

**Shrimp Aquaculture Dialogue
Process Document
Final version – Revised 10/15/10 --**

Overview

The purpose of this document is to describe the process used by the Shrimp Aquaculture Dialogue (ShAD) -- a multi-stakeholder, science-based forum convened by World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in 2007 -- to develop global, performance-based standards that minimize key negative environmental and social impacts associated with shrimp aquaculture, while enabling the industry to remain economically viable.¹

The ShAD brings together a wide range of stakeholders, such as shrimp producers and other members of the supply chain, researchers, NGOs, and government officials to engage in collaborative and voluntary standard setting.

ShAD meetings are open to everyone and all information related to the ShAD is posted on the Dialogue website at www.worldwildlife.org/shrimpdialogue. ShAD participants use a transparent, consensus-based process to create criteria, indicators and standards for responsible shrimp farming. For definitions of these terms, please see <http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/globalmarkets/aquaculture/item5224.html>.

ShAD Process and Meeting History

The ShAD's stakeholder engagement approach takes into consideration regional differences in the production of farmed shrimp for developing the standards. The main production areas identified for this ShAD include South-East Asia, Central and South America and South-East Africa. The ShAD began by hosting Full Dialogue meetings for each of the main production regions (Table 1). The goal of these meetings was to create awareness of the ShAD process and goals and to ask for volunteers to serve on steering Committees that would be the driver and decision makers of the process.

Table 1 – Meeting Locations and Numbers of Participants for Full Shrimp Dialogue Meetings

Date	Location	Participants
April 2007	Antananarivo, Madagascar	65
April 1 - 2, 2008	Belize City, Belize	54
June 3 - 4, 2008	Antananarivo, Madagascar	62
October 9–10, 2008	Guayaquil, Ecuador	55
November 17-18 2008	Bangkok, Thailand	158
March 9-10 2010	Jakarta, Indonesia	123

Initially, the ShAD formed Regional Steering Committees (RSC) from interested volunteers who attended the regional meetings. The ShAD hoped to use the RSC's to inform and ground-truth the work of the ShAD². Global Steering Committee (GSC) members (Table 2) were initially drawn

¹ This document was written and approved by the ShAD GSC and builds off of the "Aquaculture Dialogues Process Guidance Document." This document will be revised as needed by the GSC and is effective as of the date noted at the bottom of each page.

² The RSC's were never able to function as the process had initially envisioned mainly because of the availability of people's time and limited funds to manage the work of the RSC's.

from each of the three RSC's (Africa, Asia, and Americas)³ early in February 2009 and began using the input received at the regional dialogue meetings to develop global standards. As the process moved forward other GSC members who were not on the original RSC's were added based on interest and identified gaps in representation. The process sought to have balanced representation on the GSC from both NGO's and industry members; however, the process could only work with those individuals who were willing to volunteer their time and commit to the goals of the process. Steering Committee members identified themselves as either public or private sector.

Table 2 – Names and Affiliations of Global Steering Committee Members

Name	Organization	Sub-sector	Country	Voting
Laurent Galloux	Bureau VERITAS	Certification	France	private
Eric Bernard	OSO and R&O	Producer & Distributor	Madagascar, EU	private
Marc Le Groumellec	Groupe UNIMA	Producer	Madagascar	private
Dominique Gautier	Aqua Star	Distribution	UK	private
S.Jahangir Hasan Masum	Coastal Development Partnership (CDP)	NGO	Bangladesh	public
Mathew Parr	IUCN NL	NGO	Netherlands	public
Sian Morgan	Fishwise	NGO	USA	public
Pete Bridson	Monterey Bay Aquarium	NGO	USA	public
Ernesto Jack Morales	Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships	NGO	Philippines	public
Teresa Ish	Fish Choice	NGO	USA	public
Flavio Corsin/Pham Anh Tuan	ICAFIS/MARD	Producer/GO VT	Vietnam	public
Michael Bowen	Belize Aquaculture Ltd	Producer	Belize	private
Leo van Mulekom	OXFAM Novib	NGO	Netherlands	public
Jose Villalon	World Wildlife Fund US	NGO	USA	public

The ShAD GSC met face to face eight times (as of September 2010) for 2 – 4 day meetings (Table 3). These meetings served as the main vehicle for the development of the standards. Besides face-to-face meetings the GSC also worked via phone and WebEx to develop the standards.

