

Promotion of

Marketing Names for Fish
and Seafood in Australia

FRDC Project 94/136.03

Prepared by JM Ham

for the

Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this project was to promote the adoption and use of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* (MNFSA). Problems caused by the lack of uniform marketing names date back to the 1970s. The Australian Fisheries Council (AFC) established a Recommended Marketing Names for Fish Committee in 1980. *Recommended Marketing Names for Fish* was published in 1985 and a revised edition was published in 1988. MNFSA was published in 1995.

Despite compelling evidence for standardising seafood names dating back many years, little progress was evident. Lack of uniform names has

- added to the cost of marketing seafood
- created considerable consumer uncertainty regarding seafood
- impeded medical, food, and market researchers
- impeded accurate catch data and added to the cost of fisheries management
- made staff training unnecessarily difficult and costly
- limited growth in seafood consumption

Objectives

1. Develop a specific presentation package for each target group in industry, government and trade.
2. Conduct direct presentations to representatives of each target group at a state level.
3. Encourage adoption of MNFSA by the nominated groups in the context of the overall fish names strategy.

Methods

1. Research, develop, and produce a Presentation Package for the promotion of the adoption and use of MNFSA.
2. Develop and produce a supporting brochure to promote the publication.
3. Deliver the presentation to key industry organisations, government agencies and departments and trade associations in all states and territories.

Presentation Package

The package distributed to industry bodies and used at all presentations included

- background history of the publication
- major perspectives and benefits of uniform marketing names for seafood including consumer, seafood marketers, food service, tourism, fisheries management, public health and human nutrition information, and international trade
- process for amendments
- how to use the book
- distribution Arrangements
- conclusion

Brochure

Brochures containing a concise summary of the benefits of MNFSA was developed and produced in collaboration with FRDC as a principal promotional tool for the publication.

Presentations

A total of fifty five presentations were given and the flow on impact was extensive. The level of industry support influenced the support for presentations. Government agencies were generally cooperative. Post harvest sectors are reluctant to standardise marketing names. Responses from the food service, education and training sectors and the media were positive. ASIC directors unanimously supported the presentations and the MNFSA publication. Some suggestions made by ASIC about future directions have been incorporated in the recommendations in this report.

The adoption and use of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* has clear benefits for

- improving the economic efficiencies of the seafood industry
- improving the accuracy and cost efficiencies of fisheries management
- improving consumer confidence
- improving the cost effectiveness of training for retail and food service
- improving public health and human nutrition information
- improving public image and integrity of the seafood industry
- developing domestic and export seafood markets

Further Development

Implications

- target groups unanimously supported the principles of uniform seafood names
- there is apathy towards the importance of ensuring MNFSA is adopted and used
- adoption and use will not be rapid
- enforceable Legislation will motivate most industry sectors
- some changes have been drafted into Fisheries Regulations (eg. Queensland)
- some of the *catch all* names are insufficient to meet the needs of the Regulations
- numerous names threaten the adoption of the concept of uniform names
- there is an immediate need for additions to the existing publication
- to date there has not been significant applications for additions
- maintaining the processes for managing additions and review is essential
- maintaining these processes will greatly benefit future editions
- the success of the Seafood Identification Technical Manual is dependant on the widespread adoption and use of MNFSA

Recommendations

1. Undertake a media campaign to create public awareness of MNFSA
2. Provide support to retailer organisations in public education of name changes
3. Continue support of a Marketing Names for Seafood Working Group (MNSWG)
4. Consider funding further editions in a similar format and price range
5. Undertake an immediate review of this edition
6. Encourage members of the MNSWG to remain committed and involved until the Technical Identification Manual is published
7. Encourage DPIE/Standing Committee/Management Committee to stay committed to the MNSWG - outcomes need to be driven by government and/or industry
8. Encourage ASIC to take more ownership. SeaQual may be appropriate to assist.

