cod. Or should we hold a workshop with the other affected RACs?

2.2 The re-evaluation of the position of cod in the Baltic was one step ahead. Comments had been invited from fishers and a meeting was being held in Copenhagen next week. Chris Darby emphasised the key role of ICES in the re-evaluation of the plan, as Norway too had an interest in cod recovery. We should seek further information on the Commission's timetable from the Director General. Michael Anderson reminded the meeting that the plan was being evaluated; it was not being revised. However, Paul Dolder of Defra remarked that the December Council had committed itself to a full review of the plan.

2.3 The process would begin with the scoping meeting in Copenhagen at the end of this month. Our views could be presented there. The Danish Fishermen's Association could find space for RAC members to discuss outstanding issues during the scoping meeting. The first two days of the meeting would be especially important, and discussions were likely to focus on the different regions, with the North Sea discussions taking place on the Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning. Pim Visser, Barrie Deas, Michael Andersen and Michael Park intended to be at the meeting.

2.4 It was concluded that a NSRAC focus group should be convened after the scoping meeting had taken place. The date for the focus group meeting was provisionally set for Friday 8th April.

3. Fisheries science and the MIRAC meeting.

- 3.1 The MIRAC meeting is an annual meeting of RAC representatives with ICES. Niels Wichmann, Michael Andersen, Martin Brebner, Rory Campbell and Barrie Deas had attended, along with representatives from the other RACs. There had been discussion of the new format for advice, which featured MSY, the precautionary approach, and the management plan approach. The use of careless language by ICES had been highlighted as a weakness (e.g. a fishery could under the proposed format be described as subject to overfishing but harvested sustainably). ICES scientists are comfortable with giving a range of advice to their clients; but one client – the Commission – would like a single figure. Hazel Curtis emphasised that there was no single recipe for determining TACs. Moreover, scientists should not decide TACs; policy makers, who could take a range of factors into account, should take the decision. Barrie Deas thought that the Commission should not follow the science in an absolute sense, as suggested by the Commissioner; scientists would not want that as it would politicise the ICES working groups. Caro Cowen said that there were examples from other fields, like climate change, where it was important for policy makers to decide on the levels of uncertainty and risk arising from different courses of action. Hazel added that economic advice was sometimes regarded as a form of lobbying, rather than carefully considered advice from experts and an important component of policy decisions. It was pointed out that the NSRAC had repeatedly emphasised that there are four pillars to sustainability; comprising biological, economic and social factors within an appropriate institutional framework. No one source of advice should dominate. That was essentially the ecosystem approach. Long-term management plans, supported by the NSRAC encompassed all these elements and a key part of that process was preparing a range of objectives.
- 3.2 RAC representatives had asked for an indicator from ICES of the quality of their advice. Scientists are working on this but it is not an easy task as there is a wide range of factors to take into account. Other items discussed had included the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the review of the Cod Recovery Plan. It was remarked that many of those now occupying key positions within ICES had attended the meetings of the North Sea Commission Fisheries Partnership, which had brought fishermen and scientists together before the NSRAC had been set up. That engagement of fishers with scientists could now be reinstated and expanded.

4. Data deficiency initiative

- 4.1 There was agreement with the NWWRAC that we cannot go forward with 60% of ICES assessment failing to achieve 'analytical' status. Both RACs had sought support from the Commission to establish data task groups, but their approaches had been declined. The Commission did not want to take the lead in this initiative.
- 4.2 Both RACs had now met with ICES to discuss this issue and strong agreement had been reached on a way forward. The next step would be to invite ICES and Member States to a meeting to discuss the establishment of regional data task forces. The

meeting would take place on 31st March/1st April at ICES HQ in Copenhagen. NSRAC members were encouraged to attend.

- 4.3 As a first step a matrix needed to be prepared identifying those critical stocks where improvements in data collection were essential. ICES scientists had already thought about this in conjunction with the Pelagic and Baltic Sea RACs.
- 4.4 It was agreed that the NSRAC should go ahead with this initiative. The role of the Member States would be important as they were already funding many science/fisheries partnerships providing new and valuable information. It was regrettable that the Commission had not so far supported the initiative but we should continue to encourage it to take part.

