

**Freshwater Trout Aquaculture Dialogue
Verona, Italy
September 7-8, 2010**

Meeting Summary

**Prepared by World Wildlife Fund and Consensus Building Institute
David Plumb- Dplumb@cbuilding.org
Christoph Mathiesen- C.mathiesen@wwf.dk**

World Wildlife Fund - US
1250 24TH St., NW
Washington, DC 20037
www.worldwildlife.org

Meeting Background

The Freshwater Trout Aquaculture Dialogue (FTAD) met September 7-8, 2010 in Verona, Italy to discuss the development of standards for responsible freshwater trout production. This was the fourth FTAD meeting since the FTAD process began in November 2008. The meeting was held during the public comment period around the draft standards that were released in July 2010. David Plumb of the Consensus Building Institute (CBI) facilitated the meeting. The expected outcomes of the meeting were to:

- Create a shared understanding among participants of the FTAD's purpose and process
- Discuss and receive feedback on draft standards; make specific recommendations for revisions to the standards
- Develop strategies for outreach and ensuring success

The meeting agenda is attached as Annex 3.

Key Meeting Outputs

- Provided an overview of the FTAD's purpose, process and achievements to date to the 49 meeting participants
- Received participant feedback on goals and objectives of the FTAD and the Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC)
- Received feedback on the draft standards, as well as specific suggestions for revisions; encouraged all participants to submit written comments prior to the end of the public comment period
- Developed outreach ideas for the FTAD

Pre-Meeting Outreach

In anticipation of this meeting, the FTAD's coordinator and Steering Committee (SC) members communicated with a broad range of stakeholders in Italy and around the world to inform them of the progress that has been made within the FTAD and encourage their participation in the process, including attending the September meeting. The FTAD also published a notice about the meeting on the Aquaculture Dialogues' website. Meeting invitations were sent to environmental groups, trout producers, researchers and other stakeholders.

Meeting Participants

The 49 participants in the meeting represented producers, feed manufacturers, NGOs, trade bodies/industry associations and researchers. They came from more than 10 countries, including Italy, Turkey, the United States, Sweden, Netherlands, Denmark, the United Kingdom, Canada, Poland and South Africa. The full list of participants is in Annex 2.

Summary of Key Points, By Discussion Area

Aquaculture Dialogues/ FTAD Purpose and Process

After introductory presentations and discussion, participants expressed a general understanding of and agreement with the purpose and process of the FTAD. FTAD Coordinator Christoph Mathiesen and SC members said the goal of all of the Aquaculture Dialogues, including the FTAD, is to improve industry performance through measurable standards. The standards should reward best performers in the industry through market incentives. The process is built on the premise that farming should remain economically viable while addressing its main environmental and social impacts. The SC is the decision-making body of the Dialogue. The ASC will hold the standards and certify farms to them once the FTAD completes the standards. Both the FTAD and ASC are intended to be multi-stakeholder initiatives. ASC Chief Executive Officer Philip Smith and ASC Seafood Industry Liaison Carson Roper spoke about the ASC and took questions from participants.

Participant Feedback on Dialogue Process

Participants provided a range of feedback on the Dialogue process. Participants noted a sense of real progress since the last meeting. Having draft standards made the initiative more tangible at this meeting. They also noted that NGO participation present in Verona was low, and having multiple viewpoints in the same room (e.g., producers and NGOs) would allow for a more productive discussion. The FTAD should pursue opportunities to have these cross-sector conversations when revising the draft, they said.

Some participants said the standards should target best performers more generally, not a specific number, such as 20% of the industry. Also, using the phrase “transforming the industry” sounded condescending. The industry already is taking steps on these issues. Some commented that the global standards should focus on the same key environmental/social impacts, but the way to do that may vary across jurisdictions and require different metrics.

Participants said the final set of standards and resulting label would be a good marketing tool if the final document reflects the main concerns of stakeholders. Also, participants said there might be unfair competition if pangasius standards were less rigorous, while carrying the same label.

One participant encouraged the FTAD to use the precautionary principle reasonably, not as a blanket reason to block progress or potential improvements.

