



**ASC's Third TAG Technical Advisory Group Meeting**  
**MSC Office, London**  
**Thursday Sep 1 & Friday Sep 2, 2011**

5

**Agenda:**

| #                           | Document Attached | Time          | Item  | Goal          | Who |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---|---------------|-----|
| <b>Thursday 1 September</b> |                   |               |   |               |     |
| 1                           |                   | 09.00 – 09.30 | Welcome / Opening Meeting<br>- Goal of meeting  | Information   | ASC |
| 2                           |                   | 09.30 – 10.00 | Introduction Participants   | Information   | All |
| 3                           |                   | 10.00 – 10.15 | Determine agenda  |               | All |
| 4                           | Y                 | 10.15 – 10.30 | Minutes Meeting 5 May 2011  | Approval      | All |
| 5                           | Y                 | 10.30 – 11.30 | Finalize Terms of Reference TAG   | Decision      | All |
| 6                           |                   | 11.30 – 12.00 | Elect Chair & Vice-Chair TAG  | Decision (2x) | All |
| 7                           |                   | 12.00 – 12.30 | Nominate Board representative of TAG<br>(will be proposed to ASC's Supervisory Board on behalf of TAG)  | Decision      | All |
|                             |                   | 12.30 – 13.30 | Lunch   |               |     |
| 8                           |                   | 13.30 – 15.00 | Update on ASC:<br>- Mission<br>- Market opportunities<br>- Planning<br>- Governance Structure (TAG/SAG)<br>- Staff<br>- Accreditation process:<br>o ASI<br>o Requirements<br>- Technical Working Group on Certification & Accreditation<br>- AGM revisions (Pangasius & | Update        | ASC |

credible environmental robust multi-stakeholder  
responsible transparent worldwide education  
impactful change independent social effective open  
solutions efficient partnership



|    |  |               |   |             |     |
|----|--|---------------|---|-------------|-----|
|    |  |               | <p>Tilapia)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logo development</li> <li>- Chain of Custody (MSC)</li> <li>- Training (GlobalG.A.P.)</li> <li>- Harmonization</li> <li>- Group Certification</li> <li>- Development TAG (new members)</li> <li>- Q&amp;A</li> </ul> |             |     |
|    |  | 15.00 – 15.15 | Coffee break  |             |     |
| 9  |  | 15.15 – 15.45 | Flowchart Audit Process (draft)   | Information | ASC |
| 10 |  | 15.45 – 16.45 | Non-conformities – finished standards<br>( <i>Tilapia, Pangasius, Bivalves, Abalone</i> )   | Decision    | All |
| 11 |  | 16.45 – 17.30 | Non-conformities – Aquaculture Dialogues ( <i>Shrimp, Salmon, Seriola/Cobia, Trout</i> )  | Decision    | All |
| 12 |  | 17.30         | Closing Day 1   |             |     |
|    |  | 19.00         | Informal Dinner with ASC Supervisory Board  |             | All |

| #                         | Document Attached | Time          | Item  | Goal        | Who |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---|-------------|-----|
| <b>Friday 2 September</b> |                   |               |   |             |     |
| 13                        |                   | 09.00 – 09.15 | Feedback Day 1 + determine agenda Day 2   |             | All |
| 14                        |                   | 09.15 – 09.30 | Validity period farm certificates (1 year)  | Information | ASC |
| 15                        |                   | 09.30 – 10.30 | Public Summary Template<br>( <i>what do current standards &amp; draft AD's prescribe? List all. Compare all.</i> )                  | Decision    | All |
|                           |                   | 10.30 – 10.45 | Coffee break  |             |     |
| 16                        |                   | 10.45 – 11.45 | Impact / Theory of Change   |             | All |
| 17                        |                   | 11.45 – 12.30 | Unit of Certification / Chain of Custody<br>( <i>what do current standards &amp; draft AD's prescribe? List all. Compare all.</i> ) | Decision    | All |
|                           |                   | 12.30 – 13.30 | Lunch   |             |     |
| 18                        |                   | 13.30 – 14.00 | Uniform definitions across standards  | Decision    | All |
| 19                        |                   | 14.00 – 15.00 | Group Certification   | Update      | All |

|    |  |                       |   |          |     |
|----|--|-----------------------|---|----------|-----|
|    |  | 15.00 – 15.15         | Coffee break  |          |     |
| 20 |  | 15.15 – 16.00         | Auditor Qualifications<br><i>(what do current standards &amp; draft AD's prescribe. List all. Compare all.)</i>   | Decision | All |
| 21 |  | 16.00 – 17.00         | Work plan TAG for 2012:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o New species procedure</li> <li>o Standard setting</li> <li>o Revision of standards</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Planning / Meeting dates</li> <li>- Connect TAG-members to topics</li> </ul> |          | All |
| 22 |  | <i>If time allows</i> | <i>Minimum Audit Length</i>   |          |     |
| 23 |  | 17.00 – 17.10         | All other business  |          |     |
| 24 |  | 17.10 – 17.30         | Wrap Up / Action Points / Next Steps  |          |     |
| 25 |  | 17.30                 | Closing   |          |     |

