

**Note of Common Language Group (CLG) meeting held at Billingsgate.
Wednesday 16 November 2011.**

For the CLG minutes and meeting presentations see:

<http://www.seafish.org/retailers/responsible-sourcing/the-common-language-group>

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

Attendees

Mike Kaiser	Seafish Deputy Chair/Bangor University (Chairman)
Alex Olsen	Espersen
Alexia Weeple	Defra
Andrew Nicholson	Co-op
Blake Lee-Harwood	SFP
Catherine Pazderka	BRC
Cesare Basalo	New England Seafoods
Chris Brown	ASDA
Claire Tibbott	Fishmongers' Company
David Parker	MCS
Debbie Crockard	MCS
Doug Beveridge	SFP
Emily Howgate	Seaweb
Fiona Wright	Seafish
Hannah MacIntyre	Marks and Spencer
Iain Pollard	MRAG
James Wilson	Deepdock Mussels/Seafish Board
Jess Sparks	Seafood Scotland
Jim Portus	SWFPO
John Carmichael	Cumbrian Seafoods
Karen Green	Seafish (Minutes)
Lilly Milligan	Tesco
Linda Wood	New England Seafood
Mike Platt	Global Trust Certification
Mike Short	FDF
Nigel Edwards	Seachill
Peter Stagg	Le Lien
Philip MacMullen	Seafish
Robbie Fisher	Natural England
Sandy Luk	Client Earth
Toby Middleton	MSC

Apologies

Ally Dingwall	Sainsburys
Andrew Mallison	IFFO
Andy Matchett	Ocean Fish
Angus Garrett	Seafish
Arthur Neiland	IDDRA
Chris Leftwich	Fishmongers Company
Chris Ninnnes	Aquaculture Stewardship Council
ClarusChu	WWF
Colin Charman	CCW
Dale Rodmell	NFFO
David Jarrad	Shellfish Association of Great Britain
Dominic Collins	Coldwater
Jamie Smith	SSPO
Jeremy Langley	Waitrose
Mark Duffy	Natural England
Martin Jaffa	Callander McDowell
Meaghan Dodds	Tesco
Mike Brummitt	Regal Fish
Mireille Thom	WWF
Peter Vassalo	Cumbrian Seafoods
Scott Landsburgh	SSPO
Simon Rilatt	Trident Seafoods

2. Minutes from the last meeting held on 20 July 2011

The minutes from the previous meeting will be tidied up, but it was agreed they were a true reflection of the meeting. The final minutes will be added to the CLG web page.

3. Matters arising and progress reports

Progress as summarised below, with more detail elsewhere in these minutes:

3.1 Fishing for the Market (F4M)

Seafish has a meeting with Defra on 28 November to discuss taking certain aspects of the F4M project forward. Three Seafish project proposals have been submitted covering: utilisation of discards in bulk outlets not for human consumption; utilisation of discards for pot bait; and generating data on underutilised species with a view to creating markets for specific species. Defra reported that there had been changes to Sustainable Fisheries team at Defra but a new team was now in place headed up by Alexia Weeple. F4M will remain within the remit of the Sustainable Fisheries team and the plan was to work closely with Seafish to take elements of the project forward. However it was likely that the consumer /behavioural aspects of F4M would be taken forward by a different team at Defra. Defra are trying to recruit a F4M project manager to oversee these developments.

Action: Report on progress at the next meeting.

3.2 Discard Action Group (DAG)

Latest news and minutes can be found on the Seafish web page:

<http://www.seafish.org/fishermen/responsible-sourcing/protecting-fish-stocks/discards>

<http://www.seafish.org/fishermen/responsible-sourcing/protecting-fish-stocks/discards/discard-action-group>

A report was given on the last DAG meeting, which was held in Grimsby on 27 September and included a visit to the United Fish Products fishmeal factory. Cefas summarised their scoping study (June 2011) to investigate the implications of introducing a policy to ban discards. With dispensations granted by the MMO two vessels took part, operating from one port. It was mostly over-quota fish that was landed. Aim to expand the trial in 2012 to eight vessels operating from two ports over a six month period (likely April to September) with the aim of changing behaviour patterns.