Participant Feedback on ASC

Participants provided a range of feedback on the ASC and expressed several concerns about the ASC. Several participants said the FTAD and ASC needed to do a better job of explaining the business case for the standards to farmers. They also asked questions about what extent retailers are ready for another standard. Philip Smith explained that the ACS is working with organizations to help develop producer support platforms and said that while there is no guarantee of a premium in the marketplace, a recent study on the Marine Stewardship Council reveals that there is a premium for some certified products. The primary benefit of certification

would be market access, he said. ASC explained that they see significant retail support in both Europe and North America.

Participants said that ASC must demonstrate the principles that are the strength of the Dialogues - representative, democratic, multi-stakeholder and open. The credibility of ASC will impact this whole process, they said. Participants also wanted more information about the ASC's planned marketing budget and strategy. Philip Smith acknowledged the critique and said that ASC's intent is be multi-stakeholder in the same way the Aquaculture Dialogues have been. He said the marketing budget and strategy are under development. One way the ASC aims to project itself in the marketplace is by creating a Responsible Aquaculture Academy to bring relevant and timely information to the marketplace.

Some participants expressed concern that ASC certification may not be consistent across jurisdictions, and questioned a comment that suggested certifying bodies could develop their own audit checklists.

Some participants wondered if small family farming would be consistent with the scale and focus of ASC, and would it be fair if ASC were designed to operate mainly at the scale of large retailers and producers. Participants were also interested in ensuring the costs of certification and licensing of the label were fairly distributed. Some participants wondered if the ASC label would be value-adding or cost-adding. Philip Smith said that effort is being made to minimize costs and to look at avenues to develop consumer outreach to help realize additional value for responsibly produced aquaculture products. The ASC intends for all size farms to be able to participate in the scheme.

Participants encouraged the ASC to increase incentives for first entrants to compensate for the costs and risks.

Participant Feedback on the Draft Standards

Participants provided feedback on the draft standards during plenary discussions and in small groups focused on particular principles. Initial overall feedback included the point below.

Positive:

- Standards can be used in many ways (e.g. by governments)
- The format is easy to read
- Intention at being technology neutral
- Principle 1 – the obligation to comply with national regulations – is a good baseline
- Important to include social standards

Concerns:

- Too many standards
- Lack of alignment with Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue on some issues
- Too high of a documentation burden for producers

- Need for a glossary
- Cost estimates would be very helpful

Specific comments and recommendations that emerged from the small group discussion are included as Annex 1

Outreach

Participants suggested a number of ideas for outreach and ensuring the success of the standards, including:

- Reaching out to producer associations in other countries, such as the US and developing countries
- Liaising with sub-committee of FAO on aquaculture – because of global nature of this process. (There is an upcoming meeting in Phuket.)
- Pursuing government representation on the SC
- Seeking more retailer input, perhaps by pulling several retailers together to produce a common statement
- Reaching out to NGOs

Participants asked how the SC would incorporate into a revised draft the comments from this meeting and during outreach. SC members said they are committed to providing a rationale explaining the decisions they make and how feedback was addressed.

Next Steps

The SC's next step is to revise the draft standards, using feedback from this meeting, outreach activities and the comments submitted in writing during the public comment period (which ended on October 4, 2010). This meeting summary and all comments will be made publicly available on the FTAD website. Revised draft standards will likely be released by the end of 2010. The SC will also provide a brief response to the key themes that emerged from the first public comment period. Stakeholders will be invited to comment on the revised draft in a second public comment period. Final standards are expected in early 2011.

ANNEX 1

Below are detailed notes from small-group discussions on draft standards, by principle. These comments do not represent a consensus position from the small groups, but rather key points that participants offered during the discussion.

Principle 2: Conserve habitat and biodiversity

2.1.3 – 2.1.5.