5. Long-term management plans

- 5.1 The NSRAC has always supported the development of LTMPs for the North Sea fisheries and preparation of plans for *Nephrops* and whiting has already begun. However, work has been held back by lack of funding and changes to the NSRAC.
- 5.2 For *Nephrops*, following discussions of the plan with fishers and others at the ports the rapporteur was now working on a draft plan for further discussion and refinement by the *Nephrops* LTMP Development Group. The timetable would begin with a meeting of that group in March, at which results from the JAKFISH project could be incorporated. JAKFISH had part-funded the development group meetings. The plan would then be consolidated as a result of comments received.
- 5.3 It had become clear at meeting with fishers that they were reluctant to accept individual TACs for each of the functional units. They had pointed out that it would be difficult to settle on TACs for some of the units, because data were inadequate. Moreover, the imposition of individual TACs would discriminate against those fishers constrained to fish a single unit. The plan was proposing an overall TAC for the North Sea rather than individual TACs. Vulnerable functional units might be managed through sustainable fishing plans. However, that concept needed further discussion and development.
- 5.4 Several participants emphasised the need to present strong arguments against individual TACs to the November Fisheries Council. There was some enthusiasm for individual TACs within the Commission, although the emphasis from ICES had been on management at a functional unit level – which did not necessarily mean individual TACs. Indeed, it would be difficult to achieve sensible management of vulnerable units through TACs, which were crude instruments. The certifying agencies had urged the setting of individual TACs but Jane Sandell said that we should not pay too much attention to their views, as they were not close to ICES scientists. Caro Cowen emphasised the need to present arguments against individual TACs quickly and coherently if we were to avoid the imposition of this measure.
- 5.5 Giles Bartlett was pleased that the draft plan was emphasising the need to protect vulnerable functional units. He hoped that a very positive LTMP could be developed.

Fishers did recognise the need to protect vulnerable functional units, but would not welcome individual TACs. Other measures should be explored. Other participants stressed the importance of the *Nephrops* fishery and thought it would be important to extend the UWTV surveys as a way of assessing the state of the stocks. Alternative assessment methods were also under development.

- 5.6 The rapporteur suggested that one way forward in developing alternative measures for the vulnerable units would be to start with the development of a sustainable fishing plan for a specific vulnerable unit with the involvement and cooperation of fishermen. A DEFRA funding initiative was currently inviting bids for projects, especially for work which might assist the activities of the RACs. He suggested that we should contact an academic group with experience in marine fisheries and ask them to put in a bid to undertake the preparation of a sustainable fishing plan; say, for the Farne Deep functional unit. It was agreed that this opportunity should be explored.
- 5.7 It was agreed that the latest draft plan prepared by the rapporteur should now be circulated to development group members. They should then meet in March/April to develop the plan further. The plan would need to take account of the views of Dutch and Danish fishers. In the meantime the rapporteur would discuss with Michael Park, the chair of the development group, an approach to an academic group to facilitate the preparation of an example of a sustainable fishing plan.
- 5.8 With respect to the development of an LTMP for the whiting fisheries, a meeting had been held in January and a full report produced. One of the conclusions had been that further information was required on those fisheries that caught whiting in each Member State. Information on the discarding of whiting would be especially valuable. We could then go forward in preparing a draft plan for discussion with fishers as we had with the *Nephrops* plan. A simple management plan had also been called for from the EU/Norway negotiations. This would be rather simple, consisting of a set of harvest control rules. The NSRAC plan for whiting would be wider in scope and would address the management measures to be adopted to reduce discards and improve yields from the fishery.
- 5.9 Barrie Deas pointed out that our deliberations on whiting had already borne fruit. Following discussion at the previous Demersal WG Chris Darby had given a presentation to EU/Norway, which had turned a proposed reduction in TAC into an increase in TAC, a step that would go some way towards reducing whiting discards.
- 5.10 Chris Darby introduced Martin Bailey, who was working with Newcastle University in developing a spatial study of whiting. This study might provide some of the data lacking on whiting.
- 5.11 Giles Bartlett supported the whiting LTMP and suggested that we might look forward to the development of a wider plan for all the whitefish species. It was agreed that this was a worthwhile aim, although currently the Cod Recovery Plan, which had a pervasive influence on all the North Sea fisheries, largely governed the management of whitefish. Nevertheless we should be aiming for a wider plan, encompassing all the whitefish fisheries.

