

## RFS Standards Public Consultation Response Summary

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Seafish Response</b>
World Animal Protection	5.1.3 (Waste management) We draw attention to the need for additional emphasis to be placed on port management bodies to enable the provision of adequate portside reception facilities, in line with MARPOL Annex V, including recycling opportunities where practicable.	Outside the proposed scope of the RFS standard so would not recommend adding any additional RFS clauses at this stage  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	5.1.3 (Waste Management) Proper disposal of end-of-life gear, ideally in the form of recycling, should be a requirement for both crewed and single handed vessels.	“End of life gear” is captured in clause 5.1.2 “any waste material generated from its activities”  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	5.3 (Recovery of lost fishing gear) We believe that it should form part of the requirements that vessels not only possess a procedure for the recovery of lost fishing gear, but should also require vessel operators, where possible, to recover and retain any lost gear that they encounter at sea for disposal on shore irrespective of where the lost gear originated.	Agree and have recommended the addition of Clause 5.3.3 in the Crewed and SHV standards to emphasis this point.  <b>Action</b> Addition of new clause 5.3.3 to capture recommendation.
World Animal Protection	5.3.1 (Recovery of lost fishing gear) Appropriate training for fishermen for the safe recovery of lost gear should form an	Risk assessments for ALL gear retrieval will take place already, no requirement for specific lost gear retrieval training.

	integral part of the operating practices.	Therefore recommend no enhancement to relevant RFS clauses.  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	5.3.2 (Recovery of lost fishing gear) Fishermen should be required to report sightings of lost gear even if it did not originate from their own vessel and they are unable to retrieve it as this can allow relevant authorities to co-ordinate the retrieval of potentially hazardous gear	Inference is that this refers to floating lost gear which due to the fact that it is floating will be subject to shift due to tide and wind. Unlikely to be at coordinates reported by the time any relevant authorities may respond. Therefore recommend no enhancement to RFS relevant clauses.  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	5.4.1 (Scientific engagement) Recommend that vessel operators should be required to share data on lost gear – their own lost gear and that which has been encountered during their activities	Suggestion includes a recommendation that Seafish joins a World Animal Protection coordinated network/initiative to analyse collated data on lost gear. Seafish consider this to be outside the scope of the standard. Therefore recommend no enhancement to relevant clauses at this time.  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	5.4.2 (Scientific engagement) We would encourage more language in the RFS to include reference to NGOs working on marine issues alongside	The RFS standard clauses already encourage engagement with the scientific community and are so constructed to require engagement beyond just

	mentions of agencies or government research bodies in order to facilitate more effective cross-sectorial collaboration.	“agencies and Government bodies”.so would not recommend alteration to existing clauses.  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	5.4.3 (Documentation and reporting) Reference to documenting mentions of interactions with threatened, endangered or protected species, expanded to include interactions with all ‘non-target’ marine mammals, reptiles and birds.	Agreed It is recommended that clause 5.4.3 has a slight addition to take on board this recommendation.  <b>Action</b> Amendment of clause 5.4.3
World Animal Protection	5.4.3 (Reporting of interactions) Additionally, we feel there should be a requirement that vessels report all entangled animals they encounter to relevant authorities	It is uncertain as to the outcomes of such reporting, to whom reports should be made and when.  <b>Action</b> None
World Animal Protection	Core Principle 5 (care for the environment) Where rescue is deemed possible vessels should be required to report entangled animals to the relevant authorities who can facilitate a rescue operation	Like floating lost gear, positions are likely to alter. Consider this will also be very difficult to audit. No enhancement to relevant clauses.  <b>Action</b> None
New England Aquarium	General comment  Another concern is whether the logo and title of the “Responsible Fishing Scheme” standard appropriately conveys to the consumer what the standard verifies; potentially it could be mistaken for a	Seafish will have numerous documents to explain what the RFS programme stands for. So it would be a recommendation that all literature on the RFS is properly vetted before it is published to ensure that a clear message on what it stands for is given to the global audience

	fisheries ecolabel rather than a social standard.	<b>Action,</b> Ensure that all literature supporting and promoting the Responsible Fishing Scheme is consistent and clear.
New England Aquarium	General Comment.  No public comment period following the certification assessment. We would strongly suggest that a public comment period be added to the assessment process.	The standard is being accredited to ISO 17065 and as such there must be confidentiality between the vessel applicant and CB, and the CB must be the only party that issue the RFS certificate if this accredited status is to be maintained. The RFS applicant will be published on the RFS website and the Standard Holder will accept public comment on the direction of the RFS standard but cannot get involved in which vessel applicant get certified. So would recommend not including this stage in the RFS certification process.  <b>Action</b> None
New England Aquarium	General Comment.  Although it is implied, it should be stated clearly that the assessment process includes an on-site audit	Agreed,  <b>Action.</b> Recommend amendment to proposed text in the preamble under the RFS Standard Certification Process
New England Aquarium	General Comment.  The audit should require an interview with crew members to verify the Human Rights	Contractual documentation and commitment polices should be sufficient. Certain clauses can be audited by speaking with the crew so would