- If there already is an EIA from regulatory requirements, this standard should be covered
- Definition of wetland is not clear
- Trout farming in wetlands does not necessarily have negative impacts (according to some participants)

2.2

- Scientific definition of buffer zone is still too general
 - Current definition is impossible to use
- Integrate concept of a buffer zone in EIA for new farms
- We can only address land which is owned by the farmer

2.3

- Establishment of non-native rainbow trout is actually evident in some areas. We need to be careful how we write this.

2.4

- Broad agreement on ban of transgenic trout

2.5

- Installations of traps is not necessarily a good idea - you may trap other species
- Priority should be on record keeping
- Point b, f and g should be excluded

Principle 3: Minimize negative effect on water resources

3.1

Concerns

- How are we dealing with resource sharing issues? Would a farm lose its certification if another user raised its consumption? How would resource share conflicts be resolved? Saltwater intrusion is not a big issue in trout farming

Recommendations:

- Measuring at a critical times (low water level, peak seasons)?
- 3rd party or governmental determination is ok.
- Remove saltwater intrusion standard

3.2

Concerns:

- Formula is too complicated, too theoretical. We should measure the actual change in the water.
- Nitrogen not as important a factor as phosphorus in many freshwater systems
- It would be difficult to measure local P mg/ L in the case of multiple producers (loaders) or how to tie a farm's impact with more general changes in background P levels

Recommendations:

- Rely on an EIA to recommend the allowable load (N and P) and then measure actual level pr year at inlet and outlet. (for land-based systems)
- Key indicators could be BOD, DO, Biological Indices, N and P in effluent.
- Key Cage indicator: measure P levels in feed or P retention in fish
- Loading of nutrients should be measured against the carrying capacity of receiving water
- Load of N, P per ton of fish (concerns, costs of biological index studies, auditor variance)
- In order to address global variability should undertake site specific assimilative capacity studies including specific indicators and methodology including defining local limits on P mg/L in receiving water, DO mg/ L in local water as well as the appropriate methodology.
- Assimilative Studies: Need to figure out- what to measure (P, DO, Benthic)? How to measure them? Who is acceptable to measure them, when should these parameters be measured, sampling methodology.
- Study must be conducted by a credible third party (or government?)
- This section should also include a flow through efficiency standard—set numbers per ton of fish produced and measure load at farm inlet and outlet several times per year (6 times per year)
- Must define a universal methodology for assimilative capacity
- Do we need different standards for different technologies/ production systems
- Study should be updated on a regular interval (every 4 years)
- Sludge BMP need to be updated to reflect RAS and flow through systems.

BIG PENDING QUESTIONS, for which more information is needed:

- What are the elements of a credible study
- Who does the assimilative capacity study?—Criteria
- On which parameters do you set limits?
- Frequency of measurements?

- Frequency that study is updated?
- Costs of this type of study?

Principle 4: Proactively maintain health and welfare of cultured fish and minimize risk of disease transmission

- Biosecurity: Should require a veterinarian certificate for eggs (or maybe that would be too expensive?)
- Should consider waste disposal of dead fish & trimmings
- 6 mg/l oxygen not enough to ensure good health. Need to give this standard more thought.
- Should consider slaughter and welfare - it's what consumers want. You can just use the Council of Europe standard. (But do we really want welfare in this environmental and social standard?)
- Frequency of monitoring NO₂ and NH₃ should be different for different systems (daily for recirculation; monthly for raceways; twice yearly for cages)
- Clarify that veterinarian needs fish expertise
- At what stage in life cycle does standard apply – egg? Fry? And if not, what requirements do you need for egg/fry brought onto the site.
- Banned treatments. What specific laws are the standards using? Should ASC take on this role?
- Appendix III “must properly demonstrate”
- 4.1 – condense the plans into one document
- National legislation versus standard – must avoid duplication, but one whose terms? Which countries have “good” legislation?

Principle 5: Use resources responsibly

General feedback

- Should we leave it until we have the conclusion from SAD?
- Use the resources to work with the SAD principle 4 = resources, instead of wasting time in the FTAD?

