

## Energy and Greenhouse gas emissions – industry meeting

Seafish, Edinburgh, March 18<sup>th</sup> 2015

**Attendees:** Mike Evans (Icelandic Seachill); Ian Gatt (Scottish Pelagic Fishermens Association); Alex Olsen (Espersen); Huw Thomas (Morrisons); Frances Sandison (NAFC Marine Centre); Angus Garrett (Seafish).

**Apologies:** Lucy Blow (New England Seafoods); Chris Leftwich (Fishmongers Company/Billingsgate market); Phil MacMullen (Seafish); Mike Mitchell (Youngs Seafood); Ben Norbury (Co-operative Group); Mike Short (FDF); Liz Thompson (Co-operative Group); Maria Varbeva-Daley (BSI).

### Main points of the discussion

- The purpose of the GHG emissions related work was revisited and reiterated (managing reputation and making improvements to reduce GHG emissions).

#### 1. Review of previous minutes and progress to date

- The previous minutes were reviewed.
- Progress in the last six months had focussed on producing a number of cases profiling GHG emissions in wild capture supply chains.

#### 2. Profiling GHG emissions in wild capture chains - review of case study profiles in whitefish, pelagic, and shellfish

- The objective for profiling GHG emissions in wild capture chains was revisited. Producing cases served two objectives:
  - a. for internal improvement and
  - b. to support communication and reputation.
- Cases focussed on wild capture product chains within generic categories (whitefish, pelagic, and shellfish) and scope (domestic/international) beginning with the easiest profiles to generate e.g. domestic chains.
- Profiles for the following product chain cases were generated, and summaries presented at the meeting:
  1. Whitefish (domestic) – Chilled cod fillet from North Sea trawl
  2. Whitefish (international) – Frozen cod fillet from Barents Sea trawl
  3. Pelagic (domestic) – Landed Atlantic mackerel from North Sea trawl
  4. Pelagic (international) – Chilled yellowfin tuna steak from Indian ocean long line
  5. Shellfish (domestic) – Whole cooked brown crab from North Sea pots
  6. Shellfish (international) – no case
- A number of industry stakeholders were engaged in describing the chains, collecting and analysing the data. With the exception of one case, the questions used by supply chain stakeholders to produce profiles were the same as those in the online GHG emissions profiling tool. Additional questions were asked concerning the broader context of the

product chain e.g. significant events that may have affected, or affect in future, the energy performance of the chain.

- Having discussed each profile in depth, it was agreed some further work was required.  
**Action: Seafish to ensure case write-ups consider the following:**
  - a. All cases should run the data through the profiling tool, and specify practices as well as product (e.g. gear type, fishery)
  - b. The hotspots, and the story behind, were the most important aspect (rather than specific numbers)
  - c. Key drivers and trends (wider context) behind hotspots should be identified e.g. fuel consumption in the fishery should have regard for changes in the fleet (which vessels have left, are vessels getting larger, changes in the stock, changes in oil price)
  - d. Default values in the profiling tool should be reviewed and updated on a regular basis (every 3-5 years)
  - e. Consider producing online training/webinars in the use of the tool as handholding for users.
- **Action: the industry group felt they could provide additional cases** in the following product chains:
  1. Chilled cod fillet from Baltic Sea
  2. Chilled cod and haddock fillets from Icelandic fisheries
  3. Landed herring from North Atlantic
  4. Coldwater prawns from North Atlantic
- **Action: Seafish to consider the appropriateness of presenting findings to a wider audience**
- Profiling may benefit from linking with initiatives providing sustainability indicators that include energy/GHG emissions (for example the Valduvis Project run by the Belgium Institute of Agriculture & Fisheries Research). **Action: Huw Thomas to explore Valduvis Project for further information**
- Anonymity and confidentiality of these profiles was a point of concern for the stakeholders involved in producing profiles. In a number of discussions, stakeholders provided a view on acceptable levels of confidentiality. These levels reflect sensitivities in the data and supply chain.
- Levels of confidentiality were categorised as:
  1. Completely confidential (available only to processor)
  2. Commercial-in-confidence (available to processor and customer)
  3. Available on an industry share and exchange basis (available to others in industry, suitably anonymised)
  4. Publicly available (available to all, suitably anonymised)
- Stakeholders tended to be comfortable treating data as commercial-in-confidence, available only to the processor concerned and customer (option 2). However, there is an appetite to make data available to a wider audience at a later date (option 3), subject to agreement and appropriate arrangements being in place.