- 5.12 It was agreed that the NSRAC should write to the Directors of each of the administrations seeking information on the fisheries catching whiting and the levels of discards occurring in each. We would also arrange for presentations at the next meeting of the Whiting LTMP Development Group from groups carrying out research into the reduction of whiting discards.
- 5.13 Problems with the management of the shrimp fishery were raised. Currently too many shrimps were being landed in relation to the size of the market. POs might be able to regulate landings to match demand on a voluntary basis but the competition authorities do not like this being done. Management plans are being considered as a way forward, and could be developed in concert with Danish and German fishers. However, again this would fall foul of the competition authorities. If a management plan is composed as a regulatory measure by the Commission then that is acceptable to competition authorities. Voluntary agreements are less acceptable. A framework agreed by the three Member States might be acceptable, but this might take some time to formulate. A focus group might enable the NSRAC to start the process of developing an appropriate management plan.
- 5.14 Would the Commission approve such a plan? Pim Visser thought that if the Demersal WG of the NSRAC thought it was a good idea to develop such a plan we could then involve the three Member States. Niels Wichmann suggested that an outline proposal should be developed for a shrimp focus group. Pim agreed to develop a short paper for submission to the next ExCom meeting. We might also talk to authorities in the three Member States to see whether they were willing to fund such a group. It was thought that the Commission was not interested in the shrimp fishery and would not wish to be involved. However, the European Parliament Fisheries Committee was going to receive a presentation on the shrimp fishery and MEPs would be discussing the subject.

6. Flatfish issues

- 6.1 The flatfish management plan had been evaluated by STECF and a report sent to the Commission. Its current status was uncertain. There is a major problem because of the coupling of plaice with sole. The plaice stock is increasing and so is the sole stock – but not quite as fast. Because of the state of sole the plan was limiting days at sea in the plaice fishery. Dutch fishers had been in contact with their government over this mixed fishery issue. Perhaps the management plan needed revision? Barrie Deas reflected that this general issue of management measures for mixed fisheries is considered in the draft NSRAC paper on MSY.

7 Maximum Sustainable Yield

- 7.1 The WG discussed the draft paper on MSY, which had been developed further by the rapporteur from a draft presented to the previous meeting. It was agreed that the paper was fine but as it was quite long it would benefit from having a summary at the beginning rather than at the end. Michael Andersen wanted an inappropriate

reference to plaice removed from the paper. Chris Darby would also send in some amendments. He thought that one of the problems with the Commission's approach to MSY was its definition in terms of a single target value. Management needed to be achieved within a range of values. Euan Dunn thought there should be a reference to the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, as good environmental status as defined by the Directive was a contribution to more sustainable fisheries. The reference to Sidney Holt's comments had also been over-sold. Paragraph 1.7 also needed to be amended. Hazel Curtis reminded participants of a proposal by Seafish to do an impact assessment of moving towards MSY.

- 7.2 Others thought that the paper should not dwell too much upon the MSFD; although it was pointed out that MSY was one of the targets for achieving good environmental status for fisheries. It was agreed that with a few small refinements the paper would be ready for sending out to the ExCom and then to the Commission and members of the Fisheries Committee.

8. Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy

- 8.1 The Commission is going to talk to some of the RACs about their future role in reform of the CFP. There will be a move towards a more regional approach but there appear to be difficulties in writing the legal text that would enable such an approach. The process was going to be complicated. There proposal, which is expected in June, will be a package consisting of a general Communication setting out the scope of the reform, a Communication dealing with external aspects of the CFP, a new basic CFP regulation, together with specific proposals on, respectively, the common organisation of the market and financial instruments. Member States were currently entering negotiating mode and alliances were forming. What role could the NSRAC now play?
- 8.2 Several members of the NSRAC were meeting next Monday with Commissioner Damanaki, at which we could stress our wish for a regional approach to management. However, internally, the ExCom should handle these issues. It was proposed that we would invite Ernesto Penas to the ExCom to speak to us about the reform proposals.
- 8.3 Hungary, currently holding the EU Presidency assisted by the Netherlands is holding a meeting on the 9th and 10th of March at the Hague for the DG and Member States at Director level to discuss the reforms. There was also to be a similar high-level conference on discards on 1st March, as a result of recent press initiatives on discards that had influenced the Commissioner.

9. Control issues

- 9.1 A new text was due to be agreed on Control by the 8th March. It would take effect in mid April. Some progress had been made in the last few weeks on the issue of weighing fish. There was little the NSRAC could now do.

10. Discard initiatives

- 10.1 Discards had recently become the subject of media focus. A high level meeting had been convened for the 1st March. The Commissioner appeared to favour effort controls plus a discard ban. We had pointed to the flaws in this approach in our previous position papers to the Commission and had recommended an approach tailored to particular fisheries. That was still our view. Many initiatives had now been taken to reduce discards. Perhaps we should produce a list of these to send to the Commissioner?
- 10.2 Luc Corbisier said that the Commissioner had liked the 50% Project. We should certainly publicise the initiatives that fishers had taken. Antoine Le Garrec agreed. There had also been an economic study of the consequences of a discard ban that should be considered. Michael Park thought it would be a good thing to publicise fishers' initiatives but we should not get drawn in to providing figures. The level of discarding often depended on external factors beyond the control of fishermen, and often resulted from management measures. The introduction of MSY would inevitably mean more discarding of fish. Pim Visser said that discards, like noise from aircraft, could never be eliminated but they could be reduced. Paula den Hartog drew attention to the setting up of a discards think-tank by the Dutch industry. Caroline Gamblin said that IFREMER had been asked to look at the reasons for discards over a period of one year.
- 10.3 Euan Dunn said that the UK media initiative had brought political pressure to bear upon the Member States and Commission. The March meeting would be important. Do we have the resources to produce a press release in time for the high-level meeting, outlining progress with catch-quotas and other initiatives? Christine Absil said that the media campaign had been very supportive of the efforts made by fishermen. It had also promoted the consumption of fish of lower market value. It is in the interests of fishermen not to discard fish. It was pointed out that there had been a debate on discards in Sweden, as a result of which Swedish fishers had adopted measures including selective grids, and boards that did not touch the ground. These initiatives had been very successful.
- 10.4 It was agreed that the NSRAC should collate a list of initiatives for reducing discards and submit it to the Commission before the meeting on March 1st. It should be accompanied by a press release. It would need to be done properly and should be circulated for approval. Paul Dolder said that Defra could provide some material. There was also the document produced by the NSRAC two years ago, which listed fishers' conservation achievements. Seafish had set up a discards action group. Barrie Deas asked all participants to send what they had to the Secretariat. We should demonstrate that we were already taking action to reduce discards. The press release and accompanying material should go to the Commission, Parliament, Member States and the press. Links should be included to material held online.
- 10.5 Also on the subject of reducing discards a draft position paper had been produced by the NSRAC on Real Time Closures, intended for the Commission and Parliament. Any additional comments should now be sent to the rapporteur so that the paper could

be completed and sent off. It was noted that an information paper on RTCs had been prepared for MEPs and Paula would send this to participants.

- 10.6 A letter had been sent to Lowri Evans by the NSRAC chair on whiting and scientific issues. The Commission had returned this letter, as they believed the ExCom had not approved it. The letter should be re-sent. However, it might need to be updated first. Any further comments should be sent to the rapporteur. The letter would be sent to the ExCom but as ExCom members were represented on the Demersal WG this was a mere formality.