Project Background

The purpose of this project was to promote the adoption and use of *Marketing Names For Fish and Seafood in Australia* (MNFSA). Problems caused by the lack of uniform marketing names in common use were first addressed in the late 1970s by the Australian Fishing Industry Council (AFIC). In 1980 the Australian Fisheries Council (AFC) established the Recommended Marketing Names for Fish Committee.

The committee's charter was to formulate a set of uniform names for fish. The committee has comprised representatives from the catching, marketing, and scientific research sectors of the seafood industry and a representative of state government departments and agencies, with a commonwealth government chairperson.

In 1985 Department of Primary Industry and Energy (DPIE) in association with AFC published *Recommended Marketing Names for Fish*. A revised edition, which covered approximately 190 species of fish and several squid species was published in 1988.

The 1995 edition of *Marketing Names For Fish and Seafood* (MNFSA) includes 270 entries representing 330 species of fish, crustaceans, molluscs and miscellaneous products such as *beche-de-mer*. It provides a comprehensive listing of major marketable seafood species including wild caught, farmed, and imported products. It is endorsed by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture.

Need

Although documents standardising seafood names in Australia have been available since 1985, industry and government have made little effort to adopt the recommended names. These publications failed to have appropriate impact on industry and there is little evidence that the recommended names were used to standardise names.

There is compelling evidence for standardisation of seafood names. Supporting documented evidence includes

Fishing Industry National Study on Seafood Marketing 1995 Mojo for the Australian Seafood Industry Council (ASIC).

Electronic marketing of fisheries products 1995 Australian Bureau of Agricultural Resource Economics (ABARE)

Efficiency of Seafood Marketing 1993 ABARE

Seafood Consumption Study 1990/91 PA Consultancy

Analysis of the Great Australian Bight fisheries logbook and database 1988 Bureau of Resource Sciences (BRS)

The lack of uniform names has

- added to the cost of marketing seafood
- created considerable consumer uncertainty regarding seafood
- impeded medical, food, and market researchers, as they are uncertain about seafood actually caught, bought, or consumed
- impeded accurate catch data and possibly added to the cost of data collection and fisheries management
- made staff training unnecessarily difficult and costly
- limited growth in seafood consumption

Awareness and acceptance by government, industry, and trade of MNFSA is necessary to maximise its effectiveness and use.

Objectives

1. Develop a specific Presentation Package for each target group in industry, government and trade.
2. Conduct direct presentations to representatives of each target group at a state level.
3. Encourage adoption of MNFSA by the nominated groups in the context of the overall fish names strategy.

Methods

1. *Research, develop, and produce a Presentation Package for the promotion of the adoption and use of MNFSA.*

The Presentation Text was prepared by Judith Ham in collaboration with Nick Ruello and Dr Gina Newton. It was vital to identify the major perspective and benefits for the standardisation of seafood names.

Valuable advice was also received from the Marketing Names Committee, commercial fishing sources, and government department and agency personnel.

2. *Develop and produce a supporting brochure to promote the publication.*

The brochure was developed in collaboration with Simon Prattley (FRDC) and is essentially a summary of the Presentation Text. It was designed for broad circulation and for use in sales and distribution of the book.

3. *Deliver the presentation to key industry organisations, government agencies and departments and trade associations in all states and territories.*

Each state fishing industry peak body was the contact point in that state. By arrangement with FRDC, state organisations were involved in the distribution and sale of the book.

2. Brochure production

The brochure contains a concise summary of the contents of the book, the benefits and beneficiaries of the adoption of uniform marketing names for seafood and the processes for review. The brochure was developed in conjunction with FRDC. It is the principal promotional tool for the marketing of the publication. It provides an order form and contact points for the purchase of the publication.

100,000 copies were printed and distributed through state industry bodies and AUSEAS. A copy of the brochure is included in this report as Attachment III.

3. Presentations completed

A total of 55 presentations were made to a direct audience of 600. It is not possible to quantify the indirect audiences accessed as a flow on from these presentations and media coverage, but it is extensive. The steady flow of book sales and general enquiries are an indication of the success of the presentations.