	criteria	<p>recommend no further additions to section 1.3 of the Crewed RFS Standard.</p> <p><b>Action</b> None</p>
New England Aquarium	<p>General Comment.</p> <p>Seafish may want to consider unannounced audits or reviews in order to ensure that the standard is being upheld at all times.</p>	<p>Program certification model will be agreed by UKAS through discussions with CB and Seafish so would not recommend this stipulation at this stage of the RFS development, but could consider this as the programme starts to mature.</p> <p><b>Action</b> None at present but review during anticipated future reviews.</p>
New England Aquarium	<p>Core principle 5, (Care for the Environment)</p> <p>The elements of this principle could be strengthened, suggested clauses; -The vessel applicant shall commit that at all times during the fishing operations it shall take appropriate steps to avoid and minimize harm to sensitive seafloor habitats, including, but not limited to: coral, sponges, sea pens/whips, seagrass, maerl.</p> <p>The vessel applicant shall commit to participating in gear modification trials by agencies or government research bodies relevant to the fishery, non-target fish</p>	<p>Suggested requirements will be captured in sector specific CSG's developed to underpin the RFS program. Also certain elements not auditable. So would recommend no additions to relevant RFS standard at this stage.</p> <p><b>Action</b> None</p>

	<p>species, or habitat when requested.</p> <p>The vessel applicant shall record and document discards of all target and non-target species. The vessel applicant shall implement best handling practices to reduce discard mortality.</p>	
New England Aquarium	<p>1.1 (Health &amp; Safety) Add performance indicator “The vessel applicant shall provide medical care for all workplace-related injuries and illnesses”.</p>	<p>Arrangements in respect of medical care are matters to be agreed on an individual, contractual basis. This additional requirement is not recommended for inclusion.</p> <p><b>Action</b> None</p>
New England Aquarium	<p>1.3 (Crew welfare) Add performance indicator “The vessel owner shall provide health insurance and social security benefits as required by national law”.</p>	<p>Arrangements in respect of health insurance are matters to be agreed on an individual contractual basis. This additional requirement is not recommended for inclusion</p> <p><b>Action</b> None</p>
New England Aquarium	<p>1.3.4.4 (Crew welfare) “Deposits” should be defined, and include money and benefits.</p>	<p>Agreed, and would recommend modification to clause 1.3.4.4</p> <p><b>Action</b> Modify clause 1.3.4.4 to accommodate.</p>

New England Aquarium	<p>1.3.4.5 (Human rights)</p> <p>This could be rephrased as a “no child labour” requirement, as internationally this is defined differently.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Amendment to clause 1.3.4.5 to meet potential variations in legislation.</p>
New England Aquarium	<p>1.3.4.6 (Human rights)</p> <p>In addition to youth working in hazardous conditions, add others such as women who are pregnant.</p>	<p>Unlikely occurrence, however inclusion not problematic.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Amend clause to include “known to be pregnant”</p>
New England Aquarium	<p>1.3.5.1 (welfare)</p> <p>it is critical to add one or more performance indicators addressing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Salaries in accordance with or exceeding the highest of: sector regulations, collective bargaining agreements, regional average minimum wage, legal minimum wage for similar occupations (Reference: Draft Fair Trade Fisheries Standard ED-CE 1)</li> <li>- Payments made directly to employees on time under an appropriate payment schedule. If payment is made via direct deposit, employer does not have withdrawal access. (Reference: Draft Fair Trade Fisheries Standard ED-CE 2)</li> </ul>	<p>The RFS Standard has followed the ILO c 188 requirements so feel that this comments has been covered and do not recommend any additional clauses</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>

	- Appropriate payment for overtime.	
New England Aquarium	1.3.6.1 (welfare) Consider adding more specific guidelines for rest periods, such as X number of hours of rest within a 24 hour period, except in exceptional circumstances, or as required by current legislation, noting that ILO 188 sets specific time limits for this (10 hours).	This is covered in the Ethical and Welfare CSG which will underpin the RFS and the vessel applicant has to commit to complying with this as part of the certification process, so would not recommend any additional clauses  <b>Action</b>  None
New England Aquarium	1.3.6.2 (welfare)  The wording “non-fishing related activity” should be clearly replaced with “rest”.	Agreed. “Rest” is consistently referred to throughout ILOc188.  <b>Action</b>  Replace “non fishing related activity” with “rest”
New England Aquarium	1.3.7.2 (welfare)  Should also include mental and verbal abuse.	Agreed  <b>Action</b>  Include “ mental and verbal abuse” in clause 1.3.7.2
New England Aquarium	1.3.8.1 (welfare)  Given the potential international application of the standard, a maximum time at sea limit should be included.	No apparent guidance within ILO c188  <b>Action</b>  Discuss further with OB to determine position