5.1

- How far back, and what should the Feed Manufacturer provide?
- Could it end up excluding smaller fish feed producers from participating?
- How far back should marine ingredient traceability go?
 - region (North Europe, South America).
 - fisheries, should be integrate with fishing gear being used
 - to the boat. Ices region. ??
 - segregation of irresponsible sources of trimmings.
- How far back should vegetable ingredient traceability go?
 - Traders
 - Regions (Brazil,
 - Fields.
- Land animal proteins?
 - Back to processing , species identification

- Back to where the animal is produced
- Information should be provided by the feed manufacturers
- The FCR calculation is intended to be calculated by feed manufacturer. Not clear in text now.

5.2

- Concern about methodology
- How much documentation is needed from Feed Manufacturer
- How many samples?
- Is this too advanced as compared with other dialogues?
- Possible redundancy of the listed indicators (FCR, protein digestibility and N/P retention)? The latter are, in some way, also addressed under the Water Quality Effluent section 3.2.
- Fish Protein Index should be in. This should be aligned with the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue as it is a good way to highlight the positive side of aquaculture.

5.3

- FTAD should promote use of land animal proteins?
- Perhaps could include a side letter promoting use?
- Should separate FFDR standard under a different heading. FFDR is about efficient use of resources and not responsible sourcing.
- Suggestion for FFDR: Should have no limitation when marine raw materials are responsibly sourced
- FFDR should be similar to salmon.
- Fishmeal inclusion will drop anyhow (limited resources).
- Concern about the significant cost of the criteria (access to marine raw materials)
- Feed factories will have to work with more infrastructure = More WC, Investment in Silos
- Suggest requiring either FishSource score or IFFO, not both

Energy

- Life cycle analysis too early to included
- No demand for documentation
- Should we have energy consumption pr kg of fish?
- Not enough data to provide credible info
- 90% of energy footprint comes from feed anyhow

Principle 6: Be socially responsible

6.1.1

- Unclear situation for children working on community / village / family level on farms in their spare time (after school / holidays) for free with no salary or contract.
- Definition required for light work (this definition is not clear enough for auditing)

6.3.1.

- How are auditors dealing with a situation where policies are defined, but not implemented in reality: Examples: Equal wages for men and women, but in fact (worldwide) women are getting paid less for the same work.... other Example: Unequal opportunities for women within a company for certain jobs...

6.4.

- Need for additional standard related to infrastructure relevant for worker safety (e.g. hazardous construction of embankments, electricity cables, etc... most deadly accidents occur because of bad infrastructure / inappropriate infrastructure, death on trout farms by drowning and electrical shock!

6.4.1.

- Training and Information must be provided in the appropriate language!

6.5.1

- The concept of the basic needs wage is clearly understood and supported, but there are open questions with regards to economic practicability in the case of a country with high rate of unemployment and low salaries, where people would work for any kind of salaries on farms (minimum salary by law would be guaranteed, but basic needs may not be covered here)

6.9.1

- Assessment should look at impacts on both positive and negative side!

6.9

- Comment on following issue, which may be subject to an additional standard: People are concerned that communities and local people not always have access / opportunity to buy farmed products from the area (farms are using natural local resources owned by all members of communities, but the harvested products are not available for the communities). The idea is to have at least farm gate shops or opportunities available, so local people can actually buy farmed products from the area, or also that farms provide fish to the workers for special price

