

MINUTES ASC FEED PROJECT

SC-Meeting #6 (teleconference)

Date: 4th February 2015

Place: -

Attendances: Ally Dingwall, Andrew Jackson, Blake Lee-Harwood (chair), Duncan Leadbitter, Eduardo Goycoolea, Johan Verburg, Karl Tore Maeland, Michael Tlusty, Michiel Fransen, Tor Eirik Homme, Trygve Berg Lea.

Apologies: Albert Tacon, Daniel Fegan, Michael Philips, Piers Hart, Niels Alsted.

Observer(s): -

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

Meeting is opened at 13:06 CET-time. Agenda is confirmed

2. **Approval of minutes 4rd SC-meeting (11th August, 2014)**

Decision: Minutes of 4rd SC-meeting are approved.

Action: Minutes will be uploaded on the Project Website.

3. **Secretariat project update**

Discussion: The updating of the website and sending out of the newsletter is lacking behind. This has slipped off the priority-list in the last couple of months.

Action: The secretary will update the website and will also construct a new newsletter.

4. **SC-member recruitment**

Discussion: CP was contacted to see if they are interested in a possible SC-position. Yaowaluk Jirawangso was presented as a possible candidate.

Decision: CP, represented by Yaowaluk Jirawangso, will be invited to join the Steering Committee of the ASC Responsible Feed Project.

Action: Secretary will introduce Yaowaluk to the SC, and update her on recent progress.

5. **Reporting back from TWG's**

Each TWG Chair updated the SC on progress within their TWG.

Discussion:

TWG - Marine Ingredients: the TWG - Marine Ingredients is developing a rough draft based on the outcomes of the meetings during the Briefing Event (September 2014, Amsterdam), and the teleconference following that event. This draft will be discussed within the TWG, after which the first version will be presented to the SC.

TWG – Plant Ingredients: updates from the TWG - the Chair could not participate in this Teleconference. It was stressed by the Secretary that this TWG is by far the most complicated TWG within this project. It requires the attention & contribution of the entire SC to come to a satisfactory end.

TWG – Animal Ingredients: the TWG - Animal Ingredients is planning a new teleconference to update the group on progress and identify new areas of attention.

TWG – Feed Mill: the TWG – Feed Mill has draft content available, and is discussing this through a number of teleconferences. Progress and participation of the group is good.

Action: Secretary will circulate this approach to the other Chairs.

6. **Inclusion of ingredients (i) – do we only set criteria for ingredients where the aquaculture industry has the ability to influence the supply chain and promote sustainable production?**

Discussion: various views were presented. Aquaculture has a real possibility to influence practices in fishmeal and –oil production. Other ingredients are most likely beyond the scope of any aquaculture-driven incentives. These ingredients are used by the aquaculture industry in large volumes, but represent a (very) small fraction of the global produced volume. Despite this reality, the SC has the ambition to include a selection of these low-impact /high-volume used ingredients in the standard, realizing that setting standards & achieving actual impact for these ingredients might be beyond the scope for this version of the standard.

Decision: a materiality-based methodology will be developed and used for selecting the top-10 (for example) most used ingredients in aquaculture feed. This methodology will include various aspects, which are relevant for both impact & aspiration of this standard.

Action: a materiality-based methodology will be developed, and will be open for feedback during the public consultation round. Based on this

methodology the top-10 ingredients will be selected. These ingredients will be addressed in the standard.

These ingredients can then be categorized as: 1) ingredients for which certified supply is available (see point 8 below), 2) ingredients for which no certified supply is available, but for which certification schemes are present (see point 9 below) and 3) ingredients for which no certified supply, nor certification schemes are available (see point 7 below).

7. Inclusion of ingredients (ii) – do we only set criteria where there are existing standards (e.g. fish, soy, palm oil) or do we include ingredients where no standards exist as well. How could this be achieved?

Discussion: The SC discusses if also ingredients with no existing standards should be addressed in the ASC Responsible Feed Standard. It remains unclear how much effect/impact the ASC Responsible Feed Standard can generate on the supply chains of these ingredients. It is clear to the SC that a more holistic approach must be adopted in order to speak of “responsible” feed.

Decision: the SC agrees that ingredients that fall within the scope of the materiality analysis, with no current existing standards available, should be addressed in some way in this standard as well. The standard should specifically recognize such ingredients even if no standards exist. The opportunities for using ‘supplier codes’ as a mechanism for addressing such ingredients should be explored.

Action: a supplier code will be circulated as example of a possible starting point for addressing ingredients for which no standards exists.

8. How can we develop a process for evaluating schemes that may be put forward as suitable for judging the suitability of ingredients for use in certified aquafeeds?

Discussion: several possibilities for scheme evaluation are presented and discussed by the SC.

Decision: the SC agrees that ASC should make clear decisions about which new standards it will recognise as credible (for all parts of ASC standards, not just feed) and explain the basis of that decision.

Action: secretary takes this action point back to ASC. As soon as more is known, then this will be shared with the SC.

9. Improver programs –should the standard accept improver programs for all ingredients or just fish?

Discussion: SC recognizes that Improver Programs are a good methodology for improving practices if they steer towards a standard. The basic components of a IP between fish and non-fish should be the same.

Decision: SC agrees that Improver Programs are to be used for all ingredients, as long as they operate within the framework of an approved standard with a clear ambition to meet such a standard over a defined time period.

Action: Secretary will make an overview of the key components in an Improver Programs and circulate with SC.

10. Social standards – should the standard have one set of generic criteria for social standards or should there be social standards specific to each TWG (fish, plants, animal products, factory production)?

Discussion: The SC acknowledges that there is a high variance in social issues and possibilities between the TWGs.

Decision: SC decides that each TWGs will develop their own, ingredient specific, social standards.

Action: Secretary will communicate this to TWGs.

11. By-products – should the standard have one set of generic criteria for by-products or should there be specific criteria for each TWG?

Discussion: Due to the diverse nature of byproducts, various problems arise when trying to harmonize requirements to form a general byproducts approach.

Decision: The SC agrees that each TWG will develop their own byproduct requirements. If possible, byproducts requirements will be harmonized.

Action: Secretary will communicate this to TWGs.

12. Next steps

Next steps within the project are:

- Finalize standard design and send out to TWG's (Action: secretariat)
- Continuing work within the TWG's on their draft content (Action: TWGs + Chairs)
- Preparation of Public consultation period 1 (Action: secretariat)

Decision: an action plan is needed for the Public Consultation period 1 & 2. The secretariat will draft a concept, which will be discussed with the SC.

Action: secretariat will draft concept action plan and circulate it with SC.

13. AoB

No a.o.b. where mentioned.

14. Closing