

SEA FISH INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Minutes of the ninth meeting of the Seafish Domestic and Export Sector Panel

Held in the Jurys Inn hotel at Aberdeen Airport on Tuesday 01 March 2016

Present:

John Goodlad (JG) Chair

Martyn Boyers (MB) British Ports Association

Robert Duthie (RD) Exporters

David Jarrad (DJ) Shellfish Association of Great Britain

Martin Leyland (ML) Shetland interests

Kevin McDonell (KM) Scottish Association of Fish Producer Organisations

David-John McRobbie (DJM) Scottish Seafood Association

Malcolm Morrison (MM) Scottish Fishermen’s Federation

Jerry Percy (JP) Small Boat / Inshore

Dale Rodmell (DR) National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations

Marcus Coleman (MC) Seafish, Chief Executive Officer

Mel Groundsell (MG) Seafish, Corporate Relations Director

Dr Tom Pickerell (TP) Seafish, Technical Director

Simon Potten (SP) Seafish, Panel Secretariat

Helen Duggan (HD) Seafish, Head of Responsible Sourcing

Dr Angus Garrett (AG) Seafish, Head of Horizon Scanning & Long Term Issues (part)

Apologies:

Chris Anderson Processors using domestic catch

Michael Bates Scottish Seafood Association

Jim Evans Welsh interests

John Rooney Northern Ireland interests

James Wilson Seafish, Board member

Janice Anderson Seafish, Business Services Director

1. Welcome

1.1 JG advised members that Jim Portus had stepped down from the Panel due to time constraints, creating a vacancy for someone else to represent UKAFPO. On behalf of Seafish and Panel members JG thanked Jim for his contribution and wished him well.

Action 9.1: Seafish to write to UKAFPO to request an alternative representative.

1. Minutes of the last meeting (19 October 2015)

2.1 Action 8.1 to add wording that Seafish would “re-submit (the ToR) to members for approval”.

2.2 Para 5.7 MM requested clarification in the minutes explaining the difference between Seafood Scotland and Seafish Scotland.

2.3 Action 8.5 DJ questioned whether this had been done. TP advised that the Operational dashboards would be circulated electronically after they had first been seen by the Seafish Board (which had only just met). SP confirmed that the draft minutes had been circulated for comment via email.

Action 9.2 Seafish to amend the minutes of the previous meeting and update them on the Seafish web-site.

2.4 With these amendments the minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.

1. Panel Update

3.1 Updated Terms of Reference

3.1.1 MG went through the changes (highlighted in red in the paper provided). Members accepted and agreed the proposed changes.

3.1.2 ML asked if deputies could be allowed to attend a meeting (as observers) prior to the main representative stepping down to get themselves up-to-speed with the workings of the Panel. Agreed. JG asked that this be planned and notified in advance to the Panel Secretariat.

3.2 Members’ responsibilities

3.2.1 JG reminded members of their responsibilities as Panel members to gather feedback from their sectors/members in advance of meetings and then feed information back to them on the outcomes of meetings.

4. Seafish Update

4.1 Seafish Chief Executive and Board Chair

4.1.1 MC introduced himself as the new Seafish CEO and informed members that Brian Young (Seafish Deputy Chair) had agreed to continue as stand-in Chair for as long as needed whilst Defra progressed with its recruitment process.

4.2 Devolved Administrations

4.2.1 MC advised that the four Administrations had met to discuss how to ensure that

Scotland receives an equitable share of any UK monies levied (as recommended in the Smith Commission report).

Action 9.3 Members to be informed as soon as any proposal regarding Scotland is agreed.

4.3 Stakeholder Survey

4.3.1 MG advised that next survey will take place in first few weeks of April 2016. Results to be benchmarked against those from the previous survey. Some 350 in-depth telephone interviews will be undertaken from random sample of stakeholders. MG asked members to encourage their members/stakeholders to respond.

Action 9.4 Members to encourage their contacts to respond to Seafish’s stakeholder survey.

