



INTERGROUP ON THE WELFARE & CONSERVATION OF ANIMALS

Bureau Members

President:

Dan Jørgensen MEP

Vice-Presidents:

Kriton Arsenis MEP

Jacqueline Foster MEP

Nadja Hirsch MEP

Elisabeth Jeggle MEP

Jörg Leichtfried MEP

Kartika Liotard MEP

David Martin MEP

Cristiana Muscardini MEP

Sirpa Pietikäinen MEP

Raül Romeva i Rueda MEP

Daciana Sârbu MEP

Michèle Striffler MEP

Janusz Wojciechowski MEP

Andrea Zannoni MEP

Honorary President:

Carl Schlyter MEP

Honorary Secretary:

Marit Paulsen MEP

Secretariat:

Eurogroup for Animals

6, rue des Patriotes
B- 1000 Brussels

T: +32-2 740 08 20

F: +32-2 740 08 29

www.animalwelfareintergroup.eu

info@eurogroupforanimals.org

Established in 1983

Report of the 281st Session

Thursday 15th March 2012, 10.00 – 11.00 hrs

Room LOW N3.2 – European Parliament, Strasbourg

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Adoption of the written declaration N°49 on the establishment of a maximum 8-hour journey limit for animals transported in the European Union for the purpose of being slaughtered

- Co-authors: Dan JØRGENSEN, Esther de LANGE, Pavel POC, Carl SCHLYTER, Andrea ZANONI
- Date opened : 30-11-2011
- Lapse date : 15-03-2012
- Number of signatories: 395

The Chairman announced that this written declaration had received majority support and that its adoption would be announced in plenary the same day. He was very pleased about this result and thanked all MEPs that have contributed to its success. The written declaration is related to the [8 hours campaign](#) and its petition which has so far been signed by over 1 million European citizens.

The Chairman expressed the hope that the adopted declaration would send a further strong message to the commission to revise the current Animal Transport Regulation

Written declaration N°47 on fish as a common good

- Co-authors: Guido MILANA, Kriton ARSENIS, Corinne LEPAGE, Maria do Céu PATRÃO NEVES, Raül ROMEVA i RUEDA
- Date opened : 30-11-2011
- Lapse date : 29-03-2012
- Number of signatories: 324

The Chairman announced that the deadline for signing this written declaration has been moved to Thursday 29 March as it has already received 324 signatures. He encouraged all MEPs present to seek support for this declaration.

Written declaration on the implementation of the ban on individual sow stands by 1 January 2013

- Co-authors: George LYON, Esther de LANGE, Dan JØRGENSEN, Marit PAULSEN, Janusz WOJCIECHOWSKI
- Date opened : 12-03-2012
- Lapse date : 14-06-2012
- Number of signatories : 36 - 15-03-2012

The Chairman e all MEPs present to sign the declaration and to seek general support for it declaration.

Genetically modified food and feed testing

The Commission is presently drafting implementing rules concerning applications for authorisation of genetically modified food and feed, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003.

The draft Regulation on implementing rules has raised an issue of utmost animal welfare concern as it foresees an obligation to always perform a repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study in rodents which over many years has never yielded any additional significant or useful results.

The study is designed to evaluate the safety of substances for humans and animals. It involves subjecting the animals to repeated doses of a substance over a period of 90 days, resulting in high concentrations being fed. Besides being an unbalanced and unnatural diet for the rodents, the results gained by the test are difficult to compare with the diet of humans. The test has originally been carried out on a case-by-case basis determined by EFSA.

The draft Regulation is currently being discussed by Member States representatives in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health.

It was decided to send a letter by the intergroup to all member States if needed.

II. SHARK FINNING

1. The Commission proposal amending the current EU legislation

Christos Theophilou, DG Mare European Commission started his presentation by giving a definition of shark finning which means removing the fins from a shark and discarding the carcass. If the fins are removed and kept as well as the carcass it is considered as 'processing' and not finning. The current Regulation bans finning without exemptions. The exemption which exists in the EU Regulation is one which allows on board processing but does not permit finning per se.

Vessels which have special permits for on-board-processing are allowed to remove the fins from sharks if they retain the fins and the carcasses and abide to a 5% weight ratio.

