

SEA FISH INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Minutes of the fifth meeting of the Seafish Domestic and Export Sector Panel

Held at Seafish Offices, Origin Way, Europarc, Grimsby on Thursday 20 March 2014

Present:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| John Goodlad (JG) | Chair |
| Neil Auchterlonie (NA) | Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science |
| Martyn Boyers (MB) | British Ports Association |
| Jackie Bruce (JBR) | Processors |
| John Butterwith (JBU) | Inshore/small boat |
| John Cox (JC) | Scottish Seafood Association |
| Robert Duthie (RD) | Exporters |
| Jim Evans (JE) | Welsh interests |
| David Jarrad (DJ) | Shellfish Association of Great Britain |
| Martin Leyland (ML) | Shetland interests |
| Malcolm Morrison (MM) | Scottish Fishermen's Federation |
| Jim Portus (MP) | UK Association of Fish Producer Organisations |
| Dale Rodmell (DR) | National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations |
| Jane Sandell (JSA) | Scottish Producer Organisations |
| | |
| Paul Williams (PW) | Seafish, Chief Executive |
| Tom Pickerell (TP) | Seafish, Technical Director |
| Mel Groundsell (MG) | Seafish, Corporate Relations Director |
| Simon Potten (SP) | Seafish, Head of Safety, Panel Secretariat |
| Jo Guz (JGU) | Seafish, Facilitator |

Apologies:

Clare Dodgson (CD) Seafish Board Member

1. Welcome and domestics

1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and ran through the domestics.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

2.1 JE advised on a correction to Para 3.9; the acronym should be MSFD (Marine Strategy Framework Directive) and not EMFD.

2.2 JBU requested clarification to Para 8.1; the final sentence to read "JBU requested additional help for the fishermen involved in the Bristol Channel ray fishery, which is now technically closed.

2.3 With the above corrections/amendments, the minutes were agreed as a correct record.

ACTION: SP to make required changes and post corrected version of minutes on the Seafish website.

Matters Arising:

2.4 Regarding “membership and rotation”, the Chair reminded members of the previous discussion and asked those who hadn’t already done so to respond to Seafish on whether they wish to continue on the Panel into 2015 or step down in 2014.

2.5 Regarding the “levy review”, PW advised that Seafish’s proposal for a levy rate reduction was still being considered by Ministers. Members reiterated their concerns, commenting that arguments about levy needed to be put to bed, demanding focus on how best to use the available levy for the long-term benefit of the industry, and pointing out that flexibility was needed in order to address unexpected issues that (inevitably) crop up during a three year plan.

2.6 Regarding the “Responsible Fishing Scheme”, TP advised that Seafish was talking to Client Earth about use of the strapline “responsibly-caught seafood” in the new RFS standard. ML commented that this (unhelpfully) implied that everything else is caught irresponsibly.

3. Progress with delivery

3.1 TP and MG presented the workstream dashboards (used to report progress to the Seafish Board) and mind maps (showing all the various projects and services being delivered under each workstream).

3.2 Members asked Seafish to include budget figures in the “Over/Under Spend” box.

3.3 ML asked for information on phasing over the 30 month period and an overarching summary for the whole Corporate Plan.

3.4 MB questioned the justification of the comment in the Finances section of the Reputation workstream dashboard (“overspend primarily due to success”). PW explained that this comment related to the highly acclaimed Business of Fishing film, for which the costs of production and presentation had exceeded budget. PW advised that another film (the Business of Processing) had been commissioned and was intended to be launched at the ESE in Brussels.

3.5 JC questioned the budget and underspend for the International Trade workstream. PW explained that there had been poor take-up for the trade mission to Russia and no interest in the planned mission to Vietnam (so this had been pulled). JC

questioned whether this workstream should continue to focus on imports. RD commented that the exporters valued this workstream highly.

3.6 With regard to the Testimonials box, DJ commented that it would be helpful to include (constructive) criticisms as well.

3.7 NA commented that the dashboards provided a good overview, but he found the RAG ratings in the Finances box confusing. TP advised that the presentation of financial information on the dashboards would be changed.

3.8 ML observed that Regional Delivery was not included in the dashboards and questioned whether the remit of the Panel was to consider the whole of the Corporate Plan, or just the workstreams. TP advised that consultants had been appointed to review Seafish's role in Regional Delivery. JC commented that he would like to see mapped how Seafish's regional delivery work fits with other regional bodies (e.g., Scotland Food & Drink). JSA advised that Seafood Scotland has its own Board and is not wholly part of Seafish.

3.9 JSA requested forecasts of costs and delivery over the lifespan of the Corporate Plan and suggested avoiding use of comments such as "issues with other staff booking time/resources to this budget" (in the Over/Under Spend box for the Information workstream).

3.10 JC commented that the financial data used in the 2012 Processors Survey was too out-of-date to be of any use or relevance.

3.11 MB noted that there was nothing in the progress reports on ports or fish markets.

4. Development of new Corporate Plan

4.1 PW presented an overview of the process and timescale for developing the 2015-2018 Seafish Corporate Plan and explained the Seafish Board's thinking regarding the overarching strategy (change from Protect, Inform, Educate to Promote, Protect, Inform).

4.2 ML agreed with use of the word "promote" (it is proactive and positive), but expressed concern at use of the words protect (defensive) and inform (dry). MB countered that the industry does need protection.

4.3 TP presented the results of Seafish's industry-wide online survey. Two new areas had been highlighted (horizon scanning, foresight & climate change and research & development). Issues raised that were the responsibility of Government would be passed on to DEFRA and the Devolved Administrations.

4.4 ML questioned why Seafish cannot promote Scottish or British fish. PW explained that this would constitute a state aid under EU law. Export support (under International Trade) is generally outside of the EU. ML questioned how hard Seafish pushed on this.

4.5 JGU facilitated discussion to review the proposed Seafish strategic objectives and then consider the key issues, opportunities and tensions facing the domestic & export sector over the next 5-10 years. These were then considered in relation to the activities currently being undertaken. The output from these sessions is recorded in Appendix I and Appendix II.

4.6 Members noted that aquaculture was not really covered in the current Seafish programme.

4.7 Members commented that work on improving fishing safety needed to be continued and that they had been assured that it would.

4.8 Members commented that Regional Delivery and Information & Interpretation enable and support all other workstreams.

4.9 JC recommended that Seafish should reinstate its Industry Project Fund. MB agreed, but recommended that it only be made available to industry. PW agreed to consider.

4.10 ML asked what was going to be done to overcome the disconnect between Seafish, Panels and stakeholders in communicating what Seafish is, what it is doing and what it is going to do.

5. Dates and venues for future meetings

Domestic & Export Sector Panel meeting

5.1 The next meeting will take place in July 2014 (date and venue to be agreed via Doodle Poll).

Joint Sector Panels meeting

5.2 Members elected JSA and RD to represent them at the All-Panels workshop to be held in London on 07 April 2014.

6. Any other business

6.1 Members recorded their thanks to MB for organising the tour of Grimsby Fish Market ahead of the Panel meeting and asked that similar activities be arranged around future meetings (where appropriate).