ANNEX 2

Participants list for FTAD meeting 7-8th September 2010, Verona			
	Name	Organisation/Company	Country
1	Elena Piana	Università Politecnica delle Marche	Italy
2	Viggo Hørlyck	Aller Aqua	Denmark
3	John Carmichael	Dawnfresh	UK
4	Josef Nygren	Umlax	Sweden
5	Carson Roper	ASC	USA/France
6	Khalid Salie	Consultant	South Africa
7	Amy Lansdell	Sustainable Feeding Procedure Guide	South Africa
8	Bernadette Gourdon	New Gabriel Europa	Belgium
9	Thomas Anner	Blue You	Switzerland
10	Pier Antonio Salvador	API	Italy
11	Brian Thomsen	Dansk Akvakultur	Denmark
12	Lisbeth Plesner	Dansk Akvakultur	Denmark
13	Jacek Juchniewicz	Polish Trout Farmers	Poland
14	Mike Rose	Global Trust	Canada
15	Dean Foss	Wild West Steelhead	Canada
16	Mike Meeker	Northern Ontario Aquaculture Association	Canada
17	Jeff Eastmann	Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives	Canada
18	Pino Lembo	COISPA - Researcher (organic aquaculture)	Italy
19	Roberto Giavenni	Veterinarian - fish pathologist	Italy
20	Umberto Luzzana	Skretting (fish feeding)	Italy
21	Elena Pagliarino	CNR (Public Research Company) researcher	Italy
22	Andrea Magrini	Osservatore Api	Italy
23	Fuselli Marco	Farmer and fish processing	Italy
24	Andrea Fabris	API Veterinarian - fish pathologist	Italy
25	Davide Acampora	API	Italy
26	David Basset	British Trout Association	UK
27	Sian Morgan	Fish Wise	USA
28	Niels Alsted	BioMar	Denmark
29	Yavuz Papila	Liman	Turkey

30	Rene Benguerel	Blue You	Switzerland
31	Merrielle Macleod	WWF US	USA
32	Marco Saroglia	Università dell'Insubria	Italy
33	Genciana Terova	Università dell'Insubria	Italy
34	Matteo Leonardi	Trout eggs production	Italy
35	Beatrice Bergamo	SAPIO	Italy
36	Giorgio Bauce	Veronesi feed producer	Italy
37	Paolo Chignola	Gruppo Veronesi	Italy
38	Courtney Hough	FEAP	Belgium
39	Christoph Mathiesen	Coordinator of FTAD (WWF Denmark)	Denmark
40	David Plumb	Consensus Building Institute	USA
41	Marco Mancini	API Osservatore	Italy
42	Lucia Scudeller	API	Italy
43	Mariangela Aloisi	API	Italy
44	Corrado Giancesini	Naturalleva	Italy
45	Rossi Rodolfo	Rossi eredi, trotticoltura	Italy
46	Melotti Paolo	Università di Camerino	Italy
47	Fioravanti Maria Letizia	University of Bologna (fish pathologist)	Italy
48	Gustinelli Andrea	University of Bologna (fish pathologist)	Italy
49	Philip Smith	ASC	UK

ANNEX 3

Freshwater Trout Aquaculture Dialogue (FTAD)

7-8th September 2010

Verona, Italy

Villa Fraccaroli

Via Boschetto 6

37030 Lavagno

Agenda

Meeting Goals

- Create a shared understanding among participants of the FTAD's purpose and process
- Discuss and receive feedback on draft standards; make specific recommendations for revisions to the standards
- Develop strategies for outreach and ensuring success

Day 1

8:30 - 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 9:10	Welcome and introduction to the FTAD
9:10 - 9:30 introductions	Overview of the agenda and goals, meeting guidelines, participant
9:30 – 10:45	Overview of the Aquaculture Dialogues, the FTAD and the Aquaculture Stewardship Council
10:45 - 11:15	Break
11:15 – 12:00	Draft Standards for Freshwater Trout - Overview of rationale and decisions leading to draft standards
12:00 – 13:00	Draft Standards – Initial Reactions from Participants
13:00 – 14:30	Lunch

14:30 – 15:45 Breakout group discussion #1 on draft standards

15:45 – 16:15 **Break**

16:15 – 17:30 Breakout group discussion # 2.

17:30 - 17:45 Wrap up discussion and adjourn

Day 2

9:00 – 9:15 Perspectives from Day 1

9:15 – 10:30 Reviewing each other's ideas – Key thoughts from Day's breakout discussions.

10:30 - 10:45 **Break**

10:45 – 12:00 Breakout group discussion # 3.

12.00 – 13.15 Breakout group discussion # 4

13:15 – 14:30 **Lunch**

14:30 – 15:15 Debrief new ideas that emerged in the smaller groups

15:15 – 16:00 Outreach and getting to final standards

16:00 - 16:30 Wrap-up and next steps