



DRAFT MINUTES

18th Meeting of the Working Group Highly Migratory Stocks (Tunas) and their RFMOs

**Thursday, March 10, 2016
14:30 to 18:30 h**

**Hotel Renaissance. Rue du Parnasse 19.
1050, Brussels (Belgium)**

**Chairman: Mr Michel Goujon
Vice-Chair: Mr Julio Morón**

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chairman opens the meeting by thanking the invited representatives of the Commission and the members for their attendance and participation. Annex I contains the full list of attendees acting as members and observers.

2. Approval of the minutes of the last WG1 meeting

The Chairman summarizes the broad lines of the minutes of the last meeting of the WG1, held in Brussels on October 21, 2015. The minutes are adopted without any changes and are considered an accurate reflection of the discussions and agreed actions.

3. Approval of the agenda

The agenda is approved stressing that items 8 (international governance of the seas) and 9 (shark finning) will not be finally addressed at this meeting as there is no news worthy of mention.



Updated information by the European Commission on Tuna RFMOs:

4. IOTC - Indian Ocean

- **Summary of the recommendations of the meeting of the Scientific Committee of IOTC (November 23 to 27, 2015): Deterioration of the status of white tuna (albacore).**

The representative of the European Commission, Mr Orlando Fachada, reports on the recommendations of the IOTC Scientific Committee regarding tropical tunas, noting that the overall situation is positive. On yellowfin tuna, uncertainty remains, to the extent that about 50% is caught by artisanal fleets and there is insufficient data.

The Scientific Committee used three models to conduct a comparative analysis in order to assess tropical tuna stocks. For albacore, the situation is red, although there are doubts regarding recruitment levels and disparity in the results of abundance indices (CPUE).

Other important tuna fish species (mackerel and longtail tuna) are not in a good condition, in fact, most of them are caught by artisanal fleets and it is difficult to manage and combine conservation measures with the economic survival of the fleet and supplying fish to local communities.

Finally, he states that an IOTC Compliance Committee will soon be convened.

Mr Michel Goujon, ORTHONGEL, reports that he was present at the Scientific Committee meeting in Bali, highlighting the importance in terms of number of vessels and catches by the artisanal fleet in the Indian Ocean. The percentage of catches by this fleet is on the rise. On the contrary, catches reported by longliners are stable or have even declined in some cases. In his opinion, in the absence of a sanctioning regime in the RFMO, the quality of the data has decreased and deteriorated.

The EC representative, Mr Orlando Fachada, states that when measures to improve data quality are brought forward to the negotiating table it becomes very difficult for them to be approved by the contracting parties, but the Commission will continue to propose improvements in data reliability and reporting actual catches.



- **News from the meeting of the Technical Working Group on allocation criteria (Iran, February 20 to 23, 2016).**

Mr Orlando Fachada, EC, reports that there is a block of coastal States which are against the interests of the EU brandishing historical rights over these fisheries.

There were four proposals for discussion with two sides or well-defined positions. The Seychelles proposed a hybrid approach, which is to take into account all historical catches made in the high seas in order to calculate the quotas, and that these be allocated to the flag state; and for catches made inside the EEZ, that they be assigned or belong to the coastal states.

There were three alternative proposals:

1. Seychelles supported by BIOT;
2. Iran and the coastal States stated their disagreement with such approach, and Indonesia suggested the possibility of introducing correction factors also taking into account biological and economic factors.
3. All other Asian countries (China, Japan, Korea) maintained a low profile.

Iran and Indonesia are the two countries with greater fishing capacity in the Indian Ocean. The coastal states have extensive fishing rights that foster an overall increase in fishing capacity.

There was an attempt to reach a consensus document combining both the proposals of the EU and of the coastal States and finally it was agreed to progress in defining a set of criteria that may be used in the future.

As a conclusion of the meeting, he reports that they have a reference document, but are far from reaching an agreement. Progress was made in the meeting since there were many discussions, though the EU calls for a global strategy at the regional level as well as for the need to reduce the actual overall capacity.

Round of questions by the members

Mr Michel Goujon, ORTHONGEL, comments that the EU has a negative image among some countries of imposing EU criteria, as they limit their relationship with EC representatives to the negotiation for the fisheries agreements. On the proposals, he states that data on catches by age size should be provided in order to achieve a more reliable scientific advice.

Mr Juan Pablo Rodriguez, ANABAC, suggests that the EC should reflect and see if they are doing the right thing regarding the role of the EU and negotiations in the RFMOs.