4.4 Task Force

4.4.1 MG updated members on the work Seafish had been asked (by Defra) to undertake in commissioning research into the industry’s priorities for utilising EMFF funding in England and setting up an English industry Task Force to provide Defra with seafood industry input to its Food and Farming 2040 strategy.

4.4.2 The research report and submission to Defra were included in the papers for the meeting. The submission to Defra included a recommendation that the Fisheries Minister appoints an Expert Working Group of key English seafood industry stakeholders to develop an action plan for delivery of the aspirations described in Seafood 2040 and to determine key deliverables, milestones, and resource requirements.

4.4.2 Members sought clarification on the status of the submission and who had been involved in the Task Force. MG reported who had been involved in the Task Force and advised that Defra had welcomed the submissions and had already used content to inform its Food and Farming Strategy 2040.

5. CP1518 Delivery Report

5.1 Operational Delivery - Q3 dashboards

5.1.1 TP explained that the dashboard reports provide an overview of progress in each of the work programmes agreed by the Panels as being part of CP1518 (with the exception of Strategic Investment Programme) and commented on the information reported. TP explained planned changes to the format of the report that had been agreed with Board to evidence progress towards key performance indicators and annual targets. TP advised that members could ask for more in-depth presentations at future Panel meetings on any project, work programme or workstream of particular interest to them.

5.1.2 ML asked what the “IP” (intellectual property) issues were regarding some Strategic Investment Programme applications. TP explained that results of funded projects must be made available for public use. ML asked if some applicants did not really have a sufficiently in-depth understanding of CP1518 or the 2015/2016 Annual Plan in order to tailor their application. TP responded that the Strategic Investment Programme provides flexibility for stakeholders to apply for funding to undertake work in areas not prescribed in CP1518. ML asked if a list of projects approved had been published; TP confirmed that they had (see link below):

<http://www.seafish.org/media/1459189/sif_1_websummary_v2.pdf>

5.1.3 JP sought clarification on plans for another call for applications under the Strategic Investment Programme. TP confirmed that there would be another call in the summer for new projects (which must be completed by 31 March 2018). Members commented that the Seafish web-site is not very easy to navigate. MG acknowledged and advised that work was planned to improve it. Information on the Strategic Investment Programme can be found here:

<http://www.seafish.org/industry-support/funding-and-awards/funding/strategic-investment-fund>

5.1.4 MB asked about the £150k over spend on the World Seafood Congress (Reputation workstream dashboard). MG explained that the original budget (£50k) had been totally unrealistic, but that once Seafish had committed to hosting it, it had to be done properly. MB questioned the value of Seafish hosting it in Grimsby and of Seafish attending international exhibitions in general. TP advised that lessons had been learned and that in future Seafish would rather sponsor such events than organise them. TP explained some of the benefits for the promotion of the UK seafood industry at international events and the work of Seafish that is helping to reinforce the international reputation of the UK seafood industry. RD reinforced the importance of Seafish taking space at international trade shows and making it available for industry to use. MC advised that Seafish is currently undertaking work to better understand and evaluate the value for money being delivered by its work.

5.1.5 ML asked what happens with regard to work programme overspends. TP advised that Seafish focuses on the overall workstream position (top left box of financial dashboard); workstream leaders are given flexibility to manage their budgets between projects and work programmes to deliver the required outputs. Budgets are adjusted annually (within the overall constraint of the 3-year budgets agreed under CP1518). At the end of December 2015 Seafish was 2% over on its budgeted operational cost to levy. In recent years, Seafish has never been in a overspend situation at end of a CP, but measures are being put in place to ensure this is managed. JG commented that the process is very open and transparent.

5.1.6 ML commented that Shetland is very unsure what Seafood Scotland delivers and questioned why the Seafish Scotland work programme (International & Regions workstream dashboard) was almost £100k over budget. TP explained that this was due to Seafish Scotland income being less than budgeted, because of Seafood Scotland’s inability to pay Seafish Scotland staff costs for project delivery as a result of it having been unable to secure EMFF funding. TP advised that Seafish was working to resolve the situation. The National Audit Office had recommended changes to the agreement between Seafish and Seafood Scotland. Members agreed their serious concerns about the current situation.

