

SEAFOOD EXECUTIVE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting 17

9.00am-4.00pm, Tuesday 13 November 2007

Biosecurity Australia Conference Room, Edmund Barton Building, Barton, ACT

Minutes

Present:

SECC Members

Mr Alex Ziolkowski (Chair)
Mr David Crichton
Mr Simon Bennison
Mr Peter Hinsch
Mr Stephen Hood
Mr Anthony Johnson
Mr Ted Loveday
Mr David Milne
Mr Milan Rapp
Mr Stuart Richey (QEAC)
Dr Eileen Gosling (AQIS)

AQIS (and other Departmental) Presenters

Ms Christine Aughey
Dr Murli Baker-Gabb
Ms Enzina Belmonte
Ms Barb Cooper
Dr Jim Derrick (NRS)
Mr Jim Fitzgerald (F&F)
Mr Les Johns
Dr Jason Lutze
Ms Lisa McKenzie
Dr Fay Stenhouse

Also present (from AQIS):

Ms Stella Bateman
Mr Mark Schipp

Apologies: Mr Stephen Hunter (Executive Director, AQIS)

Welcome: Mr Alex Ziolkowski expressed his thanks to new members and outgoing members and explained that the members have been selected for their breadth of skills and experience and not as representatives of their present bodies or companies.

Introductions – SECC members and AQIS staff

Mr Alex Ziolkowski officially stood down as chair.

Apologies and housekeeping – Dr Eileen Gosling

Item 7.2 Selection of Chair – Dr Eileen Gosling

Call for nominations: Mr Peter Hinsch nominated Mr Alex Ziolkowski for Chair. Mr Milan Rapp seconded. There were no other nominations. All were in favour of Mr Ziolkowski taking the role of Chair for another term. Mr Ziolkowski accepted.

Item 1 Previous Minutes

1.1 Adoption of minutes from SECC 16

Mr Milan Rapp moved to adopt the SECC 16 minutes. Mr Peter Hinsch seconded the motion. The SECC 16 minutes were accepted without amendment.

1.2 Action items arising from SECC 16 meeting.

Most items had been dealt with.

Item 8.3 from SECC 14 Arsenic in Scallops Query to Mr Ted Loveday regarding progress. He reported that a phone conference took place with the relevant parties where it was determined that it is a technical issue, rather than a public health issue. FSANZ is reluctant to take action. He put forward the question of whether SECC could take a role in heading-up the review since there is some urgency considering that this issue potentially leaves the industry exposed to damage. He also expressed that it might have more credibility if industry pushes the issue.

From the discussion that ensued, the following points were made:

- FSANZ has limited resources to dedicate to ventures like this
- SECC could draft a letter to FSANZ, but it should include a request for a specific change in the MRL
- The requested level should be the same as that of our trading partners, but the issue is not just international but domestic. A review of trading partners' levels could be undertaken by the Program.
- If SECC is going to get involved, perhaps requests could be made regarding similar issues, such as levels of oxytetracycline.
- On other issues, such as the method of testing used in Codex versus that used by trading partners, perhaps a PhD student could undertake research
- The Residues Sub-Committee should be involved
- A reference manual or website is needed regarding this issue, however there is a commercial in-confidence issue where the information needs to be kept from competitors

Action: Mr Alex Ziolkowski will draft a letter from SECC outlining the proposed new limit for arsenic levels in scallops. Dr Eileen Gosling will ensure that AQIS does a review of levels set for trading partners to determine a level to request.

Item 2.1 from SECC 16 Shucking at Sea Mr Alex Ziolkowski reported a positive response to this issue in general. This issue was further discussed at Item 3.3.

Item 3.3 from SECC 16 EU Audits Comments were sent to EU review committee from AQIS and letter was sent to EU registered establishments. Further information given at Item 3.2.

Item 3.4 from SECC 16 Website and Firefox Issue resolved.

Item 4.1 from SECC 16 Final figures on financial report were more clearly labelled to distinguish YTD from whole financial year and a replacement file has been placed on the SECC intranet site.

Item 6.1 from SECC 16 Cadmium in Prawns SECC wrote a letter to the Minister and a copy has been provided to the Committee as well as the response. A copy was also sent to the European Commission. This issue was further reported on and discussed at Item 5.1.

