

Minutes of RFPS Oversight Board (OB) meeting on 06/02/2018

Attendees	Organisation	Sector
Jonathan Shepherd (JS)	Seafish Board	Seafish Board
Mark Simmons	British Ports Association	Port
Martyn Boyers	OB Chair and Grimsby Port	
Kevin Quigley (KQ)	Northern Ireland Harbour Authority	Port
Celia MacKenzie	Whitehaven Port	Port
Sam Peacock (SP)	RS Standards Ltd.	Consultant
Marcus Jacklin (MJ)	Seafish	
Apologies	Pete Bromley	Sutton harbour

1. Welcome and introduction

Marcus Jacklin (MJ) welcomed the members and highlighted the purpose of the meeting which was to:

- agree responses to feedback received from the public consultation; and
- agree the contents of the draft standard for presentation to the Seafish Board.

2. RFPS Public Consultation feedback

MJ highlighted that feedback received was limited, supportive and provided constructive comment. Most comments were able to be grouped under two main headings; worker welfare and net recycling. The remaining feedback, which proposed minor amendments to icing fish, food security processes and protection of product moved by forklift trucks, was accepted.

2.1 Worker Welfare

MJ explained that the draft standard contains most of the ETI trade requirements. Feedback received highlighted the need to include three omitted areas ('employment is freely chose, 'no discrimination is practised' and 'no harsh or inhuman treatment is allowed').

OB member agreed to include additional requirements of ETI trade requirements.

MJ explained that welfare of workers not employed directly by the ports would be covered indirectly through the use of formal agreements with third parties eg fish agents. Feedback received proposed the need to strengthen worker welfare; eg by, proposing the use of auditor sampling of employees beyond those employed directly by the port, and the development of initiatives (Clearview) designed to promote social compliance through recruitment standards and certification of labour providers.

Discussion: SP highlighted difficulties associated with auditing organisations not directly within the scope of the standard. Members agreed to retain existing requirements of the standard but discussed the potential need to review welfare provision within the standard with a view to strengthening requirements (especially those covering welfare of workers provide through third parties ie labour providers). To formally recognise the intention to develop this area, members agreed that worker development of welfare should be included within a strategic development plan, section 3.

2.2 Recycling fishing gear

MJ explained that provisions within the draft standard do not specifically mention recycling of fishing gear, as previously this activity had been agreed as difficult and expensive to address, and seen as an issue for future consideration.

Feedback received proposed specific measures aimed at minimising risks posed by redundant fishing gear at ports; eg, of fishing gear entering port waters and recycling gear, and liaising with external organisations to develop disposal strategies and the introduction of penalties for non-compliance. Difficulties of adequate storage capacity at some ports highlighted.

Discussion: members agreed that the waste management plan should consider the disposal and potential for recycling nets, and advised that ports should implement bespoke measures. Members rejected the proposal to introduce penalties, suggesting that a positive approach was required to influence a change in culture. Members agreed that any reference to the frequency of collection should not appear in the standard due to wide ranging levels of net collection. Members were advised that the standard makes no reference to 'frequency of collection'.

OB members recognised the need to consider further issues associated with redundant fishing gear and potential compliance mechanisms, and agreed that these issues should be recognised formally within the strategic development plan and be subject to further discussion.

2.3 Other feedback from public consultation

OB members agreed with responses proposed to other minor discreet points if feedback.

3. Strategic Development Plan

Member acknowledged the need, initially, for the requirements of the standard not to be excessively onerous so as to prevent adoption by industry, whilst recognising the potential need to strengthen the standard in response to future considerations.

As such, members agreed that the standard should be accompanied by a ' Strategic Development Plan' (SDP) that would outline the preferred developmental pathway of the standard. The SDP would also detail significant areas of consideration for potential future inclusion within the standard. Following approval by the OB, the SDP would be made publicly available.

4. Data protection

Members highlighted the impending implementation of the General data protection regulations (GDPR) that becomes enforceable in May 2018. Members highlighted the need for the standard to specify that applicants to the RFPS and associated organisations need to comply with all GDPR requirements, and that this could be achieved through the use of policies.

OB Members were comfortable with the standard being presented to the Seafish Board if the standard referenced the need to take account of GDPR requirements.