<p>New England Aquarium</p>	<p>2.3 and 2.4 (Crew training)</p> <p>Please add more specificity here. What does it mean to say “initiatives designed to enhance the management of the environment and/or resource/ product creation /crew safety and welfare”? What if such initiatives do not exist?</p>	<p>Agree that records of this additional training should be recorded.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Amend clause 2.6.1</p>
<p>New England Aquarium</p>	<p>Core principal 3</p> <p>There are 4 bullets, but only 2 specific performance indicators. Add at least 2 more performance indicators to expand upon and clarify the points made by the bullets, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The vessel applicant shall provide a statement detailing vessel’s mission (e.g., fishing area; catch focus; gear type, etc.)</li> <li>- The vessel applicant shall demonstrate that the vessel and its gear (including all required modifications, such as bycatch reduction devices) are in compliance with current legislation.</li> </ul>	<p>Most of these comments have been captured already in module 3, and UKAS have also commented on the legality of vessel so an additional clause has been devised which must now be included into both the RFS standards.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Develop additional clause (3.3) to cover</p>
<p>New England Aquarium</p>	<p>5.1 (Waste management)</p> <p>Consider adding a statement about disposal of organic wastes, perhaps along the lines of “disposal of organic wastes must be in compliance with best</p>	<p>5.1 and subsequent clauses already sufficient to achieve objectives, no additional requirement recommended.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p>

	practices or national regulations”.	None
GAA	<p>1.3.4.3 (Human rights)</p> <p>Add the following clause</p> <p>“The vessel applicant shall commit to an agreement policy that shall respect the rights of any employed and share crew to be able to have “Freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining”.</p>	<p>Sensible as it captures situations potentially prevalent outside of the existing clause.</p> <p>Recommend inclusion as suggested.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Add suggestion as stated in 1.3.4.3</p>
Natural England	<p>General comment.</p> <p>Taking the document in its entirety there does seem to be a disparity when considering the weighting afforded environmental as opposed to other aspects. The concern here is that the <i>Standards</i> are presented/marketed/understood by the public as providing a degree of environmental protection/level of knowledge of those in the scheme that is not actually the case</p>	<p>These comments are duly noted, however;</p> <p>The scheme remains a business to business tool and content and weighting is determined by the RFS Oversight Board</p> <p><b>Action.</b></p> <p>None</p>
Natural England	<p>General comment.</p> <p>Nowhere in the document is the issue of removal of that status mentioned</p>	<p>As this programme will be accredited to ISO 17065 this set out what the certification process will be and the CB will also set out conditions of the certificate to a vessel applicant when they receive it. In these conditions it will set out clearly how they will maintain their</p>

		<p>certified status and if do not comply give them information on how the certificate can be removed. So would not recommend any additions to standard.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Natural England	<p>2.3 (Environmental and Ethical training)</p> <p>There is no guidance/direction on what is expected or indeed should be completed.</p>	<p>The CSG will give guidance as will the generic support documentation that will be produced to help the vessel applicant. This comment is noted</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Continue to strengthen direction and guidance in CSG's and support documentation.</p>
Natural England	<p>3.1 (Vessel performance indicators)</p> <p>It would be helpful to include a comment along the lines</p> <p>"The skipper of the vessel maintains their knowledge of and complies with all relevant environmental legislation"</p>	<p>This is a requirement of the more general position of operating within the legal framework (which includes environmental legislation)</p> <p>No recommended additions to content of 3.1</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Natural England	<p>3.1 (Core principle 3)</p> <p>Include explicit reference to compliance with local IFCA or MMO byelaws for</p>	<p>These elements will be captured in CSG's</p> <p><b>Action</b></p>

	closed areas to protect marine habitats or technical measures to protect vulnerable species;	None
Natural England	<p>Core principle 5</p> <p>Only deploy gear that has been designed to minimise ghost fishing if lost i.e. traps/pots that incorporate panels of biodegradable material/sacrificial wire.</p>	<p>Gear loss can present fishers with significant costs where gear is lost and in consequence gear maintenance is already a key consideration. Requirements to ensure gear maintenance to minimise losses is felt sufficient to control the possibility of ghost fishing at this time.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Natural England	<p>Core principle 3.</p> <p>Fishing gear should also appropriately marked and constructed in order to minimise losses.</p>	<p>See above regards construction and maintenance.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Natural England	<p>Core principle 5.</p> <p>It is recommended that the ordering of 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 are reversed.</p>	<p>This was discussed at the OB and the order was agreed so would recommend no change to the order at this stage</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Natural England	<p>Core principle 5.</p> <p>It is recommended that there is an</p>	<p>Requirements to fish within the legal framework are clearly a requirement of Core principle 3.</p>