Regarding the proposals, he states that the Indian Ocean is the most important area for the European tuna fleet, whereby he requests DG MARE to ensure the stakes of the fleet there, to the extent that they create factories, jobs and maintain local economies in countries like Seychelles and Madagascar. Another consideration that he brings forward is that not all oceans are equal, and so the EC cannot propose the same thing for all of them. He also comments that the proposals should be progressive in their approach, listening to the industry, which has been working there since the late 1980s. In fact, the measures proposed voluntarily by the industry will have a major positive impact on tropical tuna fisheries.

Mr Raul Garcia, WWF, asked what the EU proposal is regarding the criteria for distribution and allocation of fishing opportunities in the area.

Mr Orlando Fachada, EC, replies that the EU is a contracting party of IOTC, representing the stakes of its ultra-peripheral regions such as Mayotte and Reunion. In addition, the EU negotiates and talks frequently with countries with which it maintains fisheries agreements, such as Seychelles.

With regard to strengthening the negotiating team at IOTC, he mentions that in DG MARE they are reflecting internally on the allocation of human resources in RFMOs, including IOTC. They will also talk with the industry and with all the stakeholders to learn their opinion in this respect.

The distribution proposed by the EC is that in order to reach a quota it ought to be based on the catches of the last 10 years, and with such data to discuss it further and jointly together with other factors related to conformity.

Mr Julio Morón, OPAGAC, states that it is paradoxical that the countries with which the EU has fisheries agreements are those that raise most problems in this RFMO. He inquires if before the May meeting of the IOTC a preparatory technical meeting may be convened with countries like Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius and Seychelles. He believes the support of these countries must be sought regarding resource distribution issues before the plenary meetings.

Mr Orlando Fachada, EC, says that the proposal of Seychelles is the most problematic one. Regarding a multilateral meeting with countries with which they have fisheries agreements, it has not been organised, though he is open to considering it.



- **Preparation of the annual plenary meeting (Reunion Island, May 2016):**

Mr Orlando Fachada, the representative of the EC, reports that this year one of the greatest concerns is compliance with existing regulations, and more efforts are being devoted to improving this. They will also try to assess the degree of individual compliance with each resolution, highlighting that in recent years in the IOTC there has been some improvement in this respect.

Two preparatory meetings were held, one with the Member States and the other with the industry and the LDAC.

The Commission will work essentially on seven proposals or premises, namely:

- 1- *"No data, no fish"*, similar to the ICCAT measure. Such contracting parties failing to provide data will be penalised in the form of quota reductions.
- 2- Limiting fishing capacity, since the current capacity of reference is not the actual capacity. The capacity of the EU long-distance fleet EU has fallen by 25%, however, this proposal was rejected, even including an exception for the artisanal and industrial fleets of developing countries. They believe that this issue may be brought back on track and reopened.
- 3- *Shark finning* (policy of attached shark fins): The EU will continue to defend the policy of attached shark fins on board vessels. They are aware that some parties show reluctance (mainly Asian countries). Australia will propose the same measures, with an exception for coastal fisheries, which is unacceptable for the EU.
- 4- Review of compliance with regulations: they will propose to update the legislation and adhere to international instruments such as the UN FSA or to revise the framework of institutional collaboration with FAO. The establishment of an ad hoc working group will be requested in order to start already this year.
- 5- Port state measures (PSM) in the Indian Ocean in conjunction with FAO PSM, with a proposal for electronic data management.
- 6- A proposal for a pilot project to implement a regional observer program, currently under study by the Scientific Committee and the Secretariat.
- 7- Improving data collection and conservation measures of species that are overexploited. For example, the recommendation to reduce yellowfin catches, with two options to be considered.

- The first option is to impose a fishing ban of 30 days between December 1 and January 31, to minimise the harm to the processing industry, north of the 15th parallel south.
- The second option is that countries that do not see it feasible choose to reduce by 20% their catches of yellowfin in 2017, compared to those of 2014. Countries that exceed 20% will have to pay for it or subtract catches against their quota for the following year. The intention is to protect the main species (marlin and mackerel). In addition, a measure to be enforced is also proposed, that of prohibiting high sea transshipments for a period of 3 years, as they are an open door to IUU fishing. Moreover, they also suggest reducing the number of FADs to 440 per quarter and 880 per year.

Round of questions

Regarding the regulation for attached shark fins, the Chair states that the Community fleet competes at a disadvantage by not receiving the same treatment as the remainder of fleets.