11. Marine Strategy Framework Directive

- 11.1 Giles Bartlett brought the meeting up to date on the MSFD. The Directive had the potential to determine the way fisheries would be managed in the future. It is a major challenge/threat. It is essentially a legislative framework to enable Member States to deliver an ecosystem approach. It required them to take action to achieve Good Environmental Status for the regional seas by 2020. There is a timeline to achieve targets and indicators for 11 environmental descriptors; four of which had a bearing upon fisheries. In September 2010 the Commission adopted a series of criteria for maintaining GES. From a fisheries standpoint these criteria require:

- Maintenance of biodiversity – conservation of species and habitats
- Populations of all commercially exploited fish and shellfish are to be within safe biological limits, exhibiting a population age and size distribution that is indicative of a healthy stock.
- All elements of the marine food are to occur at normal abundance and diversity and at levels capable of ensuring the long-term abundance of the species and the retention of their full reproductive capacity
- Sea-floor integrity is to be at a level that ensures that the structure and functions of the ecosystems are safeguarded and benthic ecosystems, in particular, are not adversely affected.

- 11.2 OSPAR is now coordinating this process for the North Sea. ICES had undertaken to provide the science base. The NSRAC would need to engage with this process and could do so through the ExCom. There would be complications as the Directive was to be operated by Member States but fisheries measures were the exclusive provenance of the Commission. There is also a necessity for the Directive to be focussed at a regional seas level but there are no institutions or mechanisms for achieving this. There is an issue of governance. Several participants thought that there had been a gross underestimation by DG Mare of the difficulties of implementing the Directive in relation to fisheries. ICES scientists are keen to engage with the NSRAC and are concerned about the rapid development of fisheries indicators, some of which might be inappropriate, contradictory or impossible to achieve. It would be necessary to map the new indicators onto the current format for providing advice, and to do this for all fish and shellfish stocks. ICES is being expected to swallow a camel!

11.3 There were implications for the preparation of LTMPs by the NSRAC. Such plans would need to re-focus their attention on the ecosystem objectives in the light of the new Directive. It was agreed that we needed someone from ICES to address us on these issues at the next ExCom. Niels Wichmann will speak to Poul Degnbol. Chris Darby has produced a paper for Defra on the implications for fisheries. Could he prepare a simplified version of that paper for the NSRAC? We had received a roadmap for OSPAR's activities. The involvement of OSPAR in any issue was likely to be problematical.

12. Any other business?

12.1 Euan Dunn reminded participants that there would be a meeting of the Spatial Planning WG at Scotland House, in Brussels on the 23rd March. We would be able to present our opinions on the proposals from the 3rd FIMPAS workshop, setting out fishery measures to be adopted in the Dutch Natura 2000 sites. The Netherlands is moving towards the adoption of management measures for three Natura 2000 sites. Proposals will have to go to ICES. This will be an important meeting. Those intending to participate should contact Euan Dunn and the Secretariat, and look at the NSRAC website for further details. A symposium organised by the 'Westbanks consortium' to investigate the use of scientific data in MPA planning is to take place in Leuven, Belgium on the day before the Spatial Planning WG. A separate SPWG meeting would be required to address the Forewind wind-farm proposals, and specifically the issues concerning the first tranche of development within the Dogger Bank area.

12.2 Paula den Hartog informed the meeting that assessment of the plaice and sole fisheries is being undertaken for possible MSC certification. The plaice box evaluation had now been completed and a final report sent to the Commission. It was likely that the *status quo* would continue despite the lack of benefits from the box.

12.3 The Technical Measures Regulation was currently subject to transitional arrangements that would remain in place until the 1st January and there were now plans to extend that. A full revision of the regulation is planned to start in 2013.

13. Future meetings

13.1 The next Demersal WG will take place on the 4th May, location to be decided. The Cod Recovery Focus Group would meet on the 8th April, location to be decided.