Key DAG actions include: a letter sent to Commissioner Damanaki on 21 October proposing a means of improving the evidence base for managing discard reduction and calling for a structured review of data requirements. DAG received a reply on 15 November; a discard matrix illustrating on a fishery-by fishery basis the targeted fishery, significant likely bycatch discard, gear type, discard figures/ICES commentary, what is being done (taken from ICES)/ICES suggestions and suggested changes necessary to comply with legislation. DAG is also planning a response to the CFP Reform proposals on the discard, regionalisation and data collection aspects. Next main meeting to be end of February 2012.

CLG members asked whether the extension of the scoping study would increase the amount of fishmeal available with the response that fishmeal was seen as the last resort.

Question was asked about aligning the aims and ambitions of DAG with the Regional Advisory Council's (RACs) and co-ordinating activities. It was reported that Mike Park (SWFPA) was trying to involve the North Sea RAC.

There was some discussion on data collection and what is required. The Data Collection Regulation stipulates the minimum information required on biological sampling, but if ICES is not able to collect enough information we need to determine what more is available, and from where, and we need systems in place to stipulate how it needs to be collected.

Questions were raised on whether the DAG engages with the RSPB and statutory conservation agencies, and to what extent other ecosystem approaches are being considered. This was in light of the possible removal of production, and important food sources from other species, by landing what might have been discarded. This was viewed as another possible angle under which the discards issue could be scrutinised. It was noted that RSPB had already been contacted on this issue.

Action: DAG does already liaise with RSPB and other statutory conservation agencies, but will look at establishing a more proactive dialogue to ascertain their opinion on landing all potential discards (thus removing production from the marine food web).

3.3 Aquaculture Common Issues Group (ACIG)

Latest news and minutes can be found on the Seafish web page:

<http://www.seafish.org/aquaculture>

<http://www.seafish.org/aquaculture/aquaculture-common-issues-group->

A report was given on the last ACIG meeting, which was held in London on 27 September. There were updates on: recent media reports covering Scottish salmon and *Bonamia* in the Menai Straits; the October meeting of the UK Aquaculture Forum in Brussels; the Defra response to the aquaculture proposals within the CFP reform proposals; and updates on the English Aquaculture Strategy; progress with the Sustainable Seafood Coalition and aquaculture certification schemes; and the introduction of the Seafish Seafood Certification Network.

There were presentations on: 1. The Cleaner Seas Forum initiative covering real time combined sewer overflow (CSO) warnings and tackling urban diffuse pollution issues; 2. Fishmeal - the UFP fishmeal operation in Grimsby, supply and demand, world production, composition of feeds and the composition of fishmeal and fish oil; 3. The findings of a Scottish-based, but UK-wide study, conducted at the beginning of 2011 which looked at attitudes to aquaculture among the public, retailers and NGOs. Amongst consumers the survey showed that wild vs. farmed is not a salient factor in choice, but that some are aware of price difference; 4. BBSRC are developing a strategy for aquaculture research, including engagement with the industry, and are looking for feedback on potential bioscience research priorities; 5. Information about a new business venture providing the UK's only warm seawater business centre seawater (from power station effluent water) with an incubator and trial and research facilities.

Action: Seafish has developed a table to compare the numerous certification schemes that are currently available for the seafood industry to be audited against. Table to be circulated.

3.4. MCS update: Industry Review Group (IRG) and stakeholder analysis

MCS reported they had been experiencing staffing issues. The intention is to hold the next formal meeting early in the New Year to agree the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the IRG and to look at the next set of scores for the January 2012 advice. There were comments that it was important that the methodology was a transparent process and its integrity needed to be guaranteed. Anyone wishing to comment on the IRG or the MCS scores should email p_macmullen@seafish.co.uk or respond directly to the MCS cc-ing P MacMullen.

Action: MCS to circulate their industry research report on views of the MCS – its work and its role - to CLG participants.