Mr Edelmiro Ulloa, Anapa / Anamer / Acemix / Agarba, says he is not surprised by Australia's position regarding sharks, they have conducted a comparative study and, for example, in New Zealand, finning is allowed for a particular segment of the fleet. Regarding billfish and marlin, he also states that catches of needles that are not swordfish are accidental and minimal and that it would be very problematic for the fleet he is representing if effort reduction measures were to be adopted for a case like this. He adds that the Spanish and Portuguese fleets exert a strict control over their catches, whereas the artisanal fleets in the Indian Ocean, which are the ones that most affect these stocks, show marked deficiencies when reporting their actual catches.

Mr Michel Goujon, ORTHONGEL, on the new proposal for albacore, states that there is a scientific committee requesting to lower catches by 17%. The EU proposes a closure that is very difficult to implement as it poses major socio-economic problems. He inquires if the EC may specify the proposal for a one-month closure or a 15% reduction. He regrets that the measure of catches reduction is to be applied only for the European purse seine fleet, when the real problem is caused by non-EU fleets.

Mr Orlando Fachada, EC, states that it is a proposal by the EU, if the Member States wish to comment they may do so, but it is no longer under consideration.



Regarding Australia, they wish to make an exception for artisanal fishing.

On marlin, the EC representative states that a reduction must be made, though for it to be by 20% is something that is still under discussion.

On FADs, Mr. Orlando Fachada emphasises that an overall reduction by 15% of the number of FADs, which is what the industry proposed, lacks scientific foundation. In fact, it is considered that a reduction of FADs by 15% would have a marginal impact. It is necessary to significantly reduce catches of albacore.

Mr Michel Goujon, ORTHONGEL, asserts that for many years the fleet has been making efforts to reduce the impact of FADs on by-catches.

For his part, Mr Juan Pablo, ANABAC, insists on that the scientific committee does not point towards solutions, the industry has proposed measures and he asks what data are available to support that such FAD reduction measure hardly has an impact. He believes it is necessary to assess the impact.

Mr Julio Morón, OPAGAC, specifies that, in his opinion, the EC proposal to include a ban on high seas transshipments is a mistake in the negotiation strategy. He suggests it would be better to address the increased observer coverage on board, since it is not normal that there is almost no information on 4% of the total catches. Such ban on high seas transshipments needs to be treated as a separate, stand-alone proposal, as it is important enough. If it is entered as an additional management measure in the framework of a global management scheme it is very easy for it to be scrapped.

Mr Michel Goujon, ORTHONGEL, on the scarcity of data reported by Asian artisanal fleets, agrees with the EU that a solution is the "no data no fish" policy. Regarding electronic observer systems, he believes they are easier to adapt for some fleets. Regarding the limited effectiveness of a 15% reduction of FADs by 15%, he does not agree that this will reduce catches of juveniles.

Mr Orlando Fachada, EC, on impact studies, believes that there has not been enough time to measure the impact that some measures could have, though one must be pragmatic. In any case, an impact on reducing catches of juveniles has already been observed but it is not proportional nor significant. A note of such concerns and recommendations is taken. Regarding transshipments, the Commission has opted for a step-by-step approach, and proposes to introduce horizontal measures of prohibiting high seas transshipments, in order to assess the impact, and from there on the implementation of the definitive measure will be studied.



Mr Raul Garcia, WWF, says that NGOs have no information on this subject, not knowing who is affected by the reduction in the number of FADs. He proposes to invite a scientist to make a presentation on the use and actual impact of FADs, the design of ecological FADs in order to start to get a clearer picture.

ACTIONS:

The members will put forward any comments they may deem relevant to the Secretariat regarding proposals for discussion at the next annual meeting of the IOTC, such as the prohibition of high seas transshipments, reducing the number of FADs, setting closed areas for yellowfin tuna, etc. If founded contributions are received, the Secretariat will coordinate the drafting of a position paper addressed to DG MARE for consideration in its preparatory work. In this respect, the Commission has given a maximum period of two weeks for consideration (i.e. until Friday, March 25).

A scientist from CECOFAAD will be invited to make an updated presentation on the consequences of the use of FADs (number, stress levels and impact on stock assessment, as well as materials and types).

5. ICCAT – Atlantic Ocean

- Summary of the annual meeting of ICCAT (Malta, November 9 to 15, 2015): follow-up on the recommendations and conclusions to be drawn.
- Working plan and calendar of meetings for 2016; Review and current state of debate on the management of FADs.

