



## NWWAC Minutes

### WORKING GROUP 2 (CELTIC SEA & WEST OF SCOTLAND)

Thursday, 05 March 2026  
Copa-Cogeca, Brussels & Online

#### 1. Welcome and introductions

The Vice Chair Jean Marie Robert welcomed all participants and chaired the first part of the meeting in the absence of the Chair Jesús A. Lourido García. Apologies were received from Dominic Rihan. The agenda was adopted.

#### Action points from the last meeting (14 October 2025)

1	Discussion on 2004 hake regulation with the Commission in January <a href="#">Agenda item 3.</a>
2	Meeting to be organised on hake between scientists and industry, either as part of the VarMer project or by NWWAC  <a href="#">The NWWAC/SWWAC Hake Workshop, within the framework of the VarMer project, will be held on 29 April in Seville and online. Its aim is to gather input from industry members on Northern European hake.</a>
3	Secretariat to circulate main articles of FMSY project and members to identify next steps  <a href="#">Completed.</a>
4	WG to hold discussion on spurdog and potential recommendations to be developed by the AC  <a href="#">Completed. Spurdog was addressed in the last FG Skates &amp; Rays meeting, and it will be also addressed during item 3.</a>

#### 2. Appointment of the new Working Group 2 Chair

The Vice Chair noted the need to appoint a new Chair for WG2 as Suso Lourido Garcia is no longer available to take on this role. Jean Marie Robert has confirmed his decision to continue in the role of Vice Chair. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat had invited expressions of interest for the WG2 Chair position via email. An expression of interest was received from Irene Prieto, from OPPF4. Members voted unanimously to appoint Irene Prieto as Chair of WG2.

#### 3. Dialogue with DG MARE – Norman Graham and Jurgen Batsleer, DG MARE C.5

The Chair, Irene Prieto, welcomed Norman Graham and Jurgen Batsleer from DG MARE C.5 and thank them for joining the meeting. The Chair informed members that they will provide an update on the current state of discussion between the EU and the UK, focusing in particular on the Celtic Sea and West of Scotland; as well to address the ongoing discussion on technical measures for the Celtic Sea, Spurdog, and Hake in the Celtic Sea. On the latter, the Chair recalled that from our previous meetings, it has emerged an ongoing concern that hake in the Celtic Sea is not recovering and is not meeting the MSY target set out in Regulation on the Multi-Annual



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR  
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES  
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN  
WATERS  
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA  
LAS AGUAS  
NOROCCIDENTALES

Management Plan for Western Waters. Members are also concerned about the effectiveness of the current management measures, which we will also address during the NWWAC/SWWAC Hake Workshop in Seville on 29 April.

**N. Graham** reported earlier that morning, the 11th meeting of the Working Group of the EU-UK Specialised Committee on Fisheries (SCF) had taken place. The Plenary will be held on 22 April. The meeting focused on reviewing the various commitments made during the EU-UK consultations and the follow-up work required in the coming months. Among the key topics discussed were technical measures, which had represented a significant component of last year's discussions.

He explained that the work under the SCF is currently organised into two main configurations. The first focuses on general fisheries management issues, including conservation and management aspects that are not stock-specific. This area of work is becoming increasingly important and was discussed during the morning session.

The second configuration focuses on a range of more specific topics, including technical measures and fishing opportunities in the Celtic Sea and West of Scotland. Discussions in this configuration primarily relate to scientific advice and to the implementation timelines for potential measures within the relevant legal frameworks, including possible UK legislation.

On technical measures, as part of last year's discussions with the UK, a decision was taken to introduce additional remedial measures in the Channel, Celtic Sea and Irish Sea. This is a legal requirement under both the EU and UK multiannual plans, which stipulate that when a stock falls below the biomass limit reference point, additional remedial measures must be adopted to ensure the rapid recovery of the stock concerned. The measures implemented should reflect the status of the stock, with more severe measures applied where the stock status is more critical. In this context, the EU and the UK have committed to jointly developing a guidance note clarifying the practical application of certain technical measures. The document will specify which fisheries will be affected, the timeline for implementation, and the relevant technical parameters (e.g. mesh sizes, catch composition threshold, square mesh panels, etc.). The intention is to produce an aligned document between the EU and the UK, even if it will not formally be a joint publication. The aim is to finalise this guidance by the end of the month, given the importance of providing sufficient time for the fishing industry to prepare for the upcoming changes.