Item 7.1 from SECC 16 Residues Sub-Committee Meeting not held, but an update provided under Item 6 in this meeting. Errors in the 2006-2007 budget estimates for NRS were corrected.

Item 8.1 from SECC 16 New Panel Selected according to agreed guidelines and procedures.

Other business from SECC 16 Dr Eileen Gosling to give verbal update on prohibited exports under Item 5.7.

Additional papers: Minutes of SECC Finance Sub-Committee and approved budget provided.

Item 2 Financial Reports

Mr Alex Ziolkowski gave an overview of all of the papers. He made the following points:

- Debt reduction is a long term project for the Finance Sub-Committee. Since April 2003 there has been a 30% reduction, but debt trends need to be monitored to ensure it doesn't get out of control. On graphs, debt should be expressed as a percentage rather than a dollar amount to better correlate with periods of increased activity or fee changes.
- Other processes are coming on line which can target those contributing to debt more efficiently
- There has been a significant drop in the number of registered establishments trending below predictions (see Financial Report – September YTD). This could be another possible area of concern.
- A debt provision of around \$5000 a quarter has been made for write-offs.
- The fund held in reserve in case of a deficit (IEA) has been completely depleted in previous years, but last year's profit has refilled the fund to some degree. At the end of 2007/08 there will be an anticipated surplus of 3.2% of operating expenditure, but a

target of 5% of budget is sought for the IEA. Until the next quarter is complete, the Committee won't have a solid idea of what the trend will be.

- Income is generated by fees. Even though there was an increase last year, in light of high dollar rates and less export, a CPI increase should be applied each year to anticipate difficult times. Small regular increases are preferable to infrequent large ones. Fees and charges are to be reviewed in March and implemented in July.

Main points from ensuing discussion:

- Fees should not become prohibitively expensive and should be kept in line with expenses. To encourage industry into export markets, whatever incentives necessary should be used – the right balance should be achieved.
- Fees today are just on par with what they were 15 years ago. There was a period of fee reduction, but now there has been a necessary increase. Essentially, fees have been moderated significantly. Several years ago, the debt situation was dire and it would have been thought impossible that the situation would be so much better now.
- 40% contribution from government assured before July 2009, but with a change of government this may change for the future. No promises have been made so far, but a seafood policy from the Labour party is due soon.
- As a government body, any change in AQIS's fees needs to be justified and approved in several different forums as an additional stage of accountability. It's a large volume of work. Fees are thus tracked against costs, fixed or otherwise.
- The aquaculture industry predicts its exports will increase over the next few years. Is this taken into account for projected revenue? It is very difficult to model predictions, since there are so many factors that can change. There may not be an increase in establishments, but rather an increase in earnings from exports. Previously there was a component of the AQIS fee structure that was matched to the volume of exports. This is no longer the case.
- Overseas markets have changed across all commodities with a greater volume of production being sold on the domestic market. This may affect the revenue base. If this occurs, AQIS may need to downsize the Program activities.
- There is a downward trend in registered establishments. This trend should bottom out, at which time the Finance Committee will make further projections.
- Any changes in fees start with the Finance Committee and then need to be passed by SECC as a whole.
- There is a larger amount charged for replacement certificates. These are not counted as revenue and it is not a simple procedure to replace them. Charges reflect this. It is important that they are valued.
- Cost recovery – currently the inspectors do multi-tasking and this helps offset costs.

Item 3 Program Issues

3.1 Update on Approved Arrangement Implementation – Ms Lisa McKenzie

Please refer to paper, 'Implementation of the *Export Control (Fish and Fish Products) Orders 2005* – Progress Report on the Submission and Approval of Approved Arrangements' by Ms Lisa McKenzie

Summary of presentation:

85% of vessels and 34% of land establishments have fully approved AAs. There are a number of reasons for a backlog in approvals:

- a) Land based establishments submit their forms to regional centres, while vessels submit theirs to the Brisbane unit;
- b) There were a large number of last minute submissions;
- c) Many submissions have either included too much information (much of it irrelevant and not ordered) or too little;
- d) Consultants who completed the submissions are not very familiar with the businesses and can't answer questions from AQIS quickly or else when the business is audited it is found they are not familiar with the submission that was put in on their behalf;
- e) The EU review late in the process required last minute adjustments to submissions;
- f) Initial audits can take a long time partly due to poor establishment documentation processes. Information has been recorded in multiple places and there is a misunderstanding of AQIS requirements in this area.