3.5. Sustainable Seafood Coalition (SSC)

ClientEarth reported that the SSC now had 14 members (retailers and their suppliers) and was looking to expand into foodservice and chefs. They are predominantly working on the labelling and diversification. They are predominantly working on labelling protocols and species diversification for the market. Progress is more advanced on labelling issues. The aim is to agree the definition of clear and consistent sustainability claims, and how they should be substantiated. The coalition aims to develop voluntary industry codes on sustainable sourcing in 2012. Re diversification the SSC is awaiting the work of DAG re diversification and data collection. Emily Howgate highlighted the work in the foodservice sector undertaken by MSC, MCS, the Seafood Choices Alliance and Sustain, and how they were looking at collaborating with the SSC.

3.6. CFP, science and data, legal aspects

Seafish and DAG have responded to the consultations on the CFP reform proposals. DAG sent to Commissioner Damanaki on 21 October about data collection, and also met on 14 October to agree a response on the legal basis of the proposals. A letter has been drafted which is with the DAG Regulatory working group for comment, before being circulated around the wider DAG. ClientEarth (CE) contributed substantially to this debate.

CE has huge concerns that what the Commission has proposed is not practicable. If the governance structure is not there at regional level within Member States the Commission will take powers back. There were comments that there were 11 articles within the proposals which give the EU the power to take back control; that it was very worrying there were no clear benchmarks; FAO guidelines are not mentioned; there were concerns that the Commission and European Parliament were at loggerheads over the proposal. It was reported that Seafish has a meeting with Struan Stevenson (MEP) on 7 December (Struan Stevenson has recently been appointed a rapporteur on CFP reform proposals).

There was reference to ClientEarth briefing documents on CFP Reform proposals. See: <http://www.clientearth.org/biodiversity/biodiversity-publications/common-fisheries-policy-reform-proposal-briefings-1569>

Actions:

- i. Circulate link to CE CFP briefing documents
- ii. Consider a CFP focus at the next CLG and invite Struan Stevenson to meeting.

3.7. Fishmongers' Company conference

The general view was that this was a very interesting and well-attended conference. It gave a very good balanced overview on the status of fish stocks worldwide and the prospects for simplified and more inclusive fisheries science. There was then discussion about how to attract more industry representatives and fishermen to these events. There was also reference to Marine Protected Areas and their role in environmental protection and marine management. In this

context there was also reference to correspondence between the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and MCS/Client Earth on fishing vessel licences, the Habitats Directive and the need for more environmental impact assessments in some areas. Members were advised that the treatment of these issues was comprehensive and bears scrutiny.

http://marinemanagement.org.uk/protecting/conservation/documents/111012_mcs-ce.pdf

Actions:

- i. Establish link from Seafish website to Fishmongers' Conference site for Ray Hilborn and other presentations.
- ii. Seafish to consider providing or supporting an annual review/conference on the status of world fisheries and oceans worldwide – what is changing, trends etc
- iii. Seafish to consider relevance of MPAs to fisheries management as a future agenda item.
- iv. Suggest ways to increase catching sector engagement both specific to CLG and more generally.

4. CLG Steering Group

There was an action at the last meeting to form a CLG Steering Group (this group now has seven industry members and three Seafish). There was also mention at the last meeting of an operating budget for the CLG. There has not been any agreement on budget yet. The underlying remit for the Steering Group is to help ensure the CLG reflects industry and stakeholder needs.

Actions:

- i. Terms of Reference (TOR) for Steering Group to be drafted.
- ii. MK to write to Steering Group members inviting their greater involvement

4.1 Topics for future meetings

A number of topics were suggested that the CLG could cover in future meetings:

- CFP reform
- CMO
- Labelling of seafood – raft of new EU Regulations
- Harmonisation of fish lists – changes to NOAA Fishwatch, new Fish Choice <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/fishwatch/>
<http://www.fishchoice.com/Resources/FishChoice-FAQ-s.aspx>.
- How we can work more effectively with environmental NGOs
- Improving media relations
- Future of the Responsible Fishing Scheme
- Industry standards

There was also discussion about industry meetings in general (industry engagement, getting people to attend) and whether we are getting the most out of the day. It was deemed important to attract the catching sector to meetings, and secure the attendance of the retail and foodservice sectors.

Actions:

- i. Topics to be agreed and agenda circulated well in advance.
- ii. Could look at format for meetings/scheduling back-to-back.

4.2 CLG TOR

A draft TOR for the CLG was tabled.