Ms. Francesca Arena, from the Unit B1 of DG MARE, makes a summary on the highlights of the annual meeting of ICCAT which took place in Malta and was attended by the Secretary and members of the LDAC. A review was carried out on the status of stocks of interest to this RFMO in the Atlantic and Mediterranean. In particular, on the stocks of bigeye tuna, sharks, swordfish, marlin and bluefin tuna. She states that there were discussions with clear differences between the position of the EU and that of the Asian fleets, as well as of those of several developing countries that blocked the discussions.



Bigeye Tuna (BET): On the credit side, a reduction was achieved for the TAC from 85,000 to 65,000 tonnes for the next 3 years, as well as a ban lasting 1 month in the Gulf of Guinea. A provisional limit was decreed on the number of FADs, 500 per vessel, which will be reviewed this year in the Working Group meeting to be held in Bilbao.

On the debit side, an increase in observer coverage of 5% was not achieved, nor the current ban on high seas transshipments prospered, although it was achieved that it be discussed in the inter-sessional meetings in July.

Tropical Tunas: mutual recognition of observers was sought, which is important for fisheries agreements in Africa. The developing countries objected to the EU proposal on the issue of freezing fishing capacity.

Sharks: conservation measures were adopted for certain species such as porbeagle. No management measures were achieved for blue shark due to opposition from many countries, and this species is not included as a directed fishery under the text of the ICCAT Convention. No major progress is expected until the next stock assessment in 2018.

“Fins-attached” policy: in one year, an increase from 15 to 30 was achieved in the number of countries supporting the EU in its proposal of the “fins-attached” policy. The proposal was rejected but it is expected to be adopted in the future.

Bluefin Tuna: The electronic documentation scheme for bluefin tuna catches has provided greater flexibility for trade flows within the EU, highlighting the fact that the new assessment for bluefin tuna will take place in 2017.

Swordfish: The EU requested the assessment of the state of the stock in the Mediterranean, which will be performed this year. Harvest Control Rules (HCR) were discussed without reaching any agreement.

Regarding **governance issues**, ICCAT adopted two resolutions to include the ecosystem approach and the precautionary principle in the new ICCAT Convention currently under review, as well as mechanisms for conflict resolution and the participation of fishing entities (such as Chinese Taipei). In addition, it seeks to improve coordination between the Scientific Committee and the Compliance Committee in order to avoid discrepancies in the catch data provided by the contracting parties and the data used by the SCRS. Detecting discrepancies between data and ensuring verification is a constructive exercise for species subject to TACs and quotas. The need was identified to assess the quality of the data supplied.

Round of questions:



Mr Raul Garcia, WWF, congratulates the EC on the proposed Harvest Control Rules (HCR) and Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE), though there is still a long way to go. He believes that most of the scientific assessments of the stocks in ICCAT should clearly be improved. He is particularly concerned that there are no new assessments until 2018 for blue shark and shortfin mako.

6. WCPFC – Western and Central Pacific

- Update on work and meetings in 2016.

Ms Angela Martini, the representative of the EC, reports that in the WCPFC website both the results of the meeting last year as well as the calendar of meetings and events for 2016 are available - Website: <https://www.wcpfc.int/>

She highlights that there was some progress at the annual meeting, but there were also some disappointments. A work plan was adopted with Harvest Control Rules (HCR) for several species of tropical tuna but not for bluefin tuna. In this case, the benchmark used is not MSY, but the level of exploitation. In addition, some interim benchmarks at 0.5 of fishing mortality were fixed for skipjack tuna (SKJ).

Another important point is that it is the first RFMO in which it has been agreed to develop a management plan for sharks. The idea is to advance some guidelines to lay the foundations for the sustainable management of sharks.

During the annual meeting, the working group on FADs was also discussed. It was approved to carry out a research plan by an external consultant to analyse what research needs there are regarding data.

On the other hand, she highlights that no progress was made regarding management measures for tropical tuna stocks. On bigeye tuna, she states that there is overfishing, and bluefin tuna is in a very poor state (approximately 4% of its precautionary biomass). For bluefin, there was a work plan that yielded few results. There is much resistance from Japan to adopt short-term measures. For 2016, the calendar is that in August the Scientific Committee will meet, in fact, this year there will be new assessments for skipjack tuna and blue sharks. For bigeye tuna, how to develop other strategies will be looked into.