On EU commitment with the UK to develop rebuilding plans/strategies for depleted stocks, this is expected to become a major area of cooperation with the UK in the coming months. In the written record of the last year, the establishment of a technical team is envisaged to develop the rebuilding plans. While the primary focus will be on stocks in the Celtic Sea (cod, haddock and whiting) and the Eastern Channel (sole and plaice), the Irish Sea whiting and cod stocks are also of concern and may be considered in the scope of the work. To support this process, the Commission is establishing a joint EU-UK technical expert group, expected to begin work in the coming weeks. The group will bring together scientists from several national institutes (including IFREMER, the Marine Institute, and others) and will focus on improving the spatial and temporal understanding of fisheries interactions with depleted stocks, through also VMS and logbook



analysis. This work of the expert group will involve analysing catch patterns, fleet behaviour, and the distribution of fishing effort in order to identify more precise and targeted management measures in the future. N. Graham added that, in the more immediate term, the work would build on the outcomes of ICES' WKREBUILD workshop, which examined rebuilding strategies for depleted stocks. In this context, the Commission is keen to explore different types of harvest control rules (HCRs) that may be better suited to supporting stock recovery. Initial exchanges on this topic have already taken place with the UK, although discussions remain at an early stage. Work is currently underway to finalise the terms of reference for the joint EU–UK technical expert group, which is expected to address these issues as part of its mandate. The group is likely to become a key component of future EU–UK cooperation under the TCA framework.

He noted that further discussions would also be needed regarding how stakeholders, including Advisory Councils, can effectively provide input into this process. The governance landscape remains complex, as several parallel processes exist, including the EU–UK SCF, the UK's Fisheries Management Plans, and existing EU multiannual management plans. The Commission is aware of the need to ensure appropriate stakeholder involvement and will provide further clarification as the work progresses.

Turning to non-quota stocks, N. Graham outlined three main issues currently under discussion.

The first relates to brown crab. An ICES research report published shortly before Christmas (the WKCRAB workshop report) highlighted a number of concerns regarding the status and management of brown crab stocks. At the same time, other environmental and ecological factors – such as octopus blooms and related ecosystem interactions in the Channel – are also being closely monitored. Both the EU and the UK are paying particular attention to these developments, and further work on brown crab management is expected in the near future. However, the institutional framework through which this work should be conducted is still being clarified.

In parallel, regional groups of Member States are currently working on the development of joint recommendations concerning management measures for brown crab, including potential minimum conservation reference sizes. On the UK side, there are also plans to revise certain national conservation measures. Given that work is progressing on both sides, efforts are being made to ensure that these initiatives remain coordinated and coherent, although the exact mechanisms for doing so are still being explored. N. Graham emphasised that brown crab is likely to become an increasingly important issue in future discussions.

The second non-quota stock issue concerns the ongoing work on a multiannual management strategy for king scallops, which – even though focused on the Channel – can be important also for the other NWW areas. This work has been progressing for some time, and a scientific report covering ICES areas 7d and 7e (Eastern and Central Channel) has recently been received. Additional stakeholder engagement activities are expected to take place in the coming weeks and months. Once the report will be fully reviewed by the Commission, it will be shared with the relevant stakeholders, including the Advisory Councils. The aim is to develop a multiannual strategy for the Channel scallop fishery, particularly in areas 7d and 7e. N. Graham noted that area 7d is generally considered to be relatively well managed and productive, but further work is nevertheless needed to support a longer-term strategic framework.



The third issue relates to seabass, specifically the seabass catch allocation tool used for distributing fishing opportunities. The current allocation tool requires updating for the upcoming fishing season, and this work is expected to continue in the coming months together with ICES. The benchmark will need to be updated. N. Graham reported that during that morning meeting the Commission was informed of a UK university is looking for spawning information on seabass.

Regarding “configuration 2” on ICES requests, N. Graham reported that three stocks have been discussed:

- On horse mackerel, in the Southern North Sea and Eastern Channel, 0 TAC catch advice has been in place for the last couple of years, with bycatch provisions applied in some of the mixed fisheries. ICES is exploring other methodologies to gather more data on this stock. Feedback should be received by the Commission around next summer.
- Additional scientific work is also expected regarding sole stocks in ICES areas 7h, 7j, 7k and 7e. In particular, further analysis of genetic information collected for these stocks is being considered, and a request for additional work may be submitted to ICES.
- On skates and rays, a joint request is in place to ask for an alignment of the minimum conservation reference size.