## 10 **1 Welcome / Opening Meeting / Goal of Meeting**

Meeting was opened 09.15hrs.

The agenda was presented at the start of the meeting.

15

In order to clarify the role of the TAG, the ASC structure was presented:

- Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) is the platform for stakeholders to raise concerns, bring in improvements etc. In this group the members represent their company (and to a wider extent they represent their peers)
- 20 - TAG is the group that advises ASC's Supervisory Board (SB) on all technical matters regarding accreditation and certification. In the TAG members participate in an individual title. Members participate based on their personal knowledge and experience.
- 25 - Technical Working Group(s): the TAG has the possibility to initiate working groups on specific matters. Currently 1 TWG has been started: the Technical Working Group on Certification and Accreditation (TWG-CA). This working group is finalizing the 'ASC Farm Certification Requirements and Accreditation Requirements' and reports to the TAG. TAG will present results to ASC's Supervisory Board.

- 30 ASC's Supervisory Board (SB) will either accept TAG advise or will inform TAG in writing (which will be public) why the advice was not accepted. Important to note that ASC's SB takes decisions for ASC organization as a whole and has to balance all factors (e.g. staffing, budgets, market opportunities, brand, competition, reputation, standards etc.). In this context it is possible that the best technical advice is not always the best option for the organization as a whole, or maybe not at that point in time.
- 35

Meeting notes of the TAG will be made public with Chatham House Rules applied to them, which means that comments will be unattributed (external readers will not be able to link comments to individuals).



- 40 This meeting has 3 main goals:
1. Decide on critical points
  2. Define clear next steps on non-critical, yet important points (improving time frame)
  3. Update TAG on ASC progress to date

45 **2 Introduction Participants**

All people not present at the meeting notified ASC timely.

| Name  | Representing       | Organisation  | Present                    | Dial in (not applicable) | Not present |
|---|--------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Peter Cook  | AAD                | University of Western Australia                           | X                          |                          |             |
| Sabine Daume  | AAD                | SCS   | X<br>(Sep 1 from 11.00hrs) |                          |             |
| Dr. Sandra E. Shumway                                 | BAD                | University of Connecticut (Department of Marine Sciences) |                            |                          | X           |
| David L. Jarrad                                       | BAD                | Shellfish Association of GB                               | Both days until 1300       |                          |             |
| Sian Morgan   | FTAD               | Independent consultant                                    | X                          |                          |             |
| David Basset<br>(Minutes Sep 1)                       | FTAD               | FEAP, British Trout Association                           | X                          |                          |             |
| Flavio Corsin   | PAD                | ICAFIS/ VINA FISH   | X                          |                          |             |
| Dan Fegan   | PAD                | Cargill   | X                          |                          |             |
| Jay Ritchlin  | SAD                | David Suzuki Foundation, CARR                             |                            |                          | X           |
| Petter Arnesen  | SAD                | Marine Harvest  |                            |                          | X           |
| Neil Sims   | SCAD               | Kona-Blue   | X                          |                          |             |
| VACANCY   | SCAD               |   |                            |                          | X           |
| Dominique Gautier                                     | ShAD               | Aquastar  |                            |                          | X           |
| Eric Bernard<br>(as alternate for Dominique Gautier)* | ShAD               | OSO/ R&S Seafood Gastronomy                               | X                          |                          |             |
| Leo van Mulekom                                       | ShAD               | Oxfam Novib   | X                          |                          |             |
| Michael Tlusty  | TAD                | New England Aquarium                                      |                            |                          | X           |
| Anne-Laurence Huillery                                | TAD                | Regal Springs Group                                       | X                          |                          |             |
| Bas Geerts  | Standards Director | ASC   | X                          |                          |             |
| Esther Luiten<br>(minutes Sep 2)                      | CEO a.i.           | ASC   | Sep 2 only                 |                          |             |

- 50 \*) During this meeting it was decided that alternates will not be allowed in future meetings, as this could (theoretically) expand the number of group members to 32 (16 x 2) members, which is too big a group to discuss (and agree on) technical matters.