14. Action Points

1. The suggestion from the Commission that because Member States were not taking up their full days-at-sea allocations there was no need to discuss effort controls will be raised at future discussions with the Commission (1.2).	Chairman
2. A letter will be sent to the Commission seeking greater transparency within the EU/Norway discussions (1.3).	Secretary Chairman
3. The paper prepared on Real Time Closures will be amended and sent to the Commission (1.3; 10.5).	Rapporteur Secretary
4. The letter to the Director General on whiting will be amended and re-sent (1.3; 10.6)	Rapporteur Secretariat
5. A meeting of the RAC Directors and Working Group Chairs will take place to set out future priorities for the NSRAC (1.4).	Secretary
6. We will seek information from the DG and the Commission on the timetable for review of the Cod Recovery Plan (2.2).	Chairman Secretary
7. A NSRAC focus group will be convened after the initial STECF/ICES scoping meeting on review of the Cod Recovery Plan. It will meet on Friday 8 th April (2.4).	Chairman Secretary
8. NSRAC members are encouraged to attend a meeting to discuss the establishment of regional data task forces, taking place on 31 st March at ICES HQ in Copenhagen (4.2).	Members
9. The amended Long Term Management Plan for Nephrops will be circulated to and discussed by members of the development group at a meeting in Glasgow (now changed to Edinburgh) on the 24 th March. The draft plan will be discussed further at the next meeting of the Demersal WG in April/May and subsequently presented to an open meeting of fishers in May/June (5.2).	Rapporteur Michael Park
10. Contact will be made with Newcastle University to consider application for Defra funding to prepare a sustainable fishing plan for the Nephrops fishery on the Farne Deeps with the cooperation of all the	Rapporteur Michael Park

relevant stakeholders (5.7).	
11. A letter will be sent to the authorities in Member States seeking information on those fisheries that catch whiting, including information on discards (5.8; 5.12).	Secretary
12. We will seek presentations on work carried out to reduce discards in the whiting fisheries at the next meeting of the whiting focus group (5.12).	Secretary Chairman
13. A short paper will be prepared for the next ExCom proposing a focus group on North Sea shrimp 5.14).	Pim Visser
14. The draft paper on MSY will be refined, sent out to the ExCom for rapid comment and then forwarded to the Commission and members of the Fisheries Committee (7.2).	Rapporteur Secretary
15. Ernesto Penas will be invited to the next ExCom to provide an update on reform to the CFP (8.2).	Secretary & Chair of ExCom
16. The NSRAC will collate a list of initiatives for reducing discards and submit it to the Commission before the meeting on 1 st March (10.4).	Members Secretary
17. ICES will be asked to provide a speaker on the MSFD at the next ExCom (11.3).	Niels Wichmann
18. The next Demersal WG will take place on the 4 th May (13.1).	Secretary Members Chairman

15. Attendance

Forename	Surname	Organisation
Christien	Absil	North Sea Foundation/Seas at Risk
Michael	Andersen	Danish Fishermen's Association
Martin	Bailey	Newcastle University
Annemiek	Bais-Rienstra	Womens Network
Giles	Bartlett	WWF
Hansen	Black	Shetland Fishermen's Association
Martin	Brebner	NSRAC Secretariat
Rory	Campbell	SFF
Luc	Corbisier	SDVO
Hazel	Curtis	Seafish

Bruno	Dachicourt	Union Nationale Des Syndicats Marins-Pecheurs CFTC
Chris	Darby	CEFAS
Barrie	Deas	NFFO
Paula	den Hartog	Stichting Van De Nederslandse Visserij
Paul	Dolder	DEFRA
Euan	Dunn	RSPB
Kenn Skau	Fisher	Danish Fishermen's Association
Lothar	Fischer	Deutscher-Fischerei-Verband
Caroline	Gamblin	Comite-peches
Tony	Hawkins	NSRAC Rapporteur
Antoine	Le Garrec	UAPF
Arnold	Locker	NFFO
Mike	Park	SFF
Nigel	Proctor	EAA
Robert	Stevenson	North East of Scotland Fishermen's Organisation
William	Stewart	Community Fisheries Control Agency (CFCA)
Pim	Visser	Stichting Van De Nederslandse Visserij/EAFPA
Niels	Wichmann	NSRAC Chairman
Willem	De Boer	Visned
Caro	Cowan	Marine Scotland
Jane	Sandell	SFO
Greig	Chalmers	Marine Scotland