A major problem is that the current Regulation permits separate landing: that is the carcasses can be landed in different ports at different times. The EU fleet lands all over the world, that is in the Indian, in the Atlantic and in the Pacific Ocean. Thus, it is very difficult to keep track and carry out controls. The inspectors very often are faced with processed carcasses and they have to rely on records in log books. They don't see most often the carcasses and the fin at the same time. One of the main problems is the lack of certainty in the control. One can never be sure if finning has occurred or not occurred under the current system. The 5% weight ratio means that the weight of the fins cannot exceed 5% of the live weight of the shark according to the EU legislation. The inspectors have to deal with processed carcasses. Not seeing the whole shark has the problem that they can never compare and balance prescribed weight ratio. Thus, they must use complex conversion factors to calculate whether the 5% weight ratio has been respected. Another problem using that ratio is that each shark species has a different 'fin-carcass' ratio and this may even differ according to the geographical location and the life stage of the animal.

A further complication is that when processing a carcass, when freezing or when drying the fins weight changes occur causing a further deviation from the ratio. In principle there is no single ratio even though the legislation foresees one. The ratio does not apply to the reality of the different shark species and the different processing methods. In addition, every fleet has its own techniques when they remove the fins. Some of them keep all the fins some of them just a part. The Spanish and the Portuguese fleets like to retain a bit of the flesh on the fins which makes them heavier whereas other fleets have relatively lighter fins even though they come from the same species.

The Spanish authorities have communicated to the European Commission that they would like to have an even higher ratio than the current one because of the way they process and because of the species they catch. This would be 6.5% whereas the Portuguese authorities are calling for a ratio between 5 and 6%. There is a question mark why these requests are different.

The dorsal fins on the back, the pectoral fins on the side and the lower lobe of the tail are considered as the primary set. Some fleets only keep the primary set. The EU fleet keeps all the fins including the smaller fins and the upper part of the tail.

Another problem with the current system is that once a shark is processed it is very difficult to identify and to collect data that would be useful for future management and conservation measures. When all the fins have been removed as well as the head and the skins, it is virtually impossible to see what kind of shark has been caught.

The 5% weight ratio stems from ICAAT and ILTC rules. These international tuna commissions manage tuna and swordfish fisheries in the Atlantic and in the Indian Ocean and have dozens of members from around the world. The ICAAT rule says that the fins shall not exceed a 5% of the shark catch but the problem is that they do not define if it is the live weight or the dressed weight. The EU has chosen to interpret this as live weight which is about two and a half times as permissive as the dressed weight. Once the shark is processed by removing the head and the internal organs and quite often also the skin the carcass has about 50 or even 40% of the original weight. There are many other countries in the world that apply a 5% dressed weight ratio which is much more restrictive concerning the quantity of fins you can have on board and you can land. EU vessels have had problems in countries such as South Africa and

Capo Verde because even though these countries are members of ICAAT and respect the 5% rule, they have a different interpretation of this rule. For this reason, EU ships have been detained and the Commission has been called to intervene at a couple of occasions at least

Another problem of having a ratio and processing sharks on board is that there are increasingly more and more shark species which are placed on protection lists as for example the *Hammerhead Shark*, the *Tresher Shark*, the *Silky Shark*, the *Grey Shark*, the *White Shark* etc. Unfortunately some of the fins of these species which are prohibited to catch, land, tranship and trade are worth two or three times more than the fins of the *Blue Shark* or even the *Shortfin Mako Shark* which are the ones that the EU fleet catches most often. If a *Hammerhead Shark* is worth three or more times than a *Blue Shark* there is an incentive to keep its fins. No one would ever know if the fish is processed beheaded, skinned and its fins removed from the carcass.

In the current Regulation there is a reporting obligation. The Member States must annually report to the Commission and describe the monitoring and compliance, the number of permits they issue for on-board processing as well as the basis for calculating the weight ratio. The European Commission has unfortunately a quite a poor record with late reports, incomplete reports and so forth. But now that more attention is given to the subject the situation will hopefully improve. Most Member States have submitted their report too late, some have not set them at all and only a few followed the required rules.

In the EU originally 5 Member States have issued permits but as from 2009 the number has dropped to 2 Member States i.e. Spain and Portugal. Spain is by far dominant with 164 to 200 permits flag trading annually. Portugal has an up-going trend with about 50 permits in the last 2 years.