In conclusion, N. Graham summarised that the morning meeting of the SCF Working Group had covered a broad range of topics, including quota and non-quota stocks, technical measures, rebuilding strategies, and scientific coordination. The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for 22 April. He noted that much of the work currently underway is process-oriented and preparatory in nature, but it will form the basis for more substantive discussions in the months ahead.

**Jurgen Batsleer** provided then an overview of the work carried out on Spurdog last year. He noted that, following the benchmark advice in 2022, a 100 cm maximum size had been established to protect large females, which had been a topic of intense discussion and stakeholder input. ICES was tasked with producing a report assessing the potential effects of removing the 100 cm maximum size, as well as considering alternative scenarios such as changing the maximum size, introducing a minimum size, or removing size limits entirely and adjusting the TAC.

Based on this report, annual consultations with the EU and UK resulted in the decision to remove the maximum size while applying a precautionary approach, taking approximately 50% of ICES’s recommended TAC. Discussions on the minimum conservation reference size as an additional precautionary measure are ongoing with the UK. A dedicated meeting with scientific experts is planned, likely around May, to review several aspects, including the minimum conservation reference size and survivability studies, with ongoing contributions from BIM, CEFAS, and France.

J. Batsleer highlighted concerns arising from the report, including how removing the maximum size might affect fishing patterns and whether larger individuals might become the primary target. While discussions with the UK continue, the immediate focus is on the upcoming biannual advice for 2027–2028. Looking ahead, a longer-term management plan for spurdog is envisaged, potentially including management strategy evaluation.



Finally, he stressed the importance of requesting regular feedback from member states on the uptake of spurdog measures, to monitor developments and ensure effective management.

**Frank Le Barzic**, regarding seabass, noted that while the seabass catch allocation tool had been updated following the benchmark advice and accounted for south-to-north migrations, there remained concerns. In the first version of the tool from several years ago, the allocation of catches between métiers assumed that all vessels would fully utilise their annual quotas, which resulted in a significant overestimation of the measures' actual effect. As an example, recreational fisheries, involving millions of fishers, would produce vastly different results even at small quotas, consuming a large part of the biomass. He asked whether this assumption was still applied in the current version of the tool. Secondly, on technical measures in the Celtic Sea, he expressed concern over the reappearance of the Raised Fishing Line this year. This device is not discussed in UK waters, is not applicable there, and can be counterproductive for protecting species such as whiting and haddock, as studies have shown it increases catches of these species. He asked whether this measure was retained due to timing in discussions between Member States or whether there is a deliberate intention to keep what he considered an obsolete device. Thirdly, on fisheries spatialisation data in the Celtic Sea, he emphasised the importance of verifying the resolution of spatio-temporal closures. He noted that this year closures were applied at the scale of statistical rectangles, which is not an appropriate scale. Attempting to protect stocks such as cod, which are now mostly caught incidentally, risks impacting entire fisheries targeting other species, including non-quota species that currently do not face management issues. Finally, he commented on skates and rays MCRS, noting that while this is likely a good measure, the biological differences between species mean that different minimum sizes would be appropriate. He stressed, however, that for practical implementation, the regulations must remain simple and not require a separate minimum size for each skate species in the area.

**J. Batsleer** responded to questions regarding the seabass allocation tool, noting that the issues raised are longstanding and complex. He explained that a request was submitted to ICES in 2022 to address elements perceived as problematic in the model, including migration, the number of vessels, and the different commercial métiers involved. These issues remain under discussion, and a new timeline for the request is expected soon, followed by a data call to Member States to update vessel and fleet information for the tool. He acknowledged that progress has been slow but emphasised that the concerns raised remain on the table and are being carefully addressed.

Regarding MCRS for skates and rays, **J. Batsleer** noted the challenge of aligning measures across species with different life histories and lengths, highlighting that overly complex rules would be impractical for fishers. He stressed the need for simplified, operational measures while ensuring effective protection. He also mentioned that dedicated workshops with ICES, open to stakeholders, are planned and encouraged participation to provide input. He concluded that this is a longer-term process and no agreement is expected this year, but the concerns raised are fully acknowledged.