5.2 Review of progress against Key Performance Indicators

5.2.1 Covered during previous agenda item. TP advised that there was just one work programme with an amber rating (Enhance Reputation – Industry Support), which was considered by the Seafish Executive to have been harshly rated by the workstream leader.

5.3 2016/2017 Annual Plans

5.3.1 MG introduced the draft plan, which had been circulated with the papers and explained that a delivery report for 2015/2016 would also be produced to evidence progress during Year 1 of C1518.

5.3.2 MB commented that he was pleased that the Annual Plan continued to reiterate the most important and commonly supported by all Panels, i.e., promoting consumption, but commented that he was disappointed that there was no mention of support for the National Federation of Fishmongers’ Annual Craft Competition. MG advised that this was too detailed for inclusion in this publication. Members discussed Seafish’s involvement in public-facing events like this which helped raise the profile of the industry and promote consumption.

Action 9.5: Seafish Exec to consider points raised regarding Seafish involvement in public-facing events and respond to members.

5.3.3 ML questioned why Shetland was mentioned on Page 11 (England Account Management). TP explained that this related to research to be conducted into the supply of Shetland seafood into the English market. ML also pointed out a typo on Page 19 – the Advocacy work programme annual target had wrong date (2015-16 rather than 2016-17).

6. Horizon Scanning

6.1 AG outlined progress to-date on this workstream.

6.2 The general objective is to identify risks and issues that may affect the industry in the future. To help, a steering group had been established comprising the three Panel Chairs and an additional member from each panel.

6.3 A number of horizon sweeps had been undertaken to identify key risks. These have now been compiled into six risk maps and colour coded (red, amber or green) according to how strong the signal is for each risk (including frequency of mention on the internet and in Seafish staff–industry interaction).

6.4 The Sector Panels were now being engaged to identify which of the risks showing a strong signal would have the greatest impact on the seafood industry.

6.5 Panel members had a number of comments on each of the risk maps. On signal strength, the panel recommended that the colour coding of a number of risks should be upgraded: some of these included risks that should be highlighted as red, specifically ‘Quota access’, ‘Landings obligation’, ‘Marine Strategy Framework Directive’, ‘Discards’, ‘MEPs’, ‘MSPs’, ‘UK workforce’ and, ‘Fish migration’. A number of additional risks were identified. This feedback was noted and will be incorporated into the next drafts of the risk maps.

6.6 When panel members were asked individually to nominate one risk of highest industry impact, the combined results and discussion highlighted a range of risks with Regulatory developments (particularly the Landings obligation and Discards), as well as Trade (including Trade distortion and embargoes) and Political developments being important areas overall.

6.7 A similar exercise will be undertaken with the members of the Importers & Processors Panel and the Consumer & Supply Chain Panels. Thereafter the results will be presented to the steering group which will recommend to the Seafish Board priority areas for deep review. This recommendation will go the Seafish Board meeting in May.

7. Workstream in Focus – Responsible Sourcing

HD explained the various work programmes being undertaken by the Responsible Sourcing workstream team:

7.1 Risk Assessment and Sourcing of Seafood (RASS) (Alex Caveen)

7.1.1 Over 300 RASS profiles now in place and plan for more than 400. Steering Group established. Developing profiles in Shetland in collaboration with NAFC Marine Centre. Working with Seafood Watch and Sustainable Fisheries Partnership on RASS ethics development and twelve pilot fishery profiles agreed. Fifteen aquaculture profiles identified. Testimonies received from all sectors and an academic paper in production. TP advised that the Science Advisory Group was very complimentary about the methodologies. JG commented that feedback from the supply chain was very encouraging.