Spain is on the third place in the world concerning shark processing, France is number 12, Portugal number 16 and the United Kingdom number 19. If the catches of the EU countries are all added together the EU is the number 1 shark catching entity in the world.

The Commission's proposal amends the current Regulation. It suggests that no more permits are issued for processing and that sharks are simply landed with the fins still attached. The fins attached option was also the one preferred in an internet consultation which was launched by the European Commission.

On international level 33 countries, the EU 27 and 8 regional fisheries management organisations have individual shark finning Regulations which cover virtually all Seas in the world. The latter have dozens of members and each RFMO has its own rules against shark finning.

The current EU Regulation is the most permissive regulation in terms of preventing shark finning. 3 of the Member States that used to issue processing permits have now stopped to do so and only Spain and Portugal still continue to do this. France which catches more sharks than Portugal has never issued such permits.

Taiwan is one of the country's with the biggest shark fin markets and is thus often like to accused for shark finning practices. However, this country has already a "fins-attached" Regulation.

The *Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)* has advised that finning should not take place because of increased mortality of sharks. The *STECF* considers the EU ratio system as problematic as it makes data collection very difficult. Therefore they recommend that all Sharks, Skates, Rays and Chimeras should be landed and gutted with their fins or wings still attached.

2. The position of the rapporteur from the Fisheries Committee

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (EPP, PT) stressed to be totally against shark finning. It is an unacceptable practice from an environmental, economic, social and moral perspective and threatens the sustainability of shark species.

The wide majority of people ignore what finning means. They usually confuse finning with processing. The practice of finning has been forbidden in the European since 2003 and the Commission has confirmed in 2005 that finning is not practiced within the European fleet. The European Parliament also confirmed it in 2006. Since then, there is no evidence that finning has occurred within the European fisheries fleet. The EU Regulation of 2003 allows exemptions to cut fins on board of vessels and to keep them on board together with the carcasses.

There is a need to ground technical and also political decisions on scientific data. This is also one of the principles of the on-going CFP reform.

The Commission's proposal to remove all special permits issued for processing of sharks on board is not based on scientific evidence. For the moment the Commission is just acting on suspicions that finning practices might take place within the EU fisheries fleet and this is quite dangerous.

There is a need to collect data on what is effectively happening on shark finning. The lack of control, the lack of certainty in control and also the possibility of disembark fins and bodies in different ports at different times are

major problems. Thus the main answer should be a reinforcement of controls and the obligation to disembark fins and bodies at the same time, in the same port.

The current exemptions in the EU Regulation are perhaps too wide. To narrow them is one of the proposals for the PECH draft report. Instead of giving exemptions to non-freezer vessels and freezer vessels it should be given just to the latter ones.

The PECH rapporteur, called for a reasonable and objective dialogue on this issue and not to react on emotions. The main problem is not finning but a lack of control.

The most common argument that Mrs Patrão Neves heard against her overall position is that the Commission's proposal to eliminate the exemptions would be the simplest solution to the problem. She agreed with no doubts that it would be the easiest and the simplest solution but as a Member of the European Parliament she had the responsibility to find the most reasonable and adequate solution and if possible to propose a common ground that takes into consideration the majority of the concerns of the different stakeholders.

3. The animal welfare and conservation concerns

Susie Watts, shark consultant for the Humane Society International (HSI), has worked for the Global Wildlife Trade for 25 years and on sharks and shark trade issues for 14 years.

Her presentation addressed the finer details like the kinds of impacts that the fins naturally attached policy may or may not have on EU fishing practices and on the commercial aspects of shark fishing.

The lack of a definitive proof of finning does not exclude the fact that finning is still taking place. Finning is illegal in the EU and thus it is carried out in a hidden way. Her long experience of investigating the shark finning trade brought her to the conviction that the shark finning industry is riddled with corruption. The lists of the Regional Fishery Management Authorities (RFMO) for vessels that have engaged in illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing are proof of it. In her research she found that many of the violations related to sharks and specifically to shark finning.

A Taiwanese trader told her that certain Spanish vessels inform him when they are a few miles offshore that they have shark fins for sale which he then collects and pays for. Such fins never appear in the official statistics and in the fin trader's tax return.