It seems that it will take some time for the AA to become embedded as a living document useful in the running of a business. There is also a worrying lack of understanding of the reasons for the legislative requirements and basic food safety systems.

Main points from discussion:

- Consultants should go through the AA with the business, rather than just producing the documents
- Poor understanding will lead to problems in the future with innovations in technology etc. Improvements in systems and knowledge are important. Industry needs support for training. AQIS is a regulatory organisation, not a training organisation, but at present are the only ones who can supply adequate training in this area.
- It is a damning criticism of the sector if existing training courses are not effective in providing adequate understanding.
- Who should provide funding for training? AQIS? Industry? State organisations?
- Who should provide the training? AQIS? Existing training organisations?
- Training should be from a food safety perspective, not a regulatory requirement
- The negative feedback in the EU audit was largely because of this transitional stage and lack of knowledge.
- Suggestion to set up a Skills Sub-Committee to address this problem of training.

Action: Skills Sub-Committee made up of Mr Milan Rapp, Mr David Milne, Mr David Crichton and Mr Stephen Hood to meet out of session.

3.2 Update on EU Audits – Dr Murli Baker-Gabb

See paper 'Audit of Establishments Listed to Export to the European Union (EU)'

Summary of presentation:

Following their audit of the Australian seafood industry, the EU has frozen the list of EU registered establishments, so that none can be added until each has been audited by AQIS to assess compliance with EU requirements. AQIS needs to do the review of these in order for the list to be unfrozen. It may be possible to achieve a slightly quicker solution to the land-based establishments since it is harder to inspect vessels. AQIS will seek to have the EU treat these two groups separately. There is a small risk that some vessels will not be available for audit in time. These may be removed from the EU list so that they don't hold up the process for the rest of the industry. Since June 2007, 44 establishments and vessels have voluntarily sought deregistration from the EU. By April 2008, AQIS anticipates being able to provide the EU with an updated list of EU-eligible establishments.

AQIS recommends that SECC notes the reasons behind the EU's actions and conveys these to seafood establishments in their region, including the potential cost implications for maintaining EU listing.

Points made in discussion:

- Review of what the audits involved.
- Businesses not interested in trading with the EU shouldn't subsidise those who are. There hasn't been any increase in costs to other businesses.
- There can be a problem with vessels who deal with brokers that want them to have EU listing just in case they source for a market within the EU.
- There is some concern that Australia might be forced to meet EU requirements for other markets. China and others are introducing a risk based system that can be defended from a scientific perspective. It is important that the industry operates to a standard that meets these relevant importing country requirements.
- There is not a history of food poisoning incidents with Australian seafood. This lends weight to the argument that we should take a stand against any unnecessarily restrictive requirements.

3.3 Abalone Shucking at Sea – Dr Murli Baker-Gabb

See paper 'Shucking at Sea'.

Dr Murli Baker-Gabb presented the above paper. Things are progressing well in discussion with the abalone industry State representative bodies regarding this issue and AQIS will continue to work with the abalone industry to assist with export registration processes.

3.4 Labelling of wild and farmed abalone – Dr Eileen Gosling

See paper 'Labelling Requirements to Differentiate Source of Products from Wild Fisheries or Aquaculture Farmed' and letter from the Seafood Industry Victoria Inc.

Dr Eileen Gosling spoke to this paper and identified that it was not just labelling but sourcing requirements that were the issue, particularly for disease control. If aquaculture product is mislabelled, there is the potential for missing residue management issues. Farmed sources

need to meet standards regarding such things as an antibiotic free environment. On two occasions in the past, goods have been seized, tested and found to be in breach of regulations.

Discussion points:

- A letter from AbComm noted friction amongst Victorian farmers regarding mislabelling. Labelling should not be AQIS's responsibility, but rather an industry controlled issue.

3.5 Client Feedback Survey – Mr Les Johns

See paper '2007 Satisfaction Surveys Land-based Fish Clients and Vessel-based Fish Clients Research Reports'

Mr Les Johns noted that overall there has been a slight drop in the vessel-based client satisfaction. He did not think it was due to a rise in fees, because these are low compared to rising fuel costs etc. He also doesn't believe it is due to the service provided by AQIS officers, because these are the same for both land-based and vessel-based occupiers. He then opened the floor to comments.