Action: Re-circulate CLG TOR and invite comments to k_green@seafish.co.uk

4.3 Chatham House Rule (CHR)

A paper was circulated which summarised CHRs and how they can be invoked. The question was posed – Do we need/want to invoke CHRs, and does the CLG need to operate under CHRs? Points were made that this would affect the drafting and publication of the minutes; the whole point of the CLG was to encourage free speech; there is the option to invoke CHRs at any point in the meeting and this is probably the best option; this has not really been an issue so far.

Action: Phil MacMullen and Karen Green to go through CHRs and pull out around four permutations where CHRs could be invoked at meetings on request. (*Subsequent to the meeting the decision was taken to draft the minutes but not attribute the comments. We do not feel that this detracts from the value of the minutes and does solve the problem. Comments are welcome.*)

5. Risk Assessment Approach to Seafood Sourcing (RASS)

Seafish gave a presentation on RASS and how the Seafish Responsible Sourcing Guides could evolve. In the short-term this would still follow the fact-based RSG approach with interpretation and traffic light rating based on ICES MSY advice; but would introduce more on ecosystem effects, gear selectivity, interactions, bycatch, discards and signpost to other sources of definitive advice ie nutrition, health etc.

The medium-term intention was a more holistic approach to seafood sourcing: using a wider interpretation of 'responsible sourcing'; starting with stock status for wild caught and harvesting method for farmed - but introducing other factors such as environmental impacts, ethics, welfare and product characteristics; take into account risks and set aspirational goals against agreed protocols/values such as FAO codes, aspirations laid out in FSIG report etc; build a flexible, decision-making framework based on low, medium and high risk impact/likelihood using range of different criteria.

There was a wide-ranging discussion. *General comments in italics.*

Who is it aimed at/ will it be benchmarked?

Primarily at industry – not designed to be a public facing campaign. The aim is to give the buyer the information he needs by looking at the detail and presenting a summary. Seafish are trying to measure the appetite for a service that goes beyond sustainability advice. It will not be prescriptive. It is intended to identify other risks beyond those of sustainability concerns to 'future proof' the reputation of the seafood industry.

I am concerned about what is different/new about this? What does it give me on top of what I already have? How do I reconcile this with other sources? How will

it compliment/differentiate with already available resources such as MCS and SFP? How will it sit alongside it?

It will allow you to manage your risk exposure but will not be prescriptive. You will be able to choose what you take out of it. We are in an early scoping stage to see what it might look like. A risk assessment approach evaluates possible hazards and the likelihood of any resulting risk. This approach could serve a number of purposes by identifying critical data gaps or where the risk sits most heavily. Annual updates would be the aim.

I am concerned this could be perceived as an eco-type label. Does Seafish have the resources to support this? This would need a significant level of detail. I also have major concerns over aquaculture operations. I would be happy for Seafish to provide the detail but not to do any risk assessment. This is an enormous challenge in terms of both time and money. Our main comment would be how you are going to weight/score. There is a lot of potential for confusion. You would have to go down to vessel level, and possibly even include a seasonal level as well. A broad brush approach would sometimes suffer from the same criticisms as other schemes. The information has to be reliable and stand scrutiny. I would have real concerns about any scoring system. I like the idea of more (related) information. There is a danger of conflicting advice. There is nothing wrong with covering a number of key additional areas in simple terms.

Action: Seafish to develop an informative guide to risks and issues in seafood procurement giving reliable advice on risk avoidance. Seafish to speak in more detail with key individuals and draft a framework showing how it could work based on a couple of species.

6. Seafish Science

Seafish Science is aiming to provide a conduit for the collection of fishing industry data to feed into science-based policy decisions. The general view within the seafood industry is that there is a disconnect between available scientific advice and what it is possible to produce, and what industry needs. There is a lot of potential mileage in this. Seafish will be taking this idea forward and is in discussion with Defra, Cefas, ABNI and Marine Scotland with different approaches – Cefas is interested in a demonstration project, Marine Scotland has aspirations for a Fish Science Excellence Centre etc.