**J. Lynch** raised a question regarding technical measures. He asked about the process for introducing a new measure when agreeing on common technical measures with the UK. While



acknowledging the benefits of harmonisation, he inquired how new measures would be introduced and aligned with the UK, particularly in the context of ongoing work on potential technical measures and future stock rebuilding programmes.

**N. Graham** responded to questions on technical measures, explaining that last year the focus was on mesh size. He noted that a legal check is being carried out to ensure that existing measures do not conflict with the agreements made with the UK. Any amendments are expected to come into force in the summer, and there are currently no mechanisms to make frequent adjustments, as this would be operationally unfair for the industry. He emphasised that conversations on technical measures with the UK and stakeholders will continue, recognising the complexity of the regulatory landscape, which includes the TCA and the UK's own FMPs. While no radical changes are planned this year, forums will remain available for discussion of potential future adjustments to ensure legal clarity and consistency. On concerns about obsolete technical measures, he explained that the aim is to replace existing measures with delegated acts, reducing legal uncertainty and conflicts. Regarding the risk of jeopardising fishing opportunities for other species, he stressed the importance of fine-scale mapping using VMS and logbook data to precisely identify where catches and bycatches of depleted stocks occur. Areas where depleted stocks are not present should remain available for normal fishing activity, ensuring that opportunities for species such as hake and megrim are not unnecessarily constrained, while acknowledging some unavoidable overlap.

**E. Brouckaert** referred to an action point from the previous WG2 meeting concerning the review of the 2004 Hake Recovery Plan. He noted that the Commission had asked for clarification on what might be considered outdated in the plan. E. Brouckaert suggested that, after nearly two decades, the objectives of the 2004 regulation may no longer be fully valid and that it is timely to review the measures in place. This remains an open question for the time being, with a review planned in the future.

He then addressed two points related to the implementation of new technical measures, Firstly, he highlighted potential conflicts between the agreed summertime measures in the written record and existing 2019 technical measures regulations, and asked whether the forthcoming guidance note would clarify and prioritise which regulations take precedence, particularly regarding exemptions for flatfish-targeted fisheries.

Secondly, regarding the ongoing mapping exercise, he expressed concern about the workload for the technical expert group, given the volume of questions and tasks from the Commission. He suggested that stakeholders be involved immediately in the process, rather than waiting for an initial session with the expert group, so that real-time information from the fishing sector could be incorporated more efficiently.

**J.M. Robert** reflected on the application of precautionary measures, highlighting two key considerations from the perspective of fishers. Firstly, he noted that excessive precaution can lead to underexploitation, preventing the stock from reaching its maximum productive potential. Secondly, he highlighted the potential for increased predation on other species: as fishing effort limits mortality on target species such as hake and seabass, their biomass tends to increase, which can lead to greater consumption of other species in the ecosystem. J.M Robert suggested that when specific management measures are being considered – such as setting minimum or



maximum catch limits or harvesting only a percentage of the ICES-recommended TAC – it would be valuable to assess not only the long-term effects on the target stock over 10–20 years but also the consequences for other species. He asked whether it would be possible for ICES to integrate these broader ecosystem effects into their assessments in the coming weeks and months.

**P. Murphy** noted that while efforts have focused on achieving MSY, the shift towards stock recovery requires consideration of broader implications. He welcomed the work being done and acknowledged the substantial workload involved on both sides. P. Murphy emphasised the need to consider ecosystem impacts, climate change, and interactions with non-quota and endangered species. Additionally, he highlighted the economic implications for operators, including their ability to adapt to new measures, and potential enforcement challenges. He noted that these practical considerations reflect the perspective of fishers and should be taken into account when implementing management measures.

**N. Graham** thanked the Chair and colleagues and provided clarifications regarding the hake and technical measures. He explained that the 2004 hake regulation had legal issues, which are being addressed with the relevant Commission colleagues. The guidance note under preparation aims to clarify the agreement with the United Kingdom, to provide legal clarity and ensure consistency. N. Graham emphasised that any changes at the regional level would be implemented through delegated acts, following formal joint recommendations, and that stakeholder input would be integrated from the outset to ensure practicality and realism.

Regarding precautionary measures for spurdog and seabass, **N. Graham** highlighted the historical collapse of the spurdog stock due to targeting large females and stressed that the current approach seeks to avoid repeating past mistakes. He noted that the removal of the 100 cm maximum size is being handled cautiously to balance conservation with fisheries interests.