Table 3 – Dates and Locations of Global Steering Committee Meetings

#	Dates	Location
<u>1</u>	April 2009	Brussels, Belgium
<u>2</u>	June 2009	Paris, France

³ See appendix for names and affiliations of RSC members

<u>3</u>	September 2009	Paris, France
<u>4</u>	November 2009	Bangkok, Thailand
<u>5</u>	February 2010	Paris, France
<u>6</u>	March 2010	Jakarta, Indonesia
<u>7</u>	June 2010	Washington (DC), USA
<u>8</u>	September 2010	Paris, France
<u>9</u>	March 2011	Amsterdam, Netherlands

Governance and Decision Making

1) Decision Making Body

The GSC is made up of 15 people who occupy 14 seats including representatives from each shrimp farming regions and the NGO's from around the world in both farming and consuming countries. The GSC is composed of volunteers and therefore, perfect representation of these sectors was not achieved by the process. All costs associated with participation on the GSC were covered by the participating member and their associated organization. GSC decisions are based on discussions with experts, consultation with stakeholders, as well as internal discussions.

a) Roles of the GSC (non-exhaustive list):

- i. Make consensus-based decisions on all principles, criteria, indicators and standards
- ii. Inform the stakeholders of their decisions
- iii. Identify where gaps in science exist and where a Technical Working Group is necessary
- iv. Make process decisions when necessary.
- v. Play an active role in the preparation for GSC meetings -- such as creating the agenda and background documents.

b) Selection Criteria for new GSC members

The GSC is composed of volunteers and by people who are interested in the process and are willing to commit the time to do the work.

Criteria for Membership

- 1) Add representative and technical value to ongoing dialogue and debate.
- 2) Support consensus-based decision-making (past, present, and future)
- 3) Commit to attend and/ or fully participate in all GSC meetings.
- 4) Good command of written and verbal English.

5) Commitment to the theory of change of the aquaculture dialogues and the accompanying goals for certification -- which includes accepting that there are significant social and environmental negative impacts of the shrimp industry in some places.

6) Understanding that the GSC is developing an international, multi-species, performance-based set of standards using a consensus-based process.

7) Willing to help to improve the standards in a constructive way by adapting the chosen criteria and indicators in order to cover the identified risks in an applicable manner.

8) Provision all relevant background information to ensure sufficient screening.

9) Have access to funding sources for covering costs incurring from participation to the GSC (mainly time and travels).

****NOTE: GSC membership is closed as of October 5, 2010 in advance of the second public comment period****

c) Duties of the GSC members (non – exhaustive list):

- i. Presence at regional Dialogue meetings in their home region.
- ii. Participation in at least one regional Dialogue meeting that is not in their home region.
- iii. Participation in all GSC conference calls and meetings.
- iv. Timely response to all e-mail correspondence.

Note: An insufficient level of participation may lead to replacement with another individual from the same stakeholder group from the same region by GSC consensus-based decision-making.

2) Decision-Making Protocol

a) Consensus:

The GSC used consensus-based decision-making. The definition of “consensus” applies to the decision making process for standards, as well as other key decisions (e.g., process and communications). The definition of “consensus” used by the International Organization for Standardization(ISO⁴) and used by the ShAD committees is:

“General agreement, characterized by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important part of the concerned interests and by a process seeking to take into account the views of interested parties, particularly those directly affected, and to reconcile any conflicting arguments. Consensus need not imply unanimity.”

⁴ ISO is the International Organization for Standardization—it is a legal association that consists of national standards institutes from 157 member countries. ISO facilitates the development of international standards (ranging from industrial to technical and quality management standards) and the widespread adoption of them in order to break down barriers to trade.

In practical terms, the GSC seeks unanimity but settles for overwhelming agreement once a reasonable effort has been made to resolve outstanding concerns. A super-majority decision implies 75% support of the full GSC, with at least 2/3rds support from both private and public sector representation (Table 2).

In the case that super-majority cannot be reached then the GSC must prescribe a course of action to attempt to address the concern and revote when and if necessary (See Conflict Resolution Section below).

b) Clarifying terms in the ISO definition

(1) *Sustained opposition* - Sustained opposition means that an important part of concerned interests has indicated, despite meaningful discussion of an issue that the position or solution put forward continues to be unacceptable to that interest.

(2) *Substantial issues*- Issues that materially affect the standards or decision being taken as appropriate.

(3) *Important part of concerned interests* - Clearly recognized representative of a segment of concerned interests that have been engaged in the discussions as a member of the decision-making body, such as all RSC and GSC members.

(4) *Interested parties* - Any party that has participated substantively in the dialogue process, including those outside the RSCs and GSC, that may present issues for the steering committee to debate and decide.

(5) *Directly affected* - Includes those whose lives or livelihoods would be altered by the proposed decision or standard financially or otherwise, as well as the affected public.

(6) *Consensus need not imply unanimity*- Under consensus, one or more parties may not fully agree with a decision, but is able to accept it.

c) *Alternate decision-making protocol*: In the case that consensus cannot be reached at the RSC level, the issue will be passed to the GSC. In the case that consensus cannot be reached at the GSC level, the following alternate decision-making protocol will be used:

The following is based on a hypothetical example of nine members of the GSC representing two main sectors. It will be adapted if the structure of the GSC is changed.

i. Supermajority voting will, if necessary, be used by the GSC to approve measures and make decisions.

ii. A provision will only go to a vote after ample time and effort has been given to trying to achieve consensus. This includes developing TWGs and committees to work through difficult issues.

iii. The decision to move to voting from consensus can be taken by a move by one GSC

member and a second of that motion by a GSC member of a different sector. Within the ShAD, the GSC will define two main sectors (i.e. industry/commercial, environmental non-governmental). Other sectors, such as government, scientists, and retailers may also be on the GSC but will have to identify themselves with one of the two main sectors or remain neutral (i.e., abstain) during voting procedures.

iv. Supermajority voting: A provision must achieve at least two-thirds in each sector of the GSC.