The response from the catching sector and government agencies to the offer of presentations varied considerably. In states where there was strong industry support for the project there was generally enthusiastic support for presentations.

Government departments and agencies were generally cooperative although in most cases they do not consider standardising names as a major priority.

The post harvest sectors of the seafood industry are reluctant to embrace the concept of standardised marketing names. Although every effort has been made to convey the importance of MNFSA, it may take legislation with effective enforcement methods for MNFSA to achieve widespread compliance.

Food service, education, and training sectors were enthusiastic about the standardisation of seafood names. They readily accepted the benefits and welcomed such initiatives.

The media response was remarkably extensive considering this project did not specifically target them. Moderate misinformation (unplanned) broadcast at the time of the launch raised awareness and interest from industry.

Following are the Promotional Presentations held. In some instances there were several presentations within the one organisation.

Queensland

- Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation State Council (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Queensland Fisheries Management Authority (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- *Ozfish* video Workshop-Information and Education Managers from WA, Vic, SA, NSW, and Qld, Ocean Rescue, GBRMPA, Department of Environment, Australian Fisheries Management Authority
- Retailers and wholesalers at the Raptis Fish Markets
- Raptis management
- Queensland Fishing Industry Training Council (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Queensland Department of Primary Industry (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Marine Educators Society of Australasia executive meeting
- Individual presentations to key marketers

Significant outcomes - QCFO, QFMA, and QDPI all adopted and endorsed the MNFSA. The new Fisheries regulations will be based on these names.

Northern Territory

- Northern Territory Fishing Industry Council and Fisheries Department (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Northern Territory Police (fisheries enforcement), Hospitality and Tourism Training, Caterers Institute, Chefs Association, Health Department

New South Wales

- Sydney Fish Markets staff
- Food media (national)
- Restaurant and Caterers Association
- Commercial Fishermen's Advisory Council
- Fish Merchants
- Fisheries and Health Departments (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Clarence Co-op staff and Seafood Marketing Trainer
- Auction Floor buyers

Victoria

- Victorian Fishing Industry Federation (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Melbourne Metropolitan Fish Market Auction Floor buyers
- Department of Conservation and Fisheries (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Individual presentations to key marketers
- Australian Institute of Environmental Health - accessed all Environmental Health Officers through their journal
- Tourism Training Victoria

Western Australia

- Western Australia Fisheries Department Management and Education Staff
 - Fish Markets
-

- Western Australia Fishing Industry Council and wholesalers
- Australian Guild of Professional Chefs/Bentley TAFE

South Australia

- South Australia Fishing Industry Council (Adopted and endorsed the MNFSA)
- Fish Market buyers
- South Australia Department of Primary Industry- management and education and training
- Regency TAFE

Tasmania

- Tasmanian Fishing Industry Council
- Safeways Supermarkets
- Tasmanian Fisheries Department

Federal

- Australian Fisheries Management Authority
- Australian Seafood Industry Council

Australian Quarantine Inspection Service was invited to most state presentations but did not attend.

Media Coverage (known)

Print:

- *The Australian*
- *The Weekend Australian*
- *Brisbane Sunday Mail*
- All major daily newspapers Australia wide
- *Gourmet Traveller*
- *House and Garden*
- All state fisheries journals

Electronic:

- Radio Darwin
- 4BC
- 3LO
- 3AW
- 4QR
- *Good Morning Australia*
- *Cross Country*
- *OZFISH Commercial/Recreational Video(to be released late 1996)*
- Channels 10, 2, 7, 9 News coverage of launch and some follow up stories.

A sample of the media coverage is included in this report in Attachment IV.

In reviewing the success of the presentations, a meeting was held with ASIC directors. There was unanimous support for the presentations and MNFSA publication and various suggestions were made in regards to future directions. These have been incorporated in this report's Implications and Recommendations.