No representatives from the SAD (Salmon) could make it to the meeting, but ASC has updated 1 SAD representative briefly via the phone prior to the meeting.

55

### **3 Determine agenda**

It is proposed to move election of chair, vice chair and SB-representatives (agenda items 6 & 7) to 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the meeting to allow the group members to get to know each other before election. Group agrees. Item moved to Sep 2. With this modification the agenda was accepted.

60

It was mentioned that ASC will need to determine a suitable technical framework for future e-meetings/teleconferences.

65

In this phase of the development of the ASC it is important the TAG focuses on getting the correct procedures in place before TAG gets involved in standard specific issues.

### **4 Minutes Meeting 5 May 2011**

70

Participants are asked if they have any comments/remarks. None.

#### **Conclusion(s):**

Minutes approved

75

#### **Action point(s):**

None

### **5 Finalize Terms of Reference TAG**

80

It was proposed that all ASC documents will be written in gender-neutral language. After some discussion all agreed, as long as it shall not jeopardize the clarity of texts.

In line with the previous, all TAG members will try their best to also use gender-neutral language during TAG-meetings.

85

Art. 10.4

TAG member suggested that this article will be reworded to reflect the intention for gender-neutrality.

Art. 3.9.1

90

Concern at the power to remove a member of the TAG should they have damaged the reputation and image of the TAG and/or the ASC and the implications for this at preventing 'whistle blowing'. It is not clear in whose opinion someone may have damaged the reputation and image of the TAG/ASC.

95

TAG member offered to draft revised wording.

Art. 4.5

TAG discussed and asked whether minute urgent matters be permitted or should it be fixed 7 days in advance? There is general agreement that if something is important it should be dealt with and should not be excluded. Various practical considerations were considered.

100

Suggested revised text:

As general practice the agenda will be set at a minimum of seven days in advance of the meeting. However, additional issues may be raised at the start of the meeting and a decision taken by the TAG if the matter should be heard. Such issues must be raised in writing in advance of the meeting with the chair. Decisions shall not be taken on short notice agenda items without full consultation of the TAG (via e-mail / telephone subsequent to the meeting if required).

105

110 Art. 4.9 & 5.2  
Article should be amended to clarify that ASC presence at meetings or alteration of the ToR is agreed only by mutual consent with the TAG.

115 Art .10.1 & 10.2  
TAG member expressed his concern that too much power is still given to ASC's SB; recommendations of TAG should be binding.  
It was explained that SB has a myriad of realities to match to make the ASC deliver on its promise. Examples are: budgets, staff, market opportunities, competition etc. To balance all these binding advice from TAG can negatively interfere the wider picture and could therefore limit the ASC in achieving its goals.

120 It was stressed that the SB has the obligation (as formalized in the ASC Deed) that in cases it does not take over TAG advise, it must provide an explanation, in writing, to the TAG. This contributes to a workable and open decision-making process.

125 **Conclusion(s):**  
Text will be reworded after the meeting and circulated to all TAG members for final approval.

130 **Action point(s):**  
5a) TAG member will provide revised wording for article 3.9.1  
5b) ASC will circulate revised wording for the articles as listed above to TAG  
5c) TAG members to react within 2 weeks after they received the TAG meeting notes  
5c) once 4.5 is agreed by TAG, ASC will integrate text into ToR

## **6 Elect Chair & Vice-Chair TAG**

135 TAG member suggested that the TAG's Chair should be an industry based person. In the framework of a farm-based standard he feels it's important the Chair has a good understanding of industry priorities.

140 It was pointed out that drivers differ per region; in US different from EU. E.g. in US it is important to convince NGO's to have a good story for retailers they approach.

145 Given the importance of the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair the group decided it is important also TAG-members not present at this meeting will have a fair voice. They should be able to nominate themselves, as well have a good insight on who they would vote for.  
Therefore it was decided to do this election after this meeting.

150 **Conclusion(s):**  
It is important for ASC and for the TAG to have chair and vice chair elected. Candidates will nominate themselves and TAG will elect via e-voting (to be accommodated by ASC) prior to next TAG meeting. Chair can represent any constituency. All agreed.