Comments:

- Mr Johns offered to supply the full report if anyone wished to see it.
- Dr Eileen Gosling made the point that AQIS is required to report on these findings and address falling client satisfaction. The increased demands on industry due to the introduction of the AAs this year may be partly at fault – things might be different next year.

3.6 Market Access Advice Notices – Ms Christine Aughey

See paper 'Publishing Market Access Advice Notices for Fish and Fish Products on the AQIS Internet Site'

Ms Christine Aughey summarised her paper: Those involved with processing establishments prior to August this year received paper mailouts. This was a lengthy and relatively inefficient process, so publishing the notices on the internet and emailing them to clients was a more timely way of doing things. Another advantage is that notices can be archived. She emphasised that while AQIS endeavours to keep information updated, it should be a guide only and importers or the local AQIS office should be contacted to confirm current information.

Questions and answers:

- Do you let clients know by email when the website has been updated? Yes, if they are on the distribution list, which they can sign up to on the website.
- Have registered establishments been given the option of receiving a hard copy of the information? We did send out an advice notice to every export registered seafood establishment and none replied requesting this option.

- Will there be a repository of other information, such as EU requirements? AQIS is working on it under the Processed Food Policy Section. It is the second phase of the website to link market access advices with the importing country requirements database.
- How much of the information at the SECC meeting can be interpreted and taken back to industry to be consulted on? We do get information out to industry. There is a newsletter produced after each meeting and there is a website: www.secc.com.au.
- The website has been updated recently.

Item 4 EXDOC

4.1 EDS Update – Ms Barb Cooper

See paper ‘EDS Update’

Ms Barb Cooper summarised her paper as follows: E-Cert was ahead of its time when it was developed in 2003/2004. Other countries are now seeking to participate. Canada, Singapore and Jordan have been running E-Cert since 2004 and there have been very few problems with those systems. Rather than dealing simply with key countries, like agencies are being mapped out. Very soon it will be possible to engage system to system with the USA for meat. Indonesia and the Philippines are also interested. Hong Kong, Japan and South Korea are also on the list of countries that are being considered. An agency to trial fish is currently being sought. The potential for seafood is not as great as for grain or meat.

A technical workshop was conducted in October with Chinese Delegates. China has signed a letter of intent to get E-Cert in place by this time next year.

4.2 EXDOC systems update – Ms Enzina Belmonte

See paper ‘EXDOC Systems Update’

Ms Enzina Belmonte presented the above paper. In addition to the information contained in her report, she made the point that while the EU is a relatively small market for Australian seafood, it may also affect markets in the Ukraine, Iceland and other countries that have adopted EU requirements. Attachment 1A shows that export numbers are down, but there is increased revenue which could be due to the fee increase.

4.3 Contingency arrangements for outages – Ms Enzina Belmonte

See paper ‘Contingency Arrangements for EXDOC Outage’

Ms Enzina Belmonte presented her paper. At no extra cost, a hard copy manual is being produced on health certificate requirements for use by AQIS officers to answer enquiries in case of EXDOC outages. Since the Department is moving buildings, EXDOC will be unavailable for a period of time on Friday 23 November and 26 December 2007.

SECC commended the contingency arrangements put into place by the department and the communication strategy to inform users.

LUNCH – 12.30pm to 1.00pm

Item 5 Policy Issues

5.1 EU – Cadmium in Prawns – status report – Mr Jim Fitzgerald (DAFF)

See paper ‘EU – Cadmium in Prawns – Status Report’

Mr Jim Fitzgerald, Fisheries Marketing and Trade section of DAFF presented the paper. He apologised for the late submission of his paper and then summarised it as follows:

Some Australian wild caught prawns do have cadmium levels above that of the EU requirements. A number of consignments have been rejected since 2004. The situation led to uncertainty within the prawn industry regarding exports to the EU. On 26 October a paper was sent around to the EU Prawn Working Group members outlining three important points on where negotiations have progressed to and what further action needs to be taken.

The European Commission has requested additional data from the Australian seafood industry. Dr Fay Stenhouse has put in the majority of work to research this data. A draft package has been put together and is currently going through AQIS channels and will be sent to government for further consideration. There is risk, however, in providing such detailed information. Industry needs to advise what level of information they are comfortable with releasing. If the EC is provided with nothing, then the issue will no longer be considered by them. It is a balance of risk versus reward.