Conflict Resolution

It is possible that irresolvable conflict may develop within the GSC or the broader ShAD during deliberations. Attempts will be made to resolve conflicts internally. However, in case this is not possible, the following conflict resolution procedure can be invoked:

With the approval of the GSC, the ShAD will use the facilitation and mediation services of a consultant to address and resolve outstanding conflicts. Currently, the Consensus Building Institute (CBI) provides this role. CBI is a neutral, independent dispute resolution firm that is assisting Dialogue coordinators with the design and management of stakeholder meetings. The costs of any dispute resolution efforts are included in WWF's contract with CBI.

Furthermore, the GSC has the power to change the decision making rules to allow a decision to be made.

Public Comment Process

1. All documents related to ShAD meetings (e.g. minutes of the meeting, preliminary documents, and meeting presentations) are posted on <http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/globalmarkets/aquaculture/item5224.html>. Those are circulated among stakeholders and shared with the other regional Dialogues. Information is also provided in the bi-monthly free Aquaculture Dialogue e-newsletter (<http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/globalmarkets/aquaculture/item6951.html>)+

2. Throughout the process, any stakeholder can provide comments either directly during the public meetings or by contacting GSC members.

3. Once principles, criteria, indicators, and standards are agreed upon by the GSC, they will be posted on the ShAD website for a 60 day period for public comment. At a minimum, request for comments will be made via e-mail to the three regional ShAD distribution lists.

4. The formal 60-day public comment period will not begin until there is a complete package of principles, criteria, indicators and standards ready for comment. Individual draft indicators and standards may be made public before that point, but comments will be most useful if they relate to the full suite of standards. At the end of the comment period, all comments will be posted on the ShAD website with attribution.

5. The GSC will review all comments and share them with the TWG(s) involved in drafting standards. The comments will be considered in the revision of the full suite of standards.

6. Before the start of the next public comment period, the GSC will post a response to the body of comments as a whole or responses to individual comments as is deemed most appropriate. Simultaneously, a final revised suite of standards will be posted for a second 60-day comment period.

7. At the end of the second 60-day comment period, the GSC will review all comments, share them with TWG, and develop final standards. The final standards will be posted on the ShAD website.

Appendix 1 – Names and Affiliations of Regional Steering Committee Members**Steering Committee: Americas region**

Formed: April 2008

Name	Affiliation	Entered ShAD
Eric Bernard	World Wildlife Fund US	2007
Larry Drazba	Camarones de Nicaragua	October 2008
Sergio Escutia	Confederación de Organizaciones Acuícolas del Estado de Sinaloa	October 2008
Teresa Ish	Environmental Defense	March 2008
Leonardo Montoya	Centro de Investigacion en Alimentacion y Desarrollo	April 2007
Corey Peet*	David Suzuki Foundation	Mar 2008
Javier Duenas	Ecocostas	October 2008
Dilia Hernandez	Fundacion la Salle de Canaas Nat	October 2008
Peter Larkins	Producer	October 2008
Attilio Castano	FIESO	October 2008

* Corey Peet resigned his Americas Steering Committee seat in order to serve as an independent contractor for the Shrimp Aquaculture Dialogue as of February 2009.

Steering Committee: Africa region

Formed: June 2008

Name	Affiliation	Entered ShAD
Alice Rasolonjatovo:	Direction des Pêches et Ressources Halieutiques	June 2008
Mathias Ismail	Groupe OSO	June 2008
Julien Boule	LFL Aqua et Extrusion Division	June 2008
Claude Brunot	Groupement des Aquaculteurs et Pêcheurs de Crevettes de Madagascar	June 2008
Marc Le Groumellec	Groupe UNIMA	June 2008
Melanie Siggs	Seafood Choices Alliance	June 2008
Laurent Galloux	Bureau VERITAS	June 2008
Eliane Chungue	Institut Pasteur de Madagascar Norosoa	June 2008
Eric Bernard	World Wildlife Fund US	June 2008

Steering Committee: Asia region

Formed: November 2008

Name	Affiliation	Entered ShAD
Dominique Gautier	Aqua Star	December 2008
S.Jahangir Hasan Masum	Coastal Development Partnership (CDP)	November 2008
Rattanawan Mungkung	Department of Environmental Science, Faculty of Science, Kasetsart University	November 2008

Pinyo Kiatpinyo	Producer	November 2008
Mathew Parr	IUCN	November 2008
Sian Morgan	Fishwise	November 2008
Geoff Shester	Monterey Bay Aquarium	November 2008
Ernesto Jack Morales	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	November 2008
Do Thanh MUON	Bureau VERITAS	November 2008
Vũ, Dũng Tiến [Tien Dzung Vu]	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Vietnam	November 2008
Eric Bernard	World Wildlife Fund US	2007