155 **Action point(s):**  
6a) Participants interested in taking up the position of:  
- Chair  
- Vice Chair  
will send a short bio to ASC.  
6b) ASC will distribute the bio's to all TAG members  
6c) ASC will set up suitable e-voting tool  
6d) TAG members will bring out their votes 2 weeks after election has opened.  
160 6e) ASC will inform ASC's Supervisory Board for final decision-making.  
6f) ASC will inform TAG members on this decision

**7 Nominate Board representative of TAG (will be proposed to ASC's Supervisory Board on behalf of TAG)**

165

2 Representatives of the TAG will have a seat in ASC's Supervisory Board. Those members will get voting rights in the Supervisory Board, but will lose their voting rights in the TAG. TAG members nominate 2 representatives, which will be proposed to the SB for final approval.

170

**Conclusion(s):**

It is important for ASC and for the TAG to have 2 TAG-representatives for a seat in ASC's Supervisory Board nominated. Candidates will nominate themselves and TAG will elect via e-voting (to be accommodated by ASC) prior to next TAG meeting. All agree.

175

**Action point(s):**

7a) Participants interested in taking up the position of Supervisory Board member of the ASC will send a short bio to ASC.

7b) ASC will distribute the bio's to all TAG members

7c) ASC will set up suitable e-voting tool

180

7d) TAG members will bring out their votes 2 weeks after election has opened.

7e) ASC will inform ASC's Supervisory Board for final decision-making.

7f) ASC will inform TAG members on this decision

**8 Update on ASC**

185

ASC presented a series of slides on:

- what ASC has done since the last TAG meeting in Brussels (May)
- planning for the next few months, including the opening of accreditation
- Governance of the ASC

190

TAG members asked what the role of the Technical Working Group on Certification (TWG-CA) and Accreditation is. ASC explained that the core task of this (temporary) working group is: to advise and co-write the 'ASC Farm Certification Requirements and Accreditation Requirements'-document. This document will then be handed to TAG for a final technical advise to ASC's Supervisory Board. In principle it is up to the TAG to establish Working Groups. The TWG-CA was established by the ASC. Members were recruited via ASC's e-newsletter, website and direct contact with relevant stakeholders. (Nov 2011: the list with TWG-CA members has been added to the ASC website)

195

200

**Conclusion(s):**

TAG agrees with the current set-up of the TWG-CA.

**Action point(s):**

205

8a) ASC will distribute his presentation to all TAG-members.

**9 Flowchart Audit Process (draft)**

ASC presents a graphical representation of the draft flowchart for ASC's audit process. Based on feedback some changes will be made

210

**Conclusion(s):**

Good to have this flowchart, but needs some minor adjustments.

**Action point(s):**

215

9a) ASC to adjust the flowchart

**10 Non-conformities – finished standards (Tilapia, Pangasius, Bivalves, Abalone)**

220 The principle of non-conformities was introduced to the participants. The original idea (at the start) of the Aquaculture Dialogues was to address a limited amount of key impacts for each species. However, looking at the standards today, we must conclude that the standards have become more complete over time (e.g. ASC Pangasius Standard contains 103 indicators and related standards). In order to be able to certify against the standards, it will be necessary to define guidance/methodologies for how CABs will need to cope with non-conformities. The  
225 Technical Working Group on Certification and Accreditation (TWG-CA) has formed a sub-working group, which will draft a proposal for non-conformities. This TWG will report back to TAG. Once agreed on an approach, the joint advice will be presented to ASC's SB.

230 The TAG was informed that in principle Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) take the final decision. ASC confirmed that ASC is indeed opting for independent certification decision making and to guide this decision making process in the direction of 'the spirit' of the ASC and, more important, to minimize differences on certification decisions between CABs. That is why ASC opts to provide clear guidance on this crucial chapter in its certification requirements.

235 TAG brainstorms about possible approaches (no final conclusions at this stage):

- all standards must be met before certification
- non-conformities can be raised by CABs (not possible for knock-out criteria)
- knock-out criteria will need to be identified
- if knock-out criteria are not met → audit will not lead to certification
- 240 - if knock-out criteria have been passed, a corrective action process for non-conformities will be developed, which may include a follow-up audit
- An audit is a sample test to determine whether a farm can deliver on the intent of the standard. It is impossible to check everything.

245 **Conclusion(s):**  
TAG and TWG-CA will define 1 joint-advice to ASC's SB.

**Action point(s):**  
250 10a) ASC will share advice of TWG-CA with TAG as soon as it will be available.

**11 Non-conformities – Aquaculture Dialogues (Shrimp, Salmon, Seriola/Cobia, Trout)**

This agenda point was not dealt with separately, but was combined with the agenda point #10 above.