Regarding financial issues, there are several projects: the mitigation of by-catches of sharks and skates, as well as the impact of FADs on bigeye tuna.

In late September, three WCPFC meetings will be held on:



1. Catch documentation scheme;
2. WG on FADs, with Pew projects to monitor and locate them in real time, collecting and analysing the data obtained.
3. Meeting of the Technical and Compliance Committee in Fiji.

Finally, the annual meeting will take place on December 5-9.

Ms Martini underlines that WCPFC has a new Chair and Executive Director, both of whom are very active, with clear ideas, who wish to address the causes of bigeye mortality as priority issues; additional HCR management measures for yellowfin tuna; development of management plans for sharks; and progress on the realisation of recommendations on FADs.

Round of questions:

Mr Michel Goujon, Orthongel, enquires who is the consultant hired for the project to mark FADs, given that the European fleets have already included their own arrangements for the marking of such devices. He also asks how the management plan designed for sharks ties in with the FAO Plan of Action.

Regarding the WCPFC WG on FADs, he believes it should be attended by those who already participate in other working groups, it is very important to ensure that European scientists will participate in this WG.

Mr Raul Garcia, WWF, reports that at the inter AC meeting an intervention was made regarding the extent to which the LDAC could contribute in order to facilitate the implementation of the external dimension and assist the Commission in preparing their positions towards the RFMOs. The reply by Mr Ernesto Penas, EC, was that they welcomed ideas from the LDAC on how to be more effective.

ACTION: The LDAC will discuss an Action Plan for the European Commission in order to point out the most important meetings in the various RFMOs from the point of view of the stakeholders. To this end, the Commission must provide an updated calendar of meetings as well as explanations on their proposals, identifying potential problems, etc.

Ms Martini replies that in terms of management of FADs for 2017 the EC will seek to pursue a coordination scheme with the RFMOs similar to the Kobe process.

Regarding the participation in the Scientific Committee, she replies that the group is open to European scientists and that Mr Josu Santiago (AZTI), for example, is attending as a member of the European delegation together with officials from the



Commission. There are limited resources of the EC, though it is the Member States who are to identify priorities.

For the EU there is an insufficient presence in terms of all the groups in WCPFC. At the scientific level, they are giving more importance to innovation strategies. In Bali, in November, Mr Gorka Merino made a presentation of what ICCAT is doing.

Regarding shark management, it is different to FAO. The idea is to define which fisheries are directed, based on the data from the stock assessments for each species, in order to reach a management plan per fleet. The idea is to have several objective benchmarks to define catch levels.

Mr Michel Goujon, Orthongel, states that we, as European fleet, do not have much presence in the Pacific, supporting the idea of Mr Raul Garcia, WWF, of identifying priorities for the LDAC, with a work plan for two years and deciding which issues we are going to foster.

Ms Angela Martini, EC, believes that the individuals involved should be aware of the actions of the WCPFC Scientific Committee, asserting that the EU would have the resources to fund it.

Mr Edelmiro Ulloa, Anapa / Anamer / Acemix / Agarba, asks the Commission whether they will continue to insist on proposing the adoption of the European regulation on attached shark fins. Ms Angela Martini, EC, says yes, the issue will be raised. The subject of attached fins was not adopted, in fact, at Western it was acknowledged that it is impossible to monitor. It is not possible either using the measure of 5% of weight.

Mr Julio Morón, OPAGAC, enquires whether the staff reduction at DG MARE might not hamper the possibility to promote the international governance of the seas. No material or human resources should be spared or reduced in matters of international policy as required by such important services as the WCPFC.

Mr Juan Pablo, ANABAC, supports the idea of creating the LDAC working group. It could also be approached with allied countries who are contracting parties to the RFMOs and thus maximise resources in order to reach consensus positions with the EU.

Mr Orlando Fachada, EC, remarks that they share such concerns and they believe more staff is necessary in order to work with the RFMOs, particularly for the Indian Ocean. They have been instructed by Commissioner Juncker to reduce staff, they have to do more with less, however, it is a matter of concern, and so next week there will be a meeting on this subject. On the issue that we are in a negative



environment for the EU, it has already been stated the situation is not new. There is still margin for negotiation with these countries.



ACTIONS:

The LDAC must issue a warning to the EC in order that they do not cut resources nor staffing concerning issues of international governance of the seas and oceans, providing the Commission's delegations with the capacity to be present at the main decision forums such as the RFMOs (other than NAFO and ICCAT where they have a large presence).

