

**Feed Project SC-Meeting No 8: In-person**  
**October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015**  
**Vancouver, Canada**



## **MINUTES ASC FEED PROJECT**

**Facilitator:** Patrick Field (Consensus Building Institute)

**Attendances:** Ally Dingwall, Andrew Jackson, Blake Lee-Harwood (chair), Dawn Purchase, Duncan Leadbitter, Eduardo Goycoolea, Karl Tore Maeland, Michael Tlusty, Michiel Fransen, Piers Hart, Trygve Berg Lea.

**Apologies:** Albert Tacon, Niels Alsted, Johan Verburg, Tor Eirik Homme,

**Observer(s):** Aaron McNevin (WWF-US), Avrim Lazar (Global Salmon Initiative).

### **1. Opening, round of introductions, confirmation agenda**

Meeting is opened at 08:35. Participants introduce themselves and share their view on the purpose of the day. Agenda is confirmed.

### **2. Business matters**

Secretary gives a short update on the activities of the recent months including the workshops given for draft 1. Feedback provided during these workshops is included in the overall feedback that has been received on draft version 1 and will be further discussed during the meeting.

### **3. Review of comments on draft v1.0 - Part A (Purpose)**

**Discussion:** Received feedback focusses on 2 areas: 1) the purpose description and standard content does not match and 2) the key impacts that are addressed with this standard are not clearly mentioned.

**Decision:** The SC agrees with the received feedback.

**Action:** Adjustments will be made to the purpose description as well as to a more detailed description of the key impacts that are addressed.

### **4. Review of comments on draft v1.0 – Part A (Scope)**

**Discussion:** Received feedback focusses on a number of areas: 1) the current scope description in draft version 1.0 is not clear enough, 2) doubts on the development of the audit manual after the approval of the standard and 3) the aim to use metric-based performance indicators in stead of descriptive performance indicators where possible.

**Decision:** The SC agrees with the received feedback. The SC also decided that the development of the audit manual will be within this project and needs the approval of the SC before release.

**Action:** Adjustments will be made to the scope description.

**Action:** TWG will be urged to use metric-based performance indicators where possible.

#### **5. Review of comments on draft v1.0 – Part A (Considerations)**

**Discussion:** Received feedback focusses on a number of areas: 1) word & language use, 2) novel ingredients need to be promoted via this standard, 3) overlap with other schemes needs to be mapped out.

**Decision:** The SC agrees with the received feedback. SC agrees that novel ingredient use must be promoted by this standard.

**Action:** Word and language use will be corrected (possibly with use of a professional editor/writer).

**Action:** A section will be developed devoted to promote uptake of novel ingredients.

**Action:** Overlapping with other schemes will be mapped out and points of duplication will be identified.

#### **6. Review of comments on draft v1.0 – Part B (Process & Governance)**

**Discussion:** Received feedback focusses on a number of areas: 1) Composition and expertise within TWG's, 2) transparency on TWG-participants, 3) disappointing output TWG-Plant & TWG-Animal.

**Decision:** The SC agrees with the received feedback. Compared to output delivered by TWG-Marine and TWG-Feed Mill is the Plant and Animal section in the standard marginal. This can have various reasons (lack of knowledge within group, unfamiliar area of expertise, etc.).

**Action:** More data/knowledge will be collected for both the Plant and Animal TWG. Based on this, a conclusion will be drawn on what is possible regarding setting requirements for both ingredient groups.

**Action:** TWG-participants will be made public on the ASC-website.

**Action:** Experienced auditors will be included in the standard development.

#### **7. Review of comments on draft v1.0 – Part C (Specific points on which feedback was requested)**

The various points listed in draft version 1 under Part C, are included in the feedback for the relevant sections of the standard.

#### **8. Review of comments on draft v1.0 – Part D (Principle 1)**

**Discussion:** Received feedback focusses on a number of areas: 1) there are many standards available that cover (parts of) Principle 1, but they are not mentioned/listed in draft v1.0, 2) duplication with P2-4 needs to be avoided, 3) a lot of the indicators are yet without details, 4) no details are given for the risk assessment and 5) traceability encompasses all four TWG's and selection of possible traceability models should be done on TWG-level.

**Decision:** The SC agrees with the received feedback. A clear separation in requirements between Principles is needed and must be made. The Risk Assessment will be an important starting point for ingredients for which no specific requirements are given.

**Action:** Overlapping standards will be identified and mentioned in Draft v2.0.

**Action:** Traceability schemes/models for the various sources must be made and compared. Details must be enclosed in Draft 2.0

**Action:** TWG-Feed Mill will be requested to develop initial requirements for the Risk Assessment.

**Action:** Missing details must be completed for Draft v2.0.

#### **9. Review of comments in draft v1.0 – Part D (Principle 2)**

**Discussion:** Received feedback focusses on a number of areas: 1) duplication of requirements in case certification against certain schemes is also achieved, 2) the main focus is on single species fisheries and the discussion on MSC/IFFO certification while other fisheries (multi-species fisheries) and intermediate solutions could present a way forward as well, 3) social criteria are on the radar but need more “body”.

**Decision:** SC agrees with the received comments. Indeed the discussion has been focusing on MSC/IFFO for a large extent. However, this remains a pivotal discussion and determines the potential success of the standard. Addressing social issues on fishing vessels is high on the “wish-list” of the participants, but does face serious practical implementations.

**Action:** the MSC/IFFO discussion will be prepared by a “non-committee” that will present its findings to the SC. This non-committee will have no mandate and will compose of max. 6 people (50/50 – industry/non-industry). In addition, the discussion must be information driven. ASC will prepare numerical values of (potential) certified supply.

**Action:** Clarity on various supply chain models needs to be given to SC.

**Action:** In order to explore the possibilities to implement social compliance criteria, ASC will contact Oxfam Novib and inform the SC afterwards.

#### **10. Review of comments on draft v1.0 – Part D (Principle 3 & 4)**

**Discussion:** Stakeholders comment that there is a big gap in requirements between marine and plant/animal ingredients. This unbalanced representation needs to be addressed in order to make the standard more robust.

**Decision:** The SC agrees with the received feedback. Although more challenging compared to marine ingredients for various reasons (availability of schemes, supply chain realities, etc.), more attention to these ingredients should be given. This could start initially with data collection from certified mills and work up towards more comprehensible requirements in a second version of the final standard.

**Action:** Secreatry will liaise with TWG-Plant & animal on next steps and provide support to both TWG's. A more extensive review of available options and issues will be made and presented to TWG. From this, a conclusion will be made and presented to SC.

**11. Next steps**

1. Complete feedback to stakeholders on Draft v1.0
2. Follow-up on various action points (within these minutes & additional points of attention)
3. Develop media tool kit

**12. AoB**

-

**13. Closing**

Meeting is closed at 4.30pm.