The Working Group decided that a comparison between testing methodologies used in Australian laboratories versus those used in Europe was needed to determine why testing results vary so much. One way of doing this may be to send out a sample that has a known level of cadmium and see what the labs come back with. Letters have been drafted to gain acceptance of this from the EC.

The third stage would involve sending Australian representatives into two laboratories in Spain and one in Belgium once the first stage has been completed and permission gained.

Main points from ensuing discussion:

- Although there has been previous discussion with the EU on testing methodology, there are some grey areas in the relevant directives which may have lead to inconsistent application, such as whether the head of the prawn is tested, since some people in Europe would say they consume the whole prawn.
- NRS data can be used, but it clearly states that there would be a percentage of Australian prawns that could not meet the 0.5ppm level. The main problem is that testing in the EU shows different results to those conducted in Australia before a shipment is exported.

- The impact of this on industry has been a significant reduction in the volume of exported prawns to the EU.
- Codex provides an international standard, but any country may choose to have higher standards. Australia does this with some things, but provides justification. The EU has not so far justified their reason for more stringent levels.
- If Australian testing certificates are not accepted is it worth having it done at all? The ultimate aim is to get our testing accepted routinely by the EU, but in the meantime it is still worth testing here because the results should indicate whether the shipment will be accepted or not. It is within their rights to test the product again and a good reason to investigate why the EU is obtaining different results.
- The concern about the data to be provided is that it may be used to further limit the industry access, rather than remove the current limitations. However, if there is no data provided, the situation will just remain as it is.

Action: The EU Prawn Residue Working Group will look at the data to determine what is sensitive and what can go into the report.

5.2 Abalone to the EU – Dr Murli Baker-Gabb

See paper ‘Abalone to the European Union (EU)’

Dr Murli Baker-Gabb spoke to his paper on this issue. He highlighted the following points: The relevant EU legislation has not changed, but has only recently been enforced by the EU. Although similar conditions are applied to bivalve molluscs, abalones are not classified as a bivalve as some industry members had previously thought. The harvest area classification process required by the EU is basically the same as ASQAP.

Discussion points:

- The zoning issue is still an enormous one. Within a zoning area, conditions should be largely homogenous. With Australia’s huge coastline, it is difficult to meet suggested sampling requirements. Any variation in local conditions could cause a change in the classification.

5.3 Detained Consignments – Dr Fay Stenhouse

See paper ‘Detained Consignments’ by Ms Enzina Belmonte and Dr Fay Stenhouse

Dr Fay Stenhouse spoke to this paper, which was drafted in consultation with Fish Exports. She also acknowledged the large contribution made by Ms Enzina Belmonte in putting together this information.

5.4 Russian Audit of Australian seafood establishments – Dr Fay Stenhouse

See paper ‘Russian Audit of Australian Seafood Establishments’

Dr Fay Stenhouse spoke to this paper, highlighting the following:

- . Any establishment that is not inspected and approved by the Russians will not be allowed to export to Russia.
- . While seafood exports to Russia are relatively small at present, there is a chance for Australia to increase that market.
- . The Russian Certificate is currently being negotiated with the Russian Federation.
- . Checklists for the audit have not yet been provided, but Russian regulations for fish are available.
- . The majority of the visit has been funded by Russia, but translator services should be paid for by the participating establishments. The visit will be from 10 December to 21 December.

SECC members raised a number of questions:

- Is it too late to get on the list? Not certain, but likely as most arrangements have been finalised.
- Is there information on past exports? Not much. A lot of fin fish and lower value products have been exported to Russia in the past. Higher value products are not out of the question now, due to increased wealth in the country.
- Industry as a whole should not subsidise the cost of the audit for those that participate. Agreed individual participants would be billed.