255 **Conclusion(s):**  
Not applicable

**Action point(s):**  
260 Not applicable

**12 Closing Day 1**

Meeting was closed 18.15hrs.

**13 Feedback Day 1 + determine agenda Day 2**

265 Meeting was opened 09.00hrs.

Feedback:

- More substantial items preferably at the beginning of the meeting.
  - Meeting should be more directive. Chair to push harder.
- 270





**14 Validity period farm certificates (1 year)**

ASC informs the group that ASC’s SB decided to work with a validity period of 1 year. It is important to have this interval between Conformity Assessments (audits) in the initial phase of the program.

275

**Conclusion(s):**

Not applicable

**Action point(s):**

Not applicable

280

**15 Public Summary Template (what do current standards & draft AD’s prescribe? List all. Compare all.)**

The ASC decided to be as transparent as possible and chose to disclose a Public Summary of all (successful) audits. In addition to this it will report on an aggregated, anonymous level about success/fail ratio of all assessments (if these figures will be available and sufficiently accurate).

285

TAG member emphasized that it is important not to include any competition-sensitive information.

It is mentioned that ASC could work out a monitoring system in place

290

In order to get a clear insight on what is already in the different standards (and/or AGM), participants are asked:

- 1) is a public template mandatory,
- 2) what is prescribed on Auditor Qualifications and
- 3) what is prescribed on Unit of Certification?

295

**Conclusion(s):**

|      | Template | Auditor Qualifications  | Unit of Certification       |
|------|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| AAD  | *        | -   | Farm                        |
| BAD  | *        | -   | Farm                        |
| FTAD | *        | -   | Farm                        |
| PAD  | *        | -   | Farm                        |
| SAD  | ?        | ?   | Farm                        |
| SCAD | ?        | -   | Farm / Pen / Tank           |
| ShAD | ?        | SA8000 (in the AGM)   | Farm/ Pond                  |
| TAD  | *        | Auditors should be audited by an SA8000 lead auditor or has received a training and experience. | Farm / Receiving Water Body |

**Action point(s):**

15a) complete the overview with all relevant data in current (4) and future (4) standards.

300

**16 Impact / Theory of Change**

This topic has not been covered at this meeting, due to time restrictions (and lower urgency at this stage).

305

**Conclusion(s):**

Not applicable

**Action point(s):**

Not applicable

310

**17 Unit of Certification / Chain of Custody (what do current standards & draft AD's prescribe? List all. Compare all.)**

See also notes under #15 above

315 ASC will team up with MSC with regards to Chain of Custody certification. Basically this means ASC will be using MSC's CoC requirements. To make these applicable for ASC, MSC and ASC will work out a document outlining which changes will need to be made to MSC's CoC requirements. This document will be (once agreed by MSC's TAB; planned 5 & 6 December 2011) added as an annex to MSC's CoC document. Technically spoken ASC will be added as a 'scope' to the MSC CoC document. This will allow ASC to go to market reasonably quickly with a credible and proven CoC-methodology. And, even more important, this structure will allow companies which currently hold MSC CoC certification to add ASC CoC certification relatively easy and cost efficiently.

325 Technical Working Group on Certification and Accreditation (TWG-CA) is working on this. It will come up with an advice.

330 TAG member proposed: General guidance for Chain of Custody: those companies which 1) have legal ownership of the products AND do physical handling of these need to be supply chain certified. (= in line with requirements of e.g. RSPO). In line with this it will be mandatory for farms to also have CoC-certification.

335 Especially in the cases where farms have parallel production (conventional and certified; e.g. in the case of starting with ASC certification, while market demand is still to economically uncertain to switch fully as a farm). It is mentioned that even in the case of a 100% certified farm it is important to have CoC at farm level. E.g. in case of diseases or other unfortunate events farms may buy product from other (certified OR conventional) farms to supply their clients. These product flows must be independently monitored. CoC can be a tool to do this.

340 **Conclusion(s):**

CoC mandatory for companies, which:

- 1) have legal ownership of the product AND
- 2) do physical handling of the product.

No real conclusion, but group tends to be in favor for mandatory CoC for farms.

345

**Action point(s):**

17) share feedback from TWG with TAG (as part of the Certification and Accreditation Document)

350 **18 Uniform definitions across standards**

It is important for the ASC to work towards a harmonized terminology across standards. A list of uniform definitions could be a good starting point.

