

Iceland responsible fisheries

- for both origin and sustainability

Styringsgruppemøte 28 august 2012

Tromsø, Nofima

Interview with IRF and 5 Companies:

- 3 both producer and exporter
- 2 only exporters
- All IRF certified
- Varied focus on the IRF
- 2 also MSC certified
- Small and big companies

«Iceland responsible fisheries»

-for both origin and sustainability

- The beginning...
- Financing
- The logos
- Response - from internal and external actors
- Future

The beginning

- 2007
 - Initiated by the fisheries association of Iceland
 - Established the Iceland Responsible fisheries foundation
 - Statement of sustainable fisheries
 - Certification of third party
 - Certification connected to the logo of origin

- 2009
 - Logo of origin presented

- 2010
 - First IRF certification – cod
 - In process since may 2011 redfish, haddock and saith

Why not MSC?

« because of the image of the fish from Iceland. We wanted to use that in the promotion and combine the certification and the sustainable use to the origin, not to some label used by other nations as well»

Gudný Káradóttir, IRF

Funding

- Fishing industry through annual fee based on export value
- Grant from the AVS fund of the ministry of fisheries and agriculture
- Salary cost for all working in the program are covered by Promote Iceland
- Registration fee 600€ (paid once for both logos)
- 0,5 promille (1/1000) of export value FOB

Certification cost for the company

- Registration fee 600€ (paid once for both logos)
- 0,5 promille (1/1000) of export value FOB
- Audit (annually) by Global Trust (figures unknown)

The logos



Seafood from Iceland

for the benefit of future generations

www.ResponsibleFisheries.is



CERTIFIED

Seafood from Iceland

for the benefit of future generations

www.ResponsibleFisheries.is

The response

1. The Icelandic industry

Pros:

- Cheaper
- National control
- Icelandic origin maintained
- Independent
- Protected from bad publicity caused by other nations malpractice

Cons:

- Market knowledge
- Loss of market access
- Development of the certification process too slow

2. The market (only based on Icelandic industry information)

Pros:

- Competitor to MSC
- Cheaper
- Evaluated to be equivalent to other schemes

Cons:

- Too small
- MSC more known and thus makes the buying process easier
- logo of origin and certification is too similar (?)

3. NGOs

No negative or positive response

Future

- Cooperation with Alaska marketing seafood institute
- Claims that Ireland, Canada and UK are taking steps towards a national label
- Receives interests from organisations in Australia and New Zealand
- More into Global Trusts model will strengthen all national logos
- To late into the market, the whole process has been too slow
- Logos too similar – might cause confusion
- Will Icelandic MSC certification strangle IRF?
- Funding is still too small and uncertain