### 3. Industry interest in data sharing

- The industry group felt there was an appetite to share data. Stakeholders had different motivations. From the retailer perspective there is little appetite to promote seafood over other proteins, but welcome the opportunities to identify improvement areas and take action. From the catching perspective there is a reputation management interest and to challenge the perspective of some NGO campaigns in Europe that 'big is bad and small is good'. From the processor perspective there is a need to shift the debate from environmental

protection to food supply. Questions will be asked in due course and the industry needs to 'be prepared': sharing data is part of that.

- In sharing data, efforts should focus on option 3 i.e. Available on an industry share and exchange basis (available to others in industry, suitably anonymised). This would need a mechanism for validating profiles that were produced and sharing these appropriately. Seafish could provide that role with the profiling tool providing the means to validate profiles. **Action: Seafish to consider role in industry data sharing.**

#### 4. GHG emissions and reputation management

- The original position statement (August 2013) was circulated and discussed along with the suggestion from the previous industry meeting that a reference document be produced:
  - a. along the lines of this statement.
  - b. specifically *for reference by industry stakeholders* (those buying/cutting/selling fish rather than the wider membership of the Common Language Group)
  - c. *to provide evidence to support corporate communications.*
  - d. titled *Characteristics of fish and seafood GHG emissions in the context of global food production.*
  - e. containing explanatory notes on fish and seafood characteristics accompanied with a series of factual statements e.g. comparison with terrestrial proteins and reasons for international sourcing, but also 'quotes' on practices already underway in fisheries that are improving performance. Factual statements would draw upon various documents such as the Seafish Guide to GHG emissions, and would be underpinned by more scientific papers that contain further evidence or new evidence e.g. new cases produced using the profiling tool.
  - f. for individual operators to retain as background material, using it to either craft a statement suited to their own circumstances to support corporate communications or to collaborate in a wider reputation management exercise.
- The above had been considered by Seafish Communications and Marketing, and a proposed approach suggested. The detail of this approach was circulated and included the technical document, infographic, short statement for use in communication, Questions & answers; and media training for industry spokespersons on this issue. The group agreed with the proposed approach, on the basis that the technical document is a 'live' document, starting small but building over time (could start with the cases already profiled). **Action: Seafish to progress this with industry.**
- As a possible contribution to this technical document, a first draft report entitled "Energy – longer term prospects and implications for the seafood industry" was circulated. This report identified energy trends, important points of exposure in seafood, and opportunities and threats to domestic and international chains. **Action: industry group to review and provide feedback.**
- The group felt that there was further work to be done in ensuring improvement actions were enabled. Many in the catching sector knew where they wanted or needed to be but 'how to get there' is difficult under current financial conditions. An outside agent or impetus is required. Pathways should be found/explored that could act as this agent or impetus and thereby support improvement actions. Pathways could include industry's own resources (very limited), public resources (funding programmes such as EMFF, although priorities are nearly agreed and may focus on near term imperatives such as discards), and charitable resources (some foundations are shifting emphasis from campaigns towards impact and demonstration projects). **Action: industry group to explore options.**

## 5. Next steps in Energy and GHG emissions in seafood

- It was highlighted that Seafish was entering a new three year corporate plan period from April 2015. As GHG emissions was not highlighted as a priority it was unclear how this work would continue. The group felt that the work had cleared much of the fogginess in this issue and was now producing tangible outputs that could be elevated to another level. **Action: Seafish to reconsider how the GHG emissions issue is supported.**
- In the next six months the group would like to see:
  1. Existing profiles finalised
  2. Improvement actions identified
  3. A wider spread of profiles
  4. Reputation management approach progressed.

## 6. Any other business

- The FAO are active in producing tools to model feed inputs to aquaculture systems, and this could be complementary to this work focussing on wild capture. The industry group suggested that expectations had to be managed; that the emphasis of the initiative ought not to be on producing numbers, but focussing on hotspots and improvement actions as with this work.
- The next 6 monthly meeting to review progress and next steps to be confirmed.