**Conclusion(s):**

355 Harmonizing definitions across standards is advisable.

**Action point(s):**

18 a) list differences and share with TAG

360 **19 Group Certification**

ASC updated the group: A consultant is working on a first draft requirements document. The consultant has an extensive track record in small holder engagement related to sustainability, with a strong focus on shrimp farming.

365 ASC sees group certification as a pivotal part of its program and therefore has initiated this in parallel with other projects. It is important to have the initial draft reviewed by peer-experts and other stakeholders, as well as field-tested. Given the current workload of the ASC operational organization, as well as its working groups, it is important to have focus in the activities. Therefore it is recommended to first launch the accreditation without specific group certification requirements. But it is stressed that ASC and its working groups continue to prepare the group certification requirements and start working towards field-testing thereof.

**Conclusion(s):**

375 Group certification is an important aspect of the ASC program. At the short term the ASC will focus of launching the ASC Standards (= opening accreditation of CABs) without group certification and will add group certification requirements later (aimed 2012).

**Action point(s):**

380 *(to be decided)* 19a) Establish dedicated Technical Working Group on Group certification? (or, delegate this work to the current Technical Working Group on Certification and Accreditation)

**20 Auditor Qualifications (what do current standards & draft AD's prescribe. List all.**

385 **Compare all.)**

See also notes under #15 above

Technical Working Group on Certification and Accreditation (TWG-CA) is working on this. It will come up with an advice.

390 Language → auditor will need an interpreter if he/she does not speak the local language. Especially when conducting the social part of the audit. It was stated that it is important to find the delicate balance between maximum assurance and cost-efficiency. If ASC aims to transform the aquaculture industry, it will need to find the ultimate balance. Raising the bar too high may conflict with this ambition. This will need pragmatic approach by all involved. Accepting some (calculated) risks is part of this approach.

**Conclusion(s):**

400 n/a

**Action point(s):**

Complete overview of the auditor qualifications as listed in the different Standards (as listed under Agenda #15 above.

405 **21 Work plan TAG for 2012:**

ASC presented some, major topics that will need attention of the TAG in 2012:

- Finalizing (and once launched: monitor and adjust) Certification Requirements
- Finalizing (and once launched: monitor and adjust) Accreditation Requirements
- Auditor Guidance Manual (AGM) review & testing Bivalves
- 410 • AGM review & testing Abalone
- AGM development / review Salmon, Shrimp, Trout & *Seriola/Cobia* (once Standards have been handed to ASC)
- Harmonization across standards, where reasonably possible
- 415 • Developing complaints procedure & structure

*(Standards Salmon, Shrimp, Trout & *Seriola/Cobia* expected to be handed to ASC Q2, 2012)*

ASC is in the process of revising the AGM for Tilapia. The AGM for Pangasius will follow. The AGMs for Abalone and Bivalves will follow after that. The revision will be aimed at:

- 420
- Harmonize language across AGMs
  - Harmonize layout across AGMs
  - Add producer (farmer) guidance to the AGM (the draft AGM for Tilapia was shared with the group)
- 425 TAG member raises the concern that some members of the Aquaculture Dialogues may show resistance towards harmonization of Standards. ASC reacts that the ASC aims to harmonize where possible; standards' feed-component seems a logical first step to focus on at this stage, but also alignment with regards to aspects with no real content consequences are considered, e.g. to have all the standards use the same terminology, the same logic in the order of principles, same layout etc. It is important to have consistency across standards where reasonably possible. This will allow the ASC to better position itself (with a clearer message) in the market and as such support and promote all standards best.
- 430
- 435 It was questioned whether ASC should have 2 separate documents for farmer guidance and auditor guidance. After some discussion with the group it is decided that it is advisable to have it in one document. (e.g. it reduces the number of standard-related documents, maintaining standards is easier, farmers can immediately see how they will be checked, auditors can see how farmers have been briefed).
- 440 ASC will hire an external consultant who will do the revisions. This consultant will need to liaise with representatives of the different ADs.