	<p>expectation that fishermen have on board their vessels paper/electronic charts that show the locations of designated sites/features so that they can avoid inadvertent interactions with them.</p>	<p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>General comment.</p> <p>We would invite Seafish to consider whether the scheme could be extended to include standards for POs</p>	<p>Outside current standard scope BUT worth seeking the opinion of the OB as to the feasibility and value of proposal</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Present proposal to oversight board for discussion</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>General comment.</p> <p>In addition we would invite Seafish to consider whether the standards could be extended to assist the journey towards earned recognition – e.g. have a standard that there have been no regulatory breaches recorded against the vessel or the skipper over the last X time period, or set a number of vessel and/or master points that should not have been exceeded. Alternatively a compliance rating could be set based on the number of regulatory breaches recorded against vessel or master –such as a Red/Amber/Green rating.</p>	<p>Not to be compatible with ISO 17065 requirement. Non-compliance with requirements of Core Principle 3 also not allowable.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>Core principle 1 (Health and Safety)</p> <p>1.2.5.1. and 1.2.5.6. Is there a reason why</p>	<p>Not intended to be, recommend re-phrasing to infer equivalence.</p>

	the risk assessment standard differs for crew and visitors?	<p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Re-phrase 1.2.5.6 to mirror level of risk assessment requirement in 1.2.5.1</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>Core principle 1 (Health &amp; safety)</p> <p>We would recommend that the scheme specifies that boarding ladders must meet regulatory requirements and be in good working order.</p>	<p>Safety and efficacy of equipment will be captured within risk assessment requirements.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>Core principle 1 (Health &amp; Safety)</p> <p>We would recommend that the scheme should include a standard that any firearms carried aboard are licenced, notified to fisheries authorities and carried and used safely and lawfully.</p>	<p>Requirements to operate within the legal framework are clearly a requirement of Core principle 3.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>None.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>Core principle 3</p> <p>We would recommend that the standard should have specific performance indicators around the 3 areas where vessels have responsibility:</p> <p>The vessel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Training of crew on regulatory requirements. The MMO would be keen to contribute to training material on regulatory issues.</li> </ul>	<p>As pointed out within the response, inclusion may duplicate legal responsibilities cited elsewhere. Difficult to audit some of the proposals. Recommend amendment to bullets under Core principle 3 to capture equipment.(other than fishing gear) Add further bullet to require cooperation with enforcement agencies. Much will be captured in CSG's</p> <p><b>Action</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Equipment (e.g. VMS, AIS, elogs) must be in good working order and used in line with requirements. This could be qualified by using the idea of tolerances to take into account technical and other operational issues.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fish-room, and stowage plans if required, must be accurate and up to date.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Vessel license conditions must be understood and observed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Crew must assist inspections/inspectors.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Correct documentation must be carried.</li> </ul> <p>The Mission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Need to maintain accurate and timely records. Including use of correct species codes.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fishing gear must be properly stowed if transiting a restricted area.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Landing obligation requirements must be observed.</li> </ul>	Amend and add bullet points as suggested above
	<p>Core Principle 3</p> <p>Record dead bycatch of protected species</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Clause 5.4.3 amended to cover this recommendation</p>
Marine Management Organisation	Core principle 3	Requirements to operate within the legal

	The legislation should include: The Conservation of Seals Act 1970, Conservation of Seals (England) Order 1999, Council Regulation (EC) No 812/2004 (Pingers regulation)	frameworks are clearly a requirement of Core principle 3.  <b>Action</b>  None
Marine Management Organisation	Core principle 5.  We suggest that re 5.2.5. the standard could usefully say that the engine power must be in accordance with the registered engine power.	Captured under Core principle 3 requirements.  <b>Action</b>  None
Marine Management Organisation	Core principle 5  5.3.1. – the standard does not specify that fishing gear must be labelled.	Requirements to fish within the legal framework are clearly a requirement of Core principle 3.  <b>Action</b>  None
Marine Management Organisation	General comment.  this standard could usefully encourage best practice, for example. Engaging with scientific programmes such as the ongoing shark tagging schemes <input type="checkbox"/> Use of non-lethal methods as	“Usefully encourage” inclusions are not compatible with ISO standard requirements. CSG’s will stipulate best practice.  In relation to specific recommendations  Engagement with scientific community already a requirement.

	<p>alternatives to shooting seals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Adherence to voluntary agreements to protect Marine Protect Areas</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Use of VMS where it is not a statutory requirement</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Completion of logbooks where this is not a statutory requirement</li></ul>	<p>Adherence to voluntary schemes already a requirement.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Further investigate recommendations with respect to seals.</p> <p>No inclusion of voluntary use of VFM and/or log books at this time.</p>
--	--	--