5.5 GCC importation regulation changes – Dr Fay Stenhouse

See paper ‘GCC Importation Regulation Changes’

Dr Fay Stenhouse presented this paper and highlighted the following: Gulf Cooperation Countries (GCC) have decided they will have uniform import regulations. Details of the GCC requirements were outlined in a Market Access Advice Notice which has been put on the DAFF website. The major issue is that the GCC countries are now require a residue monitoring program. A small number of aquaculture enterprises do not monitor their products for veterinary medicines or other residues and products from these farms cannot be exported to GCC countries. Wild caught product that is monitored through the NRS and all farms monitored to meet EU requirements will be eligible to export to the GCC. All establishments have been advised through a Market Access Advice Notice and when monitoring for EU access is renewed establishments that export aquaculture product will be advised that product being exported to the GCC must be obtained from farms that participate in a monitoring program.

5.6 Ukraine market access – Dr Fay Stenhouse

See paper ‘Ukraine Market Access – Certification’

Dr Fay Stenhouse highlighted the following points from this paper: The Ukrainians have produced a certificate using OIE wording. Some of the diseases they want certification of freedom from do exist in Australia and thus some product cannot be certified by AQIS. The Ukrainian market is extremely small and only exports of products that can be certified will go ahead.

SECC members raised a number of points, as follows:

- Who is going to alert Aquatic Animal Health? Dr Stenhouse advised that they have been informed already.
- Once some other countries adopt these sorts of measures, trade may suffer. As these requirements are based on OIE recommendations, it emphasises the need for increased Australian involvement in OIE deliberations.

5.7 Abalone as a prohibited export – status report – Dr Eileen Gosling

Dr Eileen Gosling spoke to this issue, summarising as follows:

The AQIS Fish Export Program, AQIS Compliance and Investigations Program and DAFF Fisheries and Forestry Division have met to discuss the issue of illegal abalone exports. The Australian Customs Service (Customs) has conducted two targeted projects in recent years which have not confirmed a major abalone export problem. Consultation with Customs have been supportive however following the above evaluation Customs have determined that they will not be putting a legislative proposal forward to include abalone as a prohibited export within their legislation. States have partially addressed this issue through tightening the controls on recreational fishing, through the national documenting scheme controls and through introduced penalties for trafficking. To complement the State controls, AQIS and the Fisheries and Forestry Division have agreed to the need to scope a new proposal based on controls under the Export Control Act which AQIS administers. This will require some legislative amendments, a review of powers and examination of levels currently permitted for export. In the past, it was agreed that the limit of 0kg for dried abalone would be increased and the 10kg wet weight would be decreased. In order to have an effective enforcement, further investigation is needed to determine the extent of the illegal trade to support a regulatory impact statement to advance any legislative amendments. Currently an option of employing an investigation officer with an intelligence background for two years is being examined. It is envisaged that it will cost \$150, 000 per year and requires the industry support for the proposal to commence.

- Responses from the Committee:
- Amendment of the 10 kg wet limit will not be effective unless it is regulated and enforced, which has not been supported in the past by SECC due to the resource costs.
- The issue is more dried abalone being hidden in luggage.
- Mail could also be a problem, but there is a lack of information on actual activity.
- Industry appeared to have gone cold on the issue, possibly because the State regulations are having an effect.

There appeared to be little support to progress this option.

Item 6 Seafood Residue Surveys

6.1 National Residue Survey (NRS) Wild Caught Monitoring Program – Progress Report – Dr Jim Derrick

See corresponding paper of the title above.

Dr Jim Derrick presented this report and highlighted the following: Sampling is currently being done for 2007/2008. The working group met once but hasn't agreed on future sampling requirements. There will need to be further discussions to determine the design of future monitoring programs.

The Committee asked whether the cost of testing was due to increased sample numbers. Dr Derrick advised that there has been some extra dioxin testing, but that he would need to consult the NRS finance manager for more detailed advice on this question.

6.2 EU Aquaculture Farm Residue Monitoring Program – Dr Jason Lutze

See paper 'EU – Aquaculture Farm Residue Monitoring Program' by Dr Fay Stenhouse and Dr Jason Lutze.

Dr Jason Lutze presented this paper and highlighted the following: There hasn't yet been a formal comment received from the submission made to the EC (Note – Subsequently the EC have formally advised that the Australian residue testing plans for 2007/2008 have been deemed to comply with Community requirements). The aquaculture companies involved have engaged either NRS or SARDI to manage the monitoring programs. Contracts between NRS or SARDI and the industry groups are currently being finalised. Sampling is due to start taking place in the next few weeks. There is a mix of samples being collected by AQIS inspectors and others, such as SARDI or the Tasmanian State Authorities.