An LDAC WG will be created in order to define the input in terms of the EU's overall strategic action plan within the tuna RFMOs, promoting consistency for EU policies.

The Commission will be requested to provide an updated calendar of WCPFC meetings as well as details of the consultancy study on tagging programs for tropical tuna (YFT and BET) and the work of this RFMO in developing management plans for sharks.

7. Reflection on the role of the EU in tuna RFMOs: Medium-Term Strategy for the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans

Mr Michel Goujon, Orthongel, summarises the suggestion of drafting a work plan, including the strategy to be pursued and the working means. Therefore, the following is agreed:

ACTION:

International governance and the role of the EU in RFMOs:

An "ad hoc" drafting group will be established in order to develop an action plan in the medium term stating the priorities for resources and actions of the EU within the different tuna RFMOs, as well as the capacity needs (staffing) on behalf of the European Commission in order to achieve sustainable management of international fisheries in keeping with the goal of achieving an ecosystem approach in 2020.

The aforementioned plan will identify the key issues to be addressed (e.g. management of fishing capacity, use of FADs, etc.) and the Commission will be requested to provide DG MARE with more resources in order to implement its fisheries management policies within the framework of active presence and participation of the EU in the RFMOs. This demand is in line with the external audit commissioned by the Commission itself to optimise internal staff resources.



Strategic issues

8. Policy on shark finning (ban on finning)

This issue was not addressed, pending the receipt of the report by the Commission on the assessment of the effectiveness of Regulation (EU) 605/2013 since its entry into force, and taking into account a priori the socio-economic impact on the fleets concerned by means of reports provided by the Member States.

It was decided to postpone the discussion until the next meeting of WG1.

9. Collaboration between the LDAC and COMHAFAT

The Secretary General, Mr Alexandre Rodríguez, reports on the meeting with DG DEVCO, in which COMHAFAT also participated as a strategic partner, in order to have an exchange of ideas and probing the opportunities for participation and collaboration on issues of transparency in fishing activities, cooperation with third countries, and the fight against IUU fishing.

DG DEVCO was very interested in learning more in depth the joint work carried out by the two organisations in recent years. The Secretariat will forward them all the relevant documentation.

In addition, he also briefly summarized the COMHAFAT seminar in Casablanca on control, surveillance and inspection measures as a tool against IUU fishing in the Gulf of Guinea, and he announced the upcoming celebration in June of the Second Workshop on Sustainable Fisheries Agreements between the EU and third countries, which will be attended by a large representation of the LDAC.

Finally, the Secretary introduced the idea of strengthening the MoU by holding annual coordination meetings between the two organisations, inviting and keeping informed the designated representatives of DG MARE and DG DEVCO.

Any other business

10. Exchange of information on external meetings relevant to WG1.

No comments were made on this item.



11. Date and place of the next meeting.

The next meeting of WG1 will probably take place in Brussels in mid or late October. The Secretariat will confirm the date and place of the next meeting as soon as possible.

The Chairman thanks the members and observers for their participation, the Secretariat for their coordination work and the interpreters for their effort, and formally declares the meeting closed at 18:40 h.

-END-



ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LDAC Working Group 1
Brussels, March 10, 2016

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

1. Michel Goujon. ORTHONGEL
2. Erik Olsen. Living Sea
3. Despina Symons. EBCD
4. Julio Morón. OPAGAC
5. Juan Manuel Trujillo. ETF
6. Juan Manuel Liria. FEOPE/CEPESCA
7. Raúl García. WWF
8. Edelmiro Ulloa. Anapa / Anamer / Acemix / Agarba
9. Juana Parada. ORPAGU
10. Katarina Sipic. CONXEMAR
11. Marta Llopis. CONXEMAR
12. María José Cornax. OCEANA
13. Vanya Vulperhorst. OCEANA
14. Luis Vicente. ADAPI
15. Mercedes Rodríguez. OPP-Lugo
16. Irene Vidal. EIJ
17. Marc Ghiglia. UAPF
18. Juan Pablo Rodríguez. ANABAC
19. Laura Koene. EUROTHON

OBSERVERS

1. Orlando Fachada. EC
2. Angela Martini. EC
3. Francesca Arena. EC
4. Michael Earle. PE
5. Sandra Jen. PEW
6. Jesús Iborra. PE
7. Lea Lebechnech. EBCD
8. Konstantino Kalamantis. PE
9. Alexandre Rodríguez. LDAC
10. Manuela Iglesias. LDAC
11. Marta de Lucas. LDAC