- 445 ASC stated that it is important to realize that the market is ready to embrace the ASC Standards. Extending the development processes of the 4 remaining standards may jeopardize the ASC. It is important to realize we will need to balance the aimed for robustness of the standards with the momentum in the different markets. If ASC delivers too late, it may already have lost important market shares to its competitors. We should not let the better be the enemy of the good. (the Video2000 / VHS case was named to illustrate this: Video2000 being the technically better solution, but VHS having the better marketing. With VHS becoming the world standard in video tapes).
- 450

TAG has the task to technically approve the AGMs. In practice we strive for the following procedure:

- 455
- Current AGMs will be reviewed by external consultant (supported by relevant AD-representatives)
  - Revised AGMs will be shared with AD representatives for final check

**Conclusion(s):**

- 460 TAG-members agreed with the revision of the AGMs: adding farmer guidance to all AGMs. TAG-members agreed they will be the contact (for standard / content related requests) to the consultant who will be revising the AGMs (first Tilapia, then Pangasius, then Bivalves & Abalone)

**Action point(s):**

465

**22 Minimum Audit Length**

- 470 This topic was only briefly discussed. ASC explained the this is being explored by the TWG-CA, as it can be a useful tool to eliminate unfair competition on price. Shortening audit lengths for competitive pricing could jeopardize ASC's credibility. TWG-CA will come up with an advise, which will be included in ASC's Certification Requirements and Accreditation Requirements document.

**Conclusion(s):**

475 Not applicable

**Action point(s):**  
Not applicable

480 *Remark → ASC's Supervisory Board decided not to prescribe a minimum for audit duration at this stage of the development of the ASC, but first learn from real life audits and the results thereof.*

**23 All other business**

**23.1**

485 Group agreed that it is confusing to have the word standards referring to:  
 - entire set of principles, criteria per species etc.  
 - minimum (or maximum) required level of each indicator

E.g ASC Pangasius **Standard**:

490 → issues  
       → impacts  
           → principles  
               → criteria  
                   → indicators  
 495                       → **standards**

**Conclusion(s):**

500 It is advisable to come with different wording for the word 'standard' at the level of the indicator. For reasons of clear communications it is decided to keep the word 'Standard' for the document as a whole.

**Action point(s):**

505 23a) ALL → propose new word for 'standard' (at the indicator level) to be integrated in the documents  
 505 23b) once approved by TAG to integrate it in all relevant documents (Standards, AGMs etc.)

**23.2**

510 An industry representative called in (2 Sep) to inform the group about his/her company's approach of sourcing sustainable seafood. He/she states they are very committed and it is sensed the Aquaculture Dialogues' participants and the current ASC staff are very committed to making the ASC successful. What companies are requesting from the ASC is leadership. There will be people opposing the ASC (as all change will meet resistance along the way) and those will put pressure on the organization and its supporters. It will take courage and leadership from all to have the ASC succeed. It is important to have a clear belief in the way forward and to stand for it. It will be about balancing the risks. Not about being led by emotional desire. Many people have put a lot of energy in the Aquaculture Dialogue procedures. Now we need to maintain that energy and bring those standards to the market. Market has been waiting for a while now. They want a credible solution, but it will be needed to show progress in the short term as well. Launching the ASC to the market should be strived for in the short term. It is great to have good and experienced staff at the ASC. E.g. the new CEO who has been contracted (starting in October). Again, it will take courage to make the ASC succeed. We will make mistakes, but that in itself should not be feared. We are setting up new ways of working and will find the best way by learning as we go. Many companies out there are very committed. This is a great opportunity. He/she wishes the group good luck.

515  
520  
525

**23.3**

530 It is mentioned that the ASC auditor training is being presented to the market as a GlobalGAP training. At least it is being perceived as such by many people. It is stated that this dilutes and confuses the market.

**23.4**

535 It was asked how ASC will deal with editorial flaws in the current Standards. Technically spoken, the Standards cannot be changed by ASC. In current standards we have already spotted some typo's and incorrect formulas. These should be corrected. Question is how to address these.

540 In addition, based on real live audits additional 'change requests' will arise. These too will need to be dealt with.

Group agrees that as long as the changes are not content related (typo's, style, replacing mistakes in formulas) these should be addressed. Either in the Standard or in accompanying documents, which will need to be available to both farmers and CABs.

545 ASC to keep versioning of the different documents.

**Action point(s):**

550 23.4) Determine which procedure will need to be followed to change 'editorial flaws' in current standards (check with ISEAL procedures)

**23.5**

It was stated that a feed dialogue would be an important next project for the ASC to initiate

**24 Wrap Up / Action Points / Next Steps**

555 ASC thanks all participants for their valuable participation and wishes all safe travels home.

**Action point(s):**

All action points are to be found at the end each of the topics above.