On multi-species interactions, **N. Graham** acknowledged the complexity of providing multi-species advice due to ecological uncertainties and limited data, particularly in the Celtic Sea, though work continues in this area. He also addressed ecosystem and climate change impacts, noting that ICES is developing approaches to incorporate these factors into the advisory process.

Finally, N. Graham highlighted the importance of considering the economic impacts on operators and the practical ability to adapt to new measures. He stressed that spatially refined VMS and logbook analyses would guide decision-making while maintaining a balance between recovery objectives and supporting viable fisheries.

**J. Batsleer** addressed the management of seabass, noting that while multi-species considerations were important, he would focus on precautionary measures for this stock. He highlighted that the recent benchmark indicated a positive trend, with the stock now above MSY, but emphasised that uncertainties in the assessment still warranted a cautious approach, similar to that applied for spurdog. Batsleer explained that discussions with the UK included revisiting seasonal closures, as new information suggests the spawning period in the Celtic Sea may have shifted, potentially affecting the timing and duration of the two-month closure. He also noted the need to review the existing sea bass moratorium as part of a longer-term monitoring approach. This would allow greater flexibility if the stock continues to maintain healthy levels. He concluded

by emphasising that multiple management elements are ongoing for seabass, including allocation tools and broader precautionary measures, and that progress would be taken forward at a measured, stepwise pace to ensure sustainability.

#### 4. Update on ICES work on VMEs – Simon Jennings, ICES Advisory Committee, Vice-chair

The Chair welcomed Simon Jennings, Vice-Chair of the ICES Advisory Committee. S. Jennings delivered a presentation on “Evolution and Benchmarking of ICES VME Advice” during the MIACO meeting held in January at the ICES premises, which was also attended by the NWWAC Secretariat. The Chair noted that, given our long-standing work in the WG2 on VME-related issues, we felt it important to invite him to share this presentation with WG members.

**Simon Jennings** began by welcoming participants and noting that ICES currently provides recurrent advice on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) to both the European Commission and NEAFC. He explained that the advice describes areas where VMEs occur or are likely to occur, and that it is provided every two years for the European Commission and annually for NEAFC. For the current year, ICES will give advice to both organisations and will also address a special request from the European Commission regarding the impacts of static gear.

He outlined the evolution and benchmarking of VME advice, noting that the methods used for recurrent advice were last benchmarked in 2022. These methods are applied in advice to the European Commission, though not to NEAFC. S. Jennings emphasised that ICES advice at any given time is based on the best available evidence and methods, which continue to evolve between benchmark exercises. Minor adjustments can be made within expert groups and advice drafting groups, while larger methodological changes require a formal benchmark process.

Since the 2022 benchmark, several scientific and policy developments have influenced ICES advice. S. Jennings highlighted changes arising from UN General Assembly resolutions, the availability of new technical methodologies for modelling VME distributions, and improved understanding of the impacts of different fishing gears. Feedback from stakeholders, requesters, and scientists within expert groups has further informed these developments. ICES decided that a new benchmark is necessary to ensure advice remains based on the best available science and fit for purpose, with the next benchmark scheduled for October 2027, preceded by preparatory actions that are already underway.

S. Jennings described the benchmark process, as well known in the fisheries context, applied across other types of ICES advice and was governed by the same formalised guidelines. These guidelines cover the establishment of benchmark scope, planning, and the review of methods, assumptions, and data. Preparatory actions include accounting for new research and analytical methods, as well as, in the VME context, considering issues raised by the European Commission, NEAFC, and stakeholders.

Regarding completed actions, Jennings noted that historic data in the ICES VME database had been reviewed and corrected where possible, with work conducted by the Working Group on Deep Water Ecology and reviewed in advice drafting groups. Predictive habitat modelling has advanced significantly, allowing assessment of areas where VMEs are likely to occur based on



environmental conditions rather than confirmed records. A report on these methods has been published following a workshop chaired by Kerry Howell and Chris Rooper. Transparency of analytical methods is also being improved through the creation of intermediate datasets and open-access code available via the ICES Transparent Assessment Framework, enabling others to replicate the processes used. This approach will extend into the 2027 benchmark, ensuring all inputs, code, and outputs are publicly available.