Benefits

The adoption and use of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* has clear benefits for

- improving the economic efficiencies of the seafood industry
- improving the accuracy and cost efficiencies of fisheries management, particularly in the areas of monitoring and assessment
- improving consumer confidence
- improving the cost effectiveness of training for retail and food service
- improving public health and human nutrition information
- improving the public image and integrity of the seafood industry
- developing domestic and export seafood markets

Intellectual Property

All information in this report is available in the public domain.

Further Development

Implications

1. Although target groups unanimously supported the principles of uniform seafood names, there is apathy towards the importance of ensuring MNFSA is adopted and used. Real adoption and use will not be rapid. Enforceable Legislation will motivate most industry sectors.
2. In some instances, changes have been drafted into Fisheries Regulations (eg. Queensland). This has led to an immediate need for additions to the existing publication as some of the *catch all* names are insufficient to meet the needs of the Regulations.
3. Some industry organisations and government agencies have indicated that there is an immediate need for additions to and review of MNFSA. Despite this, to date there has not been significant applications to the Working Group for additions.
4. There are numerous names that threaten the adoption of the concept of uniform names. Examples are
 - NSW- **morwong** - preferred names are bream fillet or deep sea bream

1. Introduction

The third edition of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* includes over 270 species of Australian wild caught, farmed, and imported fish, crustaceans, and molluscs (seafood). The publication is jointly funded by Department of Primary Industries and Energy (DPIE) and Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC). The promotion of the publication is a FRDC initiative to encourage the adoption and use of common marketing names seafood.

Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia is a valuable tool for everyone involved in the seafood industry, particularly those involved handling and marketing seafood. It provides the reader with

- a black and white picture of each product
- the common marketing name and scientific names for each product
- other pertinent information including scientific codes and descriptive taxonomic groupings
- details of some previously used names

The adoption and use of uniform marketing names offers many opportunities and benefits to the seafood industry, and government departments and agencies involved in fisheries management, research and public health. The ultimate beneficiaries are all seafood consumers.

The overall cost and detrimental effects to the seafood industry caused by mislabelling and uncertainties about seafood names has not been assessed. However, it is widely recognised by the industry to be substantial.

A number of recent studies and reports have highlighted the need for a uniform naming system for seafood.

The Australian Seafood Industry Council (ASIC), has identified this problem as one of the findings in its 1994/5 Fishing Industry National Study on marketing (FINS).

Electronic marketing of fisheries products 1995 by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Resource Economics (ABARE) indicates that electronic marketing has significant potential to improve the economic efficiency of the industry. There are also benefits in communication and fisheries management. Such a system can only be effective if there is uniform names for seafood.

According to a 1993 ABARE study on the *Efficiency of Seafood Marketing*, difficulties related to species identification and mislabelling are an impediment to seafood marketing both domestically and internationally.

PA Consultancy's *Fish Consumption Study* undertaken in 1990/91 noted that one of the most important factors consumers considered when purchasing seafood was the accuracy of the labelling. There is evidence that deliberate mislabelling is still a problem in some areas, but equally important is that many seafood marketers and food service operators are unknowingly mislabelling some species because they are not proficient at seafood identification or are unaware that there is a book available to guide them on the correct marketing names.

An in depth analysis of the Great Australian Bight fisheries logbook and database conducted in 1988 by scientists at the Bureau of Resource Sciences (BRS) showed that species coding errors (ie. entering the wrong fish name in the logbook or in the fishery database) was the most common error accounting for about 35% of all error types. This estimate would also apply to other multi-species demersal trawl fisheries (for example the South East Fishery).

Wrong seafood names means incorrect fisheries data- ultimately, these can adversely influence management decisions and disadvantage the industry and may put the fisheries resources at risk. Scientific assessment of fisheries stocks and fisheries management rely on the accuracy of fisheries databases.

The problems with seafood names brought about by innocent multiplicity of names and by deliberate mislabelling are not restricted to the catching and marketing sectors of the seafood industry. These same problems have also added to the costs of the restaurant and catering trade (food service) and have had a negative impact on our tourism industry.