| Action item                    | What?   | Who?              | When      | Status  |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|-----------|---|
| <b>Vancouver TAG 1 meeting</b> |   |                   |           |   |
| 3                              | Suggestions for Asian candidates for the SB   | TAG members       | a.s.a.p.  | pending   |
| 4                              | Involving AD Steering Committee members in CB trainings   | ASC               | Q1 2011   | Done (Tilapia & Pangasius)                                |
| <b>Brussel TAG 2 meeting</b>   |   |                   |           |   |
| 1                              | <i>Chatham House Rules</i> will be applied to the Vancouver-minutes (TAG 1). This version will be posted on the ASC website.  | ASC EB            | June 2011 | Done for TAG1 & TAG2 (& published at ASC website)         |
| 2                              | The ASC Executive Board will update the TAG ToR and TAG operating rules based upon the discussion (including remarks in 'private session'). This version will be send to the TAG. | TAG members + ASC | a.s.a.p.  | Pending (draft text to be agreed in Dec 2011 TAG-meeting) |
|                                | Improve typing errors both in ToR and operating rules.  | ASC               | May 2011  |   |



|   |  |                   |          |   |
|---|--|-------------------|----------|---|
|   | Addition on rules for removal of TAG members (article 3.9.2)   | TAG, suggestions? | May 2011 | Pending (draft text to be agreed in Dec 2011 TAG-meeting) |
|   | Article 3.11 and 3.13 in the Rules will be combined.   | ASC               | May 2011 | Done  |
|   | An article will be added clearly stating that under Dutch Law ASC SB members cannot be voting members of any committee of the ASC.   | ASC               | May 2011 | Done  |
|   | Additions on rules for setting the agenda (article 4.4)  | TAG, suggestions  | May 2011 | Pending (draft text to be agreed in Dec 2011 TAG-meeting) |
|   | Wording to accommodate the possibility of having TAG-sessions without ASC-staff (4.8)  | TAG, suggestions  | May 2011 | Pending (draft text to be agreed in Dec 2011 TAG-meeting) |
|   | Acknowledging that, because of its responsibilities, the ASC SB needs to have a final say in approval the TAG ToR and TAG Rules, TAG members may come up with suggestions to improve the mutual agreement wording in article 5.2 | TAG, suggestions  | May 2011 |   |
|   | Add specifications on the role of the Standards Director (article 9.1).  | ASC               | May 2011 |   |
|   | Rules for the summary report of the TAG-minutes (article 10.2)   | TAG, suggestions  | May 2011 |   |
|   | Improve consistency in wording on confidentiality in article 12.2 and 10.2   | ASC               | May 2011 |   |
|   | The ASC does not see the necessity of explicitly adding the need of a balanced variety, if the TAG wants to add a formulation not in conflict with the basic requirement of knowledge and expertise, this is up to the TAG       | TAG, suggestions  | May 2011 |   |
|   | Add the umbrella statement from the Deed on ASC's role and ambition  | ASC               | May 2011 |   |
| 3 | Send the e-mail distribution list of your AD to ASC to include all   | TAG-members →     | a.s.a.p. | Done  |



|   |   |        |  |   |
|---|---|--------|--|---|
|   | contact-details in ASC's distribution list.   | ASC    |  |   |
| 4 | Exchange and discuss ASC working plan.  | ASC EB | June 2011                                      | Done (presented at TAG meeting 1&2 Sep 2011)  |
| 5 | The TAG request that a professional operation of the TAG requires budget for process facilitation, its secretariat and reasonable travelling and hotel expenses will be included in ASC's funding activities. | ASC EB | To be determined (immediate action on funding) | Done (ASC has limited budget for those TAG-members who will need financial support) |

560

**25 Closing**

Meeting was closed 17.30hrs

565

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| a.i.   | ad interim   |
| AAD    | Abalone Aquaculture Dialogue                             |
| AD     | Aquaculture Dialogue                                     |
| AGM    | Auditor Guidance Manual                                  |
| ASC    | Aquaculture Stewardship Council                          |
| ASI    | Accreditation Services International                     |
| BAD    | Bivalves Aquaculture Dialogue                            |
| CoC    | Chain of Custody   |
| FTAD   | Freshwater Trout Aquaculture Dialogue                    |
| MSC    | Marine Stewardship Council                               |
| PAD    | Pangasius Aquaculture Dialogue                           |
| SAD    | Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue                              |
| SAG    | Stakeholder Advisory Group                               |
| SB     | Supervisory Board  |
| SCAD   | Seriola / Cobia Aquaculture Dialogue                     |
| ShAD   | Shrimp Aquaculture Dialogue                              |
| TAD    | Tilapia Aquaculture Dialogue                             |
| TAG    | Technical Advisory Group                                 |
| ToR    | Terms of Reference                                       |
| TWG-CA | Technical Working Group on Certification & Accreditation |