



Consultation Topic: Mass Balance CoC Standard

Summary of feedback received

Public consultation period: 1 to 30 September 2017

<p>Disclaimer:</p> <p><i>“The MSC publishes this information in order to demonstrate transparency, allow others involved in the consultation to fully understand different stakeholder perspectives and to assist in growing understanding of sustainable seafood certification. Where stakeholder submissions have mentioned specific fisheries, fishery certifications, individuals or organisations, details have been removed to preserve anonymity and avoid publishing commercially sensitive information. Removals are indicated thus [..*..]”</i></p>
<p>Question 1. What feedback, suggestions or comments do you have about the draft MSC Mass Balance CoC Standard?</p>
<p>Feedback received</p>
<p>would this type of mass balance system work for other areas where ingredients could not be separated? For instance in the production of blocks where the origin is mixed MSC & non-MSC. (a)</p>
<p>We do not support the move to allow for certification to be made on the basis of volume. Feed mills should be required to segregate certified and non-certified products. Allowing certification for mixed products prior to establishing such segregation requirements removes the incentive for companies to improve their practices. Each site should be required to trace product from vessel source through processing. If mixing is allowed, it will remove the incentive for a fishery to improve, similar to the concerns raised during the compartmentalization discussions on the UoA issue. (b)</p>
<p>The standard appears to be workable from a CB perspective and we would like to see wider application pilots in the near future, e.g. ASC Seaweed CoC (c)</p>
<p>Our comment is that identifying this standard as a ‘MSC Mass Balance Standard’ risks confusing this with other MSC standards. This is essentially an ASC standard which allows product from a wide variety of sources (one of which is MSC certified fisheries) to enter ASC feed production.</p> <p>Such confusion may be easily removed by terming this the ASC Mass Balance CoC Standard, although produced and administered by the MSC.</p> <p>Also, why not admit product from any third-party certification scheme, not only IFFO RS? (d)</p>
<p>Question 2. The ASC approach to due diligence, and MSC’s requirements for its implementation (see Appendix 1A and 1B of the MSC Mass Balance CoC Standard), are both new. We would especially welcome comments on the general approach.</p>
<p>a. Does it provide a reasonable balance between the need to combat IUU fishing, and the challenges and cost of accessing information to prove that a source is not associated with IUU fishing?</p>
<p>Feedback received</p>
<p>Should IUU fish be processed at all if we want to discourage the practices? (a)</p>
<p>as per our comments (b)</p>
<p>Yes (c)</p>

b. Do you support in principle the due diligence approach?
Feedback received
Yes (a)
as per our comments (b)
Yes (c)
c. Will such an approach adequately exclude IUU sources from ASC feed?
Feedback received
Not if the product is still processed (a)
We do not feel the approach is adequate to ensure exclusion of IUU sources (b)
Yes, the majority of feed mills that we work with have adequate traceability systems in place (c)
d. What other references or considerations should be added?
Feedback received
We believe that there should be explicit reference in the definition of marine ingredients (Material from marine sources) that this excludes all products or biproducts from marine mammal sources. (b)
Definitions surrounding forced/ child labour and ETP species impacts. (c)
Question 3. The MSC will develop equivalent additional requirements for application of the due diligence system to the exclusion of sources associated with child labour and forced labour aligned with the MSC 'Labour' workstream, and for the exclusion of sources that are likely to have a major detrimental impact on endangered, threatened or protected species, aligned with its 'Fisheries' workstream. This work will take place over the coming months. What specific elements do you think should be included in the determination of 'high' risk in relation to child labour and forced labour, and/or the exclusion of sources that are likely to have a major detrimental impact on endangered, threatened or protected species?
Feedback received
what sources will be used to determine the status of the species (a)
any feed fishery that has been identified as having marine mammal interactions should be excluded from the supply chain (b)
Any legal challenges currently in process. Legal challenges can take many years to reach finalisation so maybe there should be the inclusion of current proceedings? (c)
Question 4. The determination of risk in relation to sources associated with IUU fishing is based on the identification of the 'red flags' listed in Appendix 1A of the draft Mass Balance CoC Standard, Table 2.1. However, red flags may be cancelled if there is evidence that appropriate mitigating action has been taken to address the potential concern. What (if any) specific mitigating actions do you propose would be sufficient to address the red flags identified in Table 2.1?
Feedback received

Those options appear to be sensible. (c)

Additional feedback received in writing

Feedback received

The standard in a number of places make reference to a chain of custody certificate (which points to the ASC feed standard).

A batch of fishmeal or fish oil will originate from a fishery (fish species) or a mix of fisheries (a mix fish species). We assume that the sustainability level is determined by the fishery (fish species). In the ASC feed standard it is made reference to IFFO RS CoC standard as a valid chain of custody certificate. To our knowledge the IFFO RS CoC is a general standard which ensure that the certificate holder has a traceability system in place to support the provisions in the IFFO RS standard. It is not a chain of custody certificate which follows the batch of fishmeal and fish oil and as such can be used to determine the sustainability level of the fisheries the batch is composed of.

To our knowledge there is not in the fishmeal industry today any recognised “chain of custody certificate” in the context of that the certificate provides information about the fisheries the fishmeal and fish oil originates from.

Many feed companies have built up detailed traceability systems regarding the origin of fishmeal and fish oil. These traceability systems are often verified by third party standards like for example GlobalGAP. We propose that the standard makes it possible to recognize company specific traceability systems related to the origin of fishmeal and fish oil, in order to determine the sustainability level, as long as the traceability system can be third party verified.

Labelling of mass balance certified products

The proposed standard reads

2.1 Labelling of mass balance certified products 2.1.1 Once a product has been designated as a mass balance certified product, it shall be readily and reliably identifiable as such at all subsequent stages of storage, processing, packing, labelling, selling and delivery to a customer.

Guidance 2.1.1

Where it is impossible or impractical to apply a physical label to the product the organisation will need to demonstrate how the product can be verifiably linked with associated records that identify its status as a mass balance certified product.

A feedmill produces a great number of products, normally in the area of 1000-2000 products. It is not feasible to label the products with any mass balance claim or information. As such we would propose that guidance to 2.1.1 is not stated as guidance, but incorporated into the standard.

This will also influence how the provisions in 2.12 and 2.1.3 are stated:

2.1.2 The organisation shall operate a system that ensures packaging, labels and other materials identifying mass balance certified products can only be used for mass balance certified products.

2.1.3 Any product that is sold as a mass balance certified product shall be identified with a mass balance chain of custody certificate number and accompanying statement or claim. No product sold without carrying the mass balance certificate number may be associated with any mass balance statement or claim.

Sales

The proposed standard reads

2.2 Sales invoices

2.2.1 If products are sold as mass balance certified products, they shall be identifiable as such on the line item of the related invoice.

I make reference to previous comments regarding that product cannot be labelled. As such they cannot be invoiced. We would propose that this requirement is made more general and that there is a requirement that one can clearly document through invoicing or internal accounting systems the amount of mass balance eligible products delivered to customers.

Time period for calculations

The standard requires calculations made every month. We propose that the standard requires calculation to be done minimum each quarter. In many cases supply of marine raw materials will not be as frequent as each month. Having to do the calculation each month will then be perceived as a bureaucratic exercise.