Comments centred on: the need for fishermen to be involved; RFS coaches could be used as auditors to check that data is being collected in the correct manner; there may be the potential for Seafish to fill specific data gaps; there should be some incentives for fishermen attached to the collection of this data; an providing data on previously data poor fisheries could potentially result in prescriptive TACs.

The key issue is deciding when the data is good enough – a robust protocol would help decide this; it could take up to five years for new data to be meaningful; the five year timeline is an ICES directive for existing datasets but

this data could be beneficial in a much shorter time frame; there needs to be common standard with member States on the collection of data.

Action: Seafish to report back on progress.

7. DNA testing of seafood

It had been the intention to provide a speaker on this topic for this meeting but unfortunately the appropriate speaker was not available. There is a Seafish paper on DNA testing. See:

http://www.seafish.org/media/publications/SeafishFactSheet_RecentAdvancesint heuseofDNAintheSeafoodSupplyChain_201109.pdf

Actions:

- i. Speaker to be arranged for next meeting.
- ii. Mike Kaiser to provide the reference to a scientific paper by Dana Miller and Stefano Mariani on seafood labelling and DNA testing (June 2010).

8. Any other business

8.1 Industry Project Fund (IPF)

Question was asked about what is happening with the latest IPF round. Seafish is awaiting the outcome of the conversation with industry and will be issuing a statement as soon as possible.

8.2 Seafood Summit

This will be held in September 2012 in Hong Kong. The Seafood Choices Alliance is hoping for strong European and UK representation.

8.3 EU Ecolabel for food, feed and drink products – feasibility study

A new study has been published which considers the feasibility of extending this voluntary ecolabelling scheme to food, feed and drink. It covers the necessary criteria, an economic assessment of impact and added value. If perceived hurdles can be overcome, product identified as suitable were, yogurt and cheese, bread, non alcoholic beverages and processed fish. See:

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/about_ecolabel/pdf/Ecolabel%20for%20food%20final%20report.pdf

8.4 6th World Fisheries Congress, 7-11 May 2012. Edinburgh

There was a reminder that the closing date for the submission of abstracts was Friday 18 November.

9. Date of next meeting

The date will be confirmed. Likely to be late March 2012.

Action points arising:

	Action by:
Fishing for the Markets - Report on progress at the next meeting.	Jon Harman/Karen Green
DAG - Look at establishing a more proactive dialogue with RSPB and other statutory conservation agencies re landing all potential discards.	Karen Green
Certification schemes - Comparative table to be circulated.	Karen Green
MCS - To circulate industry research report on industry views of MCS work and its role to CLG participants.	David Parker
CFP - Circulate link to CE CFP briefing documents. Consider a CFP focus at the next CLG and invite Struan Stevenson to meeting.	Karen Green Phil MacMullen
<p>Next meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seafish to consider providing an annual review/conference on the status of world fisheries and oceans worldwide – what is changing, trends etc • Seafish to consider relevance of MPAs to fisheries management as a future agenda item. • Suggest ways to increase catching sector engagement both specific to CLG and more generally. • Re-circulate CLG TOR and invite comments. • Terms of Reference (TOR) for Steering Group to be drafted. • MK to write to Steering Group members inviting their greater involvement. • CLG topics to be agreed and agenda circulated well in advance. Also look at format for meetings/scheduling back-to-back. • Go through CHRs and pull out around four permutations where CHRs could be invoked at meetings on request. 	<p>Seafish</p> <p>Seafish</p> <p>Seafish</p> <p>Karen Green Karen Green/ Phil MacMullen</p> <p>Mike Kaiser</p> <p>Seafish</p> <p>Karen Green/Phil MacMullen</p>
Fishmongers Conference - Establish link from Seafish website to Fishmongers Conference site.	Karen Green
RASS - Seafish to develop an informative guide to risks and issues in seafood procurement giving reliable advice on risk avoidance. Seafish to speak in more detail with key individuals and draft a framework showing how it could work based on a couple of species.	Seafish
Seafish Science - report back on progress.	Seafish
<p>DNA testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker to be arranged for next meeting. • Provide Dana Miller and Stefano Mariani scientific paper on seafood labelling and DNA testing (June 2010). 	<p>Seafish</p> <p>Mike Kaiser</p>

23 November 2011