There are serious implications for public health through inaccurate consumption and nutritional information.

A recognised uniform marketing names system is vital to having any influence over imported seafood names as a result of the post GATT trade agreement.

Uniform marketing names will benefit

- economic efficiencies of the seafood industry
- accuracy and costs of fisheries management
- consumer confidence and lead to growth in seafood consumption
- cost effectiveness of training for retail and food service
- public health and human nutrition information
- public image and integrity of the seafood industry
- development of domestic and export seafood markets

User acceptance of a specific name for seafood is based on familiarity- the more a certain name is used the greater the user acceptance will be for the name. To ensure the rapid adoption of this edition, there must be commitment from all sectors of industry and government. Everyone has a role to play to achieve the objective of having a uniform naming system for seafood harvested and seafood sold in Australia.

In most cases there has been no cause to alter the existing names. It has only been necessary to standardise names where two or more names were used for the same species. As a result there are compromises. Consideration was given to ensure that the names selected were not misleading.

- The selection of names required balancing popularity of the currently used name with
- names used in major markets
- names generally accepted by the seafood industry and seafood consumers

Example

blue swimmer/sand crab

In Queensland, **sand crab** has been the popular name for *Portunus pelagicus*. The Sydney and Melbourne markets use the name *blue swimmer* and handle the greatest volume of sales for this species and therefore the name *blue swimmer* has been adopted. *Sand crab* now covers the *Ovalipes* species which includes the three spot crab, rock crab and coral crab.

Advantages

- fishers and marketers trade between states using a common name to describe the same species
- reduce consumer confusion
- more accurate catch data information for fisheries managers

Disadvantages

- name change- new name tags and consumer education required

Included in this new edition of *Marketing Names* is a mechanism to allow for any necessary additions and the review of existing names if required.

2. Background history of the publication

Confusion about common names for seafood exists because more than one name has evolved for any one species. Several different names are used from one region to another for the same species, particularly across state boundaries. Commercial and recreational fishers, marketers and processors, and scientists and fisheries managers, have all contributed to the diversity of seafood names.

The problem with seafood names and the lack of uniform marketing names in common use, was first addressed in the late 1970's by the then Australian Fishing Industry Council (AFIC). In 1980 the Australian Fisheries Council (AFC) established a Recommended Marketing Names for Fish Committee. The committee's charter was to formulate a set of uniform names for fish. The committee has comprised representation from the catching, marketing, and scientific research sectors of the seafood industry and a representative of State government departments and agencies, with a Commonwealth government chairperson.

In 1985 DPIE in association with the AFC published *Recommended Marketing Names for Fish*. A revised edition, which covered approx 190 species of fish and several squid species was published in 1988.

The 1995 edition of *Marketing Names For Fish and Seafood* includes fish, crustaceans and molluscs and a listing of miscellaneous species such as *beche-de-mer*. It provides a comprehensive listing of major marketable seafood species including wild caught, farmed, and imported products. It has the endorsement of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture.

3 Major Perspectives and Benefits of Uniform Marketing Names for Seafood

3.1 Consumer perspective

Many consumers are suspicious of the labels on seafood because of past experience and negative media reports regarding deliberate mislabelling.

Example

Deliberate substitution

- *king threadfin* and *ling* being labelled and sold as *barramundi*

Misnaming

- *warehou* under various names such as **blue eye** and **trevally**
- a number of deep water *oreo* species under the general name **dory** The inappropriate use of the name **dory** not only misleads and confuses the consumer but undermines the value and credibility of high demand and market value *John dory*.

Misrepresentation

- farmed *catfish* imported from Vietnam marketed as **Pacific dory**

Deliberate substitution confuses consumers about the eating qualities of the better known species and impedes market development of new products on the market. According to the 1992 PA *Fish Consumption Study* this is an impediment to seafood marketing and increasing seafood consumption.