7.2 Responsible Fishing Scheme (RFS) (Mick Bacon and Kara Brydson)

7.2.1 Pilots progressed with 30+ vessels; over 130 applications now received. Currently taking five months from initial engagement to certification; aim to reduce this to three months. Focus in 2016 on moving from “re-development” to “re-launch and full roll-out”. Concentrating on support for applicant vessels and on managing the expectations of the supply chain. Planning to develop chain of custody, a group certification model and commence the roll out internationally. RD noted that many retailers had committed to only sourcing (UK) supplies from RFS vessels; he commented that processors supplying supermarkets would not be able to buy fish from vessels currently supplying them if they were not in the RFS and that not all vessel operators seemed to be aware of the urgency to get onboard with the scheme. Members agreed that the supply chain’s expectations needed to be managed realistically in terms of the availability of landings from RFS vessels. It was agreed that for this to succeed the whole industry needs to pull together. The certification body (Acora) currently has thirteen RFS assessors in place around the UK. Cost will be £150+VAT for under 10m vessels and £350+VAT for over 10m vessels with mid-term inspections somewhat less. Seafish is exploring options for EMFF funding to support RFS. MC asked what feedback had been received to-date; HD advised that the biggest concern for skippers was evidencing compliance. JP advised that most common question from skippers for old scheme was “what’s in it for me?”; this time it is very different if buyers will only buy from RFS vessels, as many under 10m vessels are not be aware if their landings end up with a retailer that has committed to only source from RFS vessels. It was agreed that more information on RFS and the urgency for fishermen to engage was needed to be communicated.

7.3 Technology (Mike Montgomerie)

7.3.1 Gear selectivity training for fishers and non-fishers delivered at the Flume Tank in Denmark, gear database development, ad hoc advice/guidance provided to stakeholders, and (gear) research conducted at sea. Members commented on value of this work in helping to build common understanding, but questioned staff resources and succession planning.

7.4 Domestic Aquaculture (Lee Cocker)

7.4.1 This work programme has been reinvigorated under CP1518. During 2015/2016 meetings have been held with stakeholders to scope out priorities for work. The next two years are about starting to deliver. Activities to-date include providing information on the Seafish web-site, publication of an economic report and an SRO (Several and Regulating Order) report. Currently developing a toolbox for stakeholders and facilitating the English Aquaculture Working Group (at the request of Defra). ML commented that 60% of mussel production is in Shetland and questioned whether Shetland was engaged with this work programme.

Action 9.6: HD to ensure Shetland mussel farms engaged in aquaculture work programme.

7.5 Tailored Advice (Bill Lart)

7.5.1 Responses to specific technical fisheries enquiries and the distillation/dissemination of scientific information into a digestible format for industry.

8. Meetings Schedule 2016

8.1 All-Panel meeting

8.1.1 JG advised members that this had been discussed with the Chairs of the other two Panels and it has been agreed to go ahead. Plans had been discussed at the recent Seafish Board meeting. MG advised that the structure of the meeting (to take place at the end of the summer) will be drafted and circulated for consideration, but asked if members wanted Seafish presentations, panel member presentations and/or external speakers. ML suggested that each Panel should select one workstream to be reviewed in depth. MB suggested that focus should be on activities of common interest (i.e., areas of work supported by all three panels). MC suggested that the meeting should focus on the comment made earlier that “Panels need to be better prepared for decision making”. JP suggested that the focus should be on opportunities as much, if not more than, threats. MM and DR suggested gear technology and TP suggested a Dragon’s Den type approach whereby Panel members could ‘sell’ the necessity of work programmes and seek cross-Panel support.

Action 9.7: Seafish to circulate proposals for content and structure of all-Panel meeting.

8.2 October meeting

8.2.1 Agenda items and date to be confirmed.

Action 9.8: Seafish to circulate Doodle poll to agree date for next meeting.

9. Any Other Business

9.1 DJ would like to see membership lists of all three Panels.

Action 9.9: Seafish to include membership lists in packs for future meetings.