



IFFO RS Technical Advisory Committee Factory Criteria Comments Minutes of the Sixth Meeting

IFFO RS Head Office, Unit C, Printworks, 22 Amelia Street, London, SE17 3BZ

Members	Representation	Country
Blake Lee-Harwood (BLH)	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (E-NGO)	World
Michiel Fransen (MF)	Aquaculture Stewardship Council (Aquaculture/Standard holder)	World
Emily McGregor (EM)	Marine Stewardship Council (Fisheries/Standard holder)	World
Francisco Aldon (FA)	IFFO RS (Marine ingredients/Standard holder)	World
Søren Anker Pederson (SAP)	Marine Ingredients Denmark (Fisheries)	Denmark
Antoine Dangy (AD)	Olvea Group (Fish oil processor)	France/Africa
Estelle Brennan (EB)	Lyons Seafood (Fish Processor)	UK/Asia
Observers		
Alex Caveen (AC)	Seafish UK	UK
Samuel Peacock (SP)	Independent consultant	UK
Laura Shepherd (LS)	IFFO RS Secretariat	UK
Neil Auchterlonie (NA)	IFFO Technical Director	UK
Deirdre Hoare (DH)	Fishery Assessor (Certification Body)	UK

Apologies:

Trygve Berg-Lea (TBL)	Skretting (Feed Manufacturer)	Norway
Frank Treaty (FT)	United Fisheries Industries (Marine Ingredient Producer)	UK
Tracy Cambridge (TC)	World Wildlife Fund (E-NGO)	World
Duncan Leadbitter (DL)		

Objectives of the TAC meeting

To agree on the final draft of the IFFO RS Version 2.0 to present for approval by the IFFO RS Governance Board.

Action: To send TAC meeting minutes and presentations to all TAC members.

Fishery audit criteria:

Discussion: Should all fishery data be made publically available, and not just the management processes and results? (1.3.1.2)

Decision: Making every piece of raw data publically available would be very challenging for applicants and certificate holders and it would be unfair to 'fail' fisheries on this basis. It could also be considered setting the bar too high.

Action: Clause to remain as it states

Discussion: Should Stock assessments be publically available, and not just to the assessment team? (A2)

Decision: It would be reasonable to request this of fisheries and it would be fair to fail a fishery on these grounds. Although there are concerns about data restriction due to governments, it would be acceptable to pass fisheries where the stock assessment is not made publically available provided that the applicant has made a request for the stock assessment to be made publically available.

Action: Reword clause 1.3.1.2 to reflect the TAC agreement.

Discussion: The 95% Rule

Decision: No changes to the 95% rule needed however further explanation may be needed to ensure it is fully understood

Action: 95% rule to remain unchanged and further explanation to be provided

Factory assessment criteria:

Discussion: Responsible Sourcing Practices 1.2.1 – Should IFFO RS produce a factory policy format document for all producers? Is this practical?

Decision: This would be something nice to include in the Standard however it is not practical to do so. It would be best to draw up guidelines rather than a format to follow.

Action: To discuss with the IFFO RS Governance Board, in particular producer members of the board, whether it would be best to produce a format or guidelines.

Discussion: Responsible Traceability Practices 2.1.5.1 – Should IFFO RS produce guidelines for all producers?

Decision: It isn't practical to provide guidelines for all producers, companies need to be able to create their own traceability systems however, providing principals of traceability will give companies the flexibility they need but will ensure that certain aspects are covered within the traceability system.

Action: *Provide principals of traceability for future revisions of the standard.*

Discussion: Should IFFO RS introduce timeframes for auditors to perform the mass balance exercise during the factory audit?

Decision: Setting a timeframe isn't relevant however, a time limit of some sort does need to be introduced.

Action: *No timeframes to be introduced at this stage however this is to be revisited for future revisions of the standard.*

Discussion: Responsible Traceability Practices - 2.1.8 – To add a requirement of 2 recall exercises every 12 months

Decision: 1 re-call exercise is standard practice, 2 recall exercises within 12 months is too much, 1 would be much more appropriate

Action: *Clause 2.1.9 is to be added to the standard as “Applicants shall perform 1 recall exercises every 12 months and whenever necessary.”*

Discussion: Social Accountability 5.8.1 – To reduce time frame from every 3 years to 1 year with the suggested clause “The employees have been informed about the self-declaration and it is reviewed every 12 months”

Decision: Agreed with change

Action: *To include clause 5.8.1 in the standard with the agreed wording.*

Discussion: Social Accountability 5.14 – Should clause 5.14 be rephrased to “The applicant shall document that they have engaged with their raw material suppliers to ensure compliance with national social legislation”

Decision: To reword the clause to "the applicant must demonstrate that they have communicated the national social legislation to their raw material suppliers" and this will be complemented by the risk based social tools and guidelines that are under development.

Action: *Rephrase the clause as agreed by the TAC.*

Discussion: Environmental Accountability 6.4.1 – To expand on the requirements and to add a time frame and introduce establish indicator or short term action plans within 12 month

Decision: To rephrase the clause to make the requirements clearer and to add guidelines for future revisions.

Action: *To rephrase the clause and to add guidelines for future revisions raise the changes for approval from the Governance Board.*

The Chairman asked to all members of the TAC if there were any other issues to be discussed before the finalisation and sign off of the new version.

No issues were raised

All agreed on the new IFFO RS V2.0 to be sent for approval by the IFFO RS Governance Board

AOB

Discussion: Mixed Trawl Fishery. EM confirmed that one MSC representative will be joining the MTF group.

Action: *TAC members to think of suitable people that can join for discussion on the development of the Mixed Trawl Fishery part of the standard.*

Action Point	Responsible	Status
<i>To send TAC meeting minutes and presentations to all TAC members.</i>	LS	Complete
<i>Clause 1.3.1.2 to remain as it states</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>Reword clause 1.3.1.2 to reflect the TAC agreement that stock assessments must be made public.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>95% rule to remain unchanged</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>To discuss with the IFFO RS Governance Board, in particular producer members of the board, whether it would be best to produce a format or guidelines.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>Provide principals of traceability for future revisions of the standard.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>No timeframes to be introduced in clause 2.1.5.1 at this stage however this is to be revisited for future revisions of the standard.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>Clause 2.1.9 is to be added to the standard as “Applicants shall perform 1 recall exercises every 12 months and whenever necessary.”</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>To include clause 5.8.1 in the standard with the agreed wording. “The employees have been informed about the self-declaration and it is reviewed every 12 months”</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>To rephrase the clause and to add guidelines for future revisions raise the changes for approval from the Governance Board.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>To add guidelines and rephrase the clause and raise the changes for approval from the Governance Board.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete
<i>TAC members to think of suitable people that can join for discussion on the development of the Mixed Trawl Fishery part of the standard.</i>	IFFO RS	Complete