Another example is the owner of a private dock in Vigo, Spain who told her that 600 tons of sharks are landed at his dock every year. On the day she visited three tons of fins had come in and the owner admitted quite freely that when there is no further room on the board the sharks are finned. These and other cases show that there is no traceability in the chain of possession of shark fins. Transshipping fins at sea is a common occurrence and it leaves no trail for anyone to follow.

Some years after the EU finning ban came into effect a Spanish vessel called the Costa Azul Uno was intercepted in Equator with a cargo containing 4.2 tons of shark fins and not nearly enough shark carcasses to account for the fins. The fins were destined for Vigo in Spain.

There are other documented cases in Mozambican and Madagascan waters where illegal shark fishing has occurred. In one case the vessel was flagged to Namibia where the Spanish have a very large fleet. The crew of this Namibian boat was entirely Spanish. In another case the vessel had been flagged to Spain, then to Namibia and then again to Senegal and it was carrying processed products all of which were labelled with the name of a Spanish company. Flagging and reflagging is one way of avoiding detection. The oceans are vast and innumerable violations are going on out there. To assume that there is no finning is extremely optimistic.

Another objection relates to industry claims that a fins-attached rule would involve an extra burden on fishermen that the weight ratio does not. The reality is the exact opposite. All the administrative burden of keeping specific log books would be rendered unnecessary if the fins remained attached to the shark. Visual inspection is all that would be needed.

Concerning the objections that that frozen fins are difficult to remove and that they are dangerous to handle she reported about the experience of her colleague Rebecca Regnery who had attended a fins-attached workshop in Costa Rica in 2010. She was permitted to cut off the fins of a couple of deep frozen sharks to see what it was like and apparently is very easy. Sometimes Costa Rican fishermen don't even bother to use a knife. On a smaller shark they can snap off the fins. It was not even necessary to wear gloves when removing the fins and there was no damage to her hand. Thus, the argument about the danger to humans to handle deep frozen fins is simply not valid neither is it the case that frozen parts have to be partially defrosted in order to remove the fins this reducing the quality and

value of the meat. In Costa Rica the fins are removed moments after the shark has been taken out from the freezer and there is no reason why this cannot be done at other ports as well.

In response to the question about breaking the cold chain the impact assessment also suggests very sensibly that if EU vessels are landing their sharks in ports where cold storage is not available they might consider to switch to ports where it is available.

The whole basis of shark finning is a space saving exercise as well as a value enhancing exercise. The whole point of discarding a carcass at sea is to get as much value as possible from the contents of the available storage space. Any calculations of the relative value of the different parts of the shark have to include space as a factor, otherwise it is meaningless.

With regard to the concerns about the rule of origin the Commission's impact assessment makes it very clear that removing fins in a non EU port and then shipping them off to the markets will not damage the commercial interests of the Member States.

Looking at the possible compromise solutions it is already known that fresh sharks are landed with their fins attached. To suggest that fresh shark could be subject to a fins-attached rule but that the freezer fleet should be allowed to continue perceiving special permits to allow the on-board removal of fins is not a compromise at all it is simply a statement to what is already happening.

Finally eliminating the derogation that permits the landing of shark fins and carcasses in separate ports will not address the issue of finning either. It will still be linked to a fin to carcass ratio which has shown over and over again its ineffectiveness. The impact assessment states that there have been numerous violations of the EU Regulation and specifically of the 5% weight ratio rule. Suggestions that different ratios could be applied to different species and to different vessels or different fleets will further complicate an already complicated enforcement system. If the shark fishing industry is genuine in its desire to release itself from an administrative and logistical burden, then it should reject the weight ratio system and support fins-naturally- attached.

Questions and debate

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE, IT), rapporteur of the opinion by the Committee on Environment supported the Commission proposal and informed that with his draft opinion he has made some suggestions which focus on a call for more scientific data, better monitoring and controls and the use of sanctions. Considering that the two main shark species involved are the *Mako Shark*, a vulnerable species and the *Blue Shark*, a threatened one, he asked what the Commission intends to do to better protect these species which are continuously declining. He stressed that the majority of infringements to the EU legislation are linked to derogations which represent major problems for monitoring and control. The current controls are inefficient, complicated, difficult and expensive. To eliminate such derogations would lead to better enforcement of the legislation. He also pointed out that if the Commission had operated only on suspicions of shark finning the Regulation of 2003 to ban shark finning would have never been introduced.