Further preparatory actions include addressing the impacts of static gear, with a workshop planned for October 2026 and preparatory analyses already underway. A separate workshop on the VME index is also planned for the same month. S. Jennings emphasised that ICES workshops are open processes, and stakeholders are encouraged to register and participate. Significant work is also underway regarding the spatial scales of analysis, moving from the latitude-dependent C-square grid system to equal-area kilometre-based grids to ensure consistency of results across latitudes.

S. Jennings concluded by reiterating that planning for the benchmark is ongoing and welcomed feedback from stakeholders on the completeness of the approach and additional issues to consider. Participants were informed that questions could be submitted via the Secretariat for consideration.

**P. Murphy** asked about stakeholder engagement.

**S. Jennings** explained that terms of reference are published for all workshops and that, while the ICES Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct apply, stakeholders are encouraged to provide evidence relevant to the processes. Early submission of questions or concerns allows expert groups time to prepare analyses and ensures that meaningful responses can be provided during workshops. Engagement is therefore possible.

## **5. Small-scale Coastal Fisheries issue**

The Chair noted that, as agreed at the last ExCom meeting in October 2025, each working group should include a standing agenda item on small-scale coastal fisheries (SSCF), providing members with the opportunity to raise any relevant issues. He then invited members to share their views on this topic.

No points were raised by members.

## **6. NWWAC Work programme overview and planning for Y22 – Secretariat**

Mo Mathies informed members that the preparation of the work programme will take place in the coming weeks. Members will be contacted shortly via email to provide their input, with the aim of finalising the programme prior to its submission to the European Commission in June.



A. Philippe intervened, noting that CHARM has recently emphasised the importance of making the drafting of advice more efficient, where members have greater ownership and engagement in the process and enable the focus to remain on the most significant issues. When a member proposes an idea for advice, they are encouraged to support the Secretariat in its drafting, by providing a first draft or bullet points. This approach ensures that the advice is meaningful and reflects full stakeholder engagement within the Advisory Council.

## 7. AOB & Summary of actions agreed and decisions adopted by the Chair

1	Secretariat to check for updates on the issue of Nephrops in the Porcupine bank for potential presentation during the next WG2 meeting.
2	Secretariat to follow up on the Guidelines Note related to Technical Measures, which should be finalised by the end of March and sent to the AC by the Commission.
3	Secretariat to keep WG2 updated on the ICES Rebuilding Strategy.
4	Secretariat to keep WG2 updated on Spurdog and BIM works, as well as on skates and rays through the dedicated Focus Group
5	Secretariat to await information from the Commission on hake and the query on the 2004 Regulation.
6	Secretariat to share more information – once available - on the registration for two ICES workshops taking place in October 2026: 1) Workshop on VME index; 2) Workshop on static gear impact.
7	Members to send to Secretariat queries for Simon Jennings following is presentation “Update on ICES work on VMEs”
8	Secretariat to initiate members’ consultation regarding Year 22 Work Programme.

The Chair concluded the meeting, thanking the WG2 members for their participation, the Secretariat and the interpreters.



## Participants

<b>NWWAC members</b>		
José	Beltran	OPP-7 BURELA
Emiel	Brouckaert	BFPO
Manu	Kelberine	CRPM de Bretagne
Franck	Le Barzic	OP COBRENORD
John	Lynch	ISEFPO
Patrick	Murphy	ISWFPO
Irene	Prieto	OPPF4
Jean-Marie	Robert	Les Pêcheurs de Bretagne
Arthur	Yon	FROM Nord
<b>Experts &amp; observers</b>		
Jurgen	Batsleer	DG MARE
Guillermo	Bravo Téllez	NWW MS TG - Spanish Representative
Juan Carlos	Corras Arias	FREMSS
Audren	Gloria	DGAMPA
Norman	Graham	DG MARE
Gérald	Hussenot Desenonges	Blue Fish
Simon	Jennings	ICES
Michael	Keating	ISEFPO
Jesús A.	Lourido García	OPP-77
Erwan	Quemeneur	CDPMEM 29
Alexandra	Philippe	EBCD
Chloé	Pocheau	SWWAC Secretariat
Michelle	Twomey	DAFM
Dirk	Van Guyze	Departement LV ABCO dienst zeevisserij
<b>NWWAC Secretariat</b>		
Ilaria	Bellomo	Fisheries Strategy & Administration Officer
Mo	Mathies	Executive Secretary