Dr Fay Stenhouse added that a segregation issue still applied – EU compliant product should be separated in aquaculture as well as other areas and that this must be reflected in company AAs.

6.3 Future wild caught residue survey – Dr Fay Stenhouse

See paper 'Future Wild Caught Residue Surveys'

Dr Fay Stenhouse presented her report and highlighted the following: This report is of the teleconference with the NRS working group. A number of high level concepts were discussed, including that of testing and sampling being aligned to overseas testing requirements. The future involvement of the CRC was also discussed. There is a lack of data on dioxin in edible seafood and it was decided that this was highly important. A high resolution mass spectrometer is needed in testing labs to produce adequate results regarding dioxins. A plan has not yet been produced out of this meeting.

Points made by the Committee:

- Shouldn't double up on these Sub-Committees. Might be able to partner with other bodies.
- Some aquaculture sectors may be interested in commissioning the CRC for their testing.

- Are these issues the ones that will become important in the future? Are we taking a proactive approach? Trade opportunities are important for the future.
- Market and trade access is not necessarily within the scope of this Committee.
-

Nominations called for members of the NRS Wild Caught Sub-Committee: Mr Stuart Richey was nominated by Mr Ted Loveday and seconded by Mr Milan Rapp. Mr David Crichton and Mr Ted Loveday were nominated by Mr Peter Hinsch. Mr Stephen Hood was nominated by Mr Milan Rapp.

All of the above were accepted without objection for the Sub-Committee. The NRS Wild Caught Sub-Committee thus consists of Mr David Crichton, Mr Stephen Hood, Mr Ted Loveday and Mr Stuart Richey.

Item 8 Other Business

Fish Names

Mr Ted Loveday expressed his thanks for the Committee's support of this initiative to ensure fish names were used consistently and matched to scientific names. He reported that there has been a lot of interest from industry, supermarkets and more recently, the recreational sector. There is plenty of concern over fish naming in the community. There are a couple of issues regarding imported species that have still to be sorted out. A branding scheme will hopefully be rolled out before Christmas. Further delineation needed in sea cucumbers and pearl oysters. Further information could be obtained from the website: www.fishnames.com.au

Questions and answers:

- Where is FSANZ in terms of support and would the Primary Production and Processing Standard be updated to reflect the new Australian standard? They don't see names as a food safety issue. However, when there was a scare over mercury, the FSANZ website was changed to reflect potential risk species.

Item 7 SECC Administration

7.2 Selection of Chair and New Sub-Committee Members

Mr Alex Ziolkowski was re-elected as Chair at the beginning of the meeting.

The Skills/Training Sub-Committee was elected under Item 3.1.

The NRS Wild Caught Sub-Committee was elected under Item 6.3.

Nominations for a fifth member of Finance Sub-Committee: Mr Ted Loveday nominated Mr David Milne. There were no other nominations. He was accepted without objection.

The Finance Committee now consists of Mr Simon Bennison, Mr Tony Johnson, Mr David Milne, Mr Milan Rapp and Mr Alex Ziolkowski.

7.1 Terms of Reference

See '2007-08 Terms of Reference'

Dr Eileen Gosling introduced this issue, reminding the Committee that it was suggested in SECC meeting 16 that a protocol be adopted for these meetings. This one is not finalised, but seems to have all the right elements. In terms of trade and market access, it may need modifying.

She then passed the issue to the floor for comment:

- Shouldn't there be indemnity for the Committee chairman in the insurance? No, since SECC is just an advisory body, not a decision-making one.
- Since the papers tabled in these meetings are confidential, if Committee members wish to use them in discussion with their industry, an approval process is needed. Perhaps something needs to be added about that.
- In most instances, minutes released to the public should not include member names associated with comments.
- Should the NRS be mentioned in the Terms of Reference?

Action: Committee members should email Dr Eileen Gosling with any further comments by the end of November 2007 and she will incorporate those that are necessary.

Item 9 Next Meeting

The next meeting is set for Tuesday 13 May 2008. There will be a Finance Sub-Committee meeting some time before that. Fees discussions will be managed with the Sub-Committee out of session, with final agreement of any necessary changes to be made at the main meeting.

Dr Eileen Gosling closed the meeting at 4pm, with thanks to all the SECC members and presenters and others who had helped.