Concerning the argument that it is dangerous to remove fins from a deep frozen shark he said that this could be solved by taking qualified staff and using the necessary tools and equipment for personal protection.

Kriton Arsenis (S&D, GR), S&D shadow rapporteur in the Fisheries Committee said that all Members involved were collaborating very well with the rapporteur on this dossier. The guidelines to apply are common sense and positions that are based on scientific evidence. He found the Commission proposal reasonable and believed that there is a great risk of not being effective and increasing the costs without proper monitoring of what is happening at sea. The *fins- naturally-attached* policy will not involve major constraints for the fishermen. With a partial cut of the fins which allows folding them to the body of the shark, will reduce the storage problems on board. He informed that the S&D Group will support the Commission proposal as it is. Generally the idea of keeping fins naturally attached would be better also better for the safety of the workers on board. He asked which procedures apply when the Commission intervenes in case of infringements outside EU waters.

Raul Romeva y Rueda (Greens/EFA, ES), Greens/EFA shadow rapporteur in the Fisheries Committee agreed with the PECH-rapporteur that there is no concrete proof whether finning is still going on but nevertheless there are irrefutable suspicions that this might be the case. Therefore it is essential to apply the precautionary principle. In this context the Commission proposal makes sense. It is simple, easy and in terms of control and it is the best that can be applied in order to be sure that finning is not happening. He reminded Mrs Patrão Neves that she had signed the written declaration on shark finning which was asking for a *fins-attached* policy without exemptions. As a matter of coherency the rapporteur should thus defend what was stated in the written declaration.

He referred to the rapporteur's proposal of disembarking carcasses and detached fins in the same port and inquired why it would be problematic to disembark the sharks with the fins still attached. This would make the control measures easier. If she would agree with this point of view it would be the best to accept the original proposal coming from the Commission. He said that all the technical problems which have been raised by the industry have been solved so far by the Commission. Therefore, if there is no problem for the industry and improvements can be made to the current situation, the question is why not to accept the Commission's proposal.

John Stuart Agnew (EFD, UK) said that it has taken the shark finning issue to stop fish being thrown overboard which has been the EU policy for the last 40 years. This issue will hopefully bring an end to this practice. Protein prices for livestock are going up and up and thus fish is a very good source of protein.

Carl Schlyter (Greens/EFA, SE) wanted to know how many hammerhead sharks have to be killed to get one ton of hammerhead fins. He also inquired whether more carcasses or more fins were found during controls. This might give an indication whether there is fraud or not. To argue that the absence of court cases in this regard is not sufficient evidence that shark finning does not take place.

He could not understand the rapporteur's rejection of emotion as the whole issue is emotional. Otherwise finning would be permitted. He also stressed that a fins-attached policy would lead to less red tape. Easy legislation is good legislation. Why should tax payers pay for difficult controls? After processing it is very difficult to identify a shark species and it is not possible to carry out a DNA test for each individual fish. Fishermen who don't want to apply the fins attached policy should pay for it. Why should a tax payer increase the profit margin of an industry just because they want to avoid controls?

Christos Theophilou, DG Mare European Commission attempted to answer several questions and comments at once. The reason why there is no proof finning is the weaknesses of the current system which allows separate landings and log books that can be easily modified at any time. Thus, suspicions are justified. A lot of these suspicions are even outlined in a report submitted by the Spanish authorities to the Commission. The serious weaknesses in the system which need to be amended otherwise the Regulation remains meaningless. Concerning the question on how many hammerhead sharks have to be killed to get one ton of hammerhead fins it was decided to forward the answer in an email exchange.

Susie Watts, agreed with Mr Agnew that sharks can be a source of protein, but at what prize. She stressed that filling the ship storages with shark fins only would be a much more valuable cargo than keeping the whole body with the fins attached. This is the reason why the industry wants to go on with onboard processing practices.

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (EPP, PT) announced to be more than willing to receive comments by e-mail or to arrange a meeting. Reacting to Carl Schlyter's comment that the issue is emotional she said that in dealing with this issue emotions should give place to a constructive and clear reasoning. It is necessary to keep an open mind and learn from one and other. No one should be certain to be right. She refused to accept the remark by Susie Watts that the industry is running like a mafia as it would give an unjust label to the whole sector.

III. The AGRI draft report on the new Animal Welfare Strategy

Marit Paulsen, rapporteur in the Committee on Agriculture on the new Animal Welfare Strategy said that the commission Communication was based on the guiding principles of an own initiative report by the EP which had been adopted by a large majority in 2010. However the EP report is reflected in an extremely washed down way in the new Strategy. She attributed this fact to divergent positions and demands within the Commission DGs.

Her draft report has been written in cooperation with the shadow rapporteurs, the animal welfare groups, the farmers' organisations, the trade unions, the veterinarians and even the butchers. Thus, it should represent a good compromise for all positions.

The draft report focuses again on a common framework law for animal welfare based on science and world wide accepted OIE definitions. The FAO has taken contact with her to investigate whether such a framework law could be applied to the whole world. The new law should emphasise responsible ownership whether is for very large numbers of farm animals or for single animals. For better enforcement of rules with long phasing in periods, enforcement milestones should be foreseen at regular intervals.

IV. Closing remarks

The next intergroup meeting will be held on **Thursday 20 April** in Strasbourg. The issue of debate will focus on the EU's future Research and animal welfare. Further details about the meeting will be dispatched in time

Members of the European Parliament (13)

Agnew, John Stuart	EFD	UK
Arsenis, Kriton (Vice-President)	S&D	GR
Jørgensen, Dan (President)	S&D	DK
Loving, Isabella	Greens/EFA	SE
Muscardini, Cristiana (Vice-President)	EPP	IT
Nielsson, Jens	S&D	SE
Patrão Neves, Maria do Céu	EPP	PT
Paulsen, Marit (Honorary Secretary)	ALDE	SE
Romeva y Rueda, Raul	Greens/EFA	ES
Schlyter, Carl (Honorary President)	Greens/EFA	SE
Taylor, Keith	Greens/EFA,	UK
Wojciechowski, Janusz (Vice-President)	ECR	PL
Zanoni Andrea, (Vice-President)	ALDE	IT

Assistants and Interns to Members of the European Parliament (14)

Amall, Amanda	Assistant to Mr Gustafsson(GUE/NGL, SE)
Anselmi, Antonio	Assistant to Mrs Muscardini (EPP, IT)
Brennetot Claire	Assistant to Mr Lyon (ALDE, UK)
Carter, Rob	Stagiaire to Mr Lambert (Greens/EFA)
Chaplain, Mathias	Assistant to Mr Cochet (Greens/EFA, FR)
Faloci, Chiara	Assistant to Mr Zanoni (ALDE, IT)
Gijsselaers, Thomas	Assistant to Mrs Liotard (GUE/NGL, NL)
Wohlert, Lea	Assistant to Mr Jørgensen (S&D, DK)
Müller, Jens	Assistant to mr Cramer (Greens/EFA, DE)
Olansson, Lisa	Stagiaire to Mr Nilsson (S&D, SE)
Pahlen, Marita	Assistant to mr Schlyter (Greens/EFA,
Pazan, Sara	Assistant to Mr Newton-Dunn (ALDE, UK)
Sergo, Leida	Assistant to Mrs Paulsen (ALDE, SE)
Sprackett, Joanna	Assistant to Mr Taylor (Greens/EFA, UK)

Guest Speaker and Observers (14)

Busquet, François	CAAT - EU Policy Coordinator
Cheklarova, Rada	European Commission, DG SANCO
Dalton, Dan	ECR- Political Adviser
Duthoit, Sopie	Vier Pfofen, EU Legal Research Officer
Grandmougin, Thomas	Protection Mondiale Animaux de Ferme, PMAF
Loulov, Andrej	Visitor
Majerczyk, Magdalena	ECR- Political Adviser
Miczki, Tamara	Parliament Official
Rudzite, Guna	ALDE, Political Adviser
Sidowitz, Heike	Shark Alliance
Swabe, Joanna	Humane Society International (HSI)
Theophilou, Christos	European Commission DG Mare,
Wang Wawa	Animals Angels, 8 hours campaign lobbyist
Watts, Susie	Shark Consultant, HSI

Secretariat (5)

Erlar, Andreas	Eurogroup for Animals, Political Officer
Fleury, Elise	Eurogroup for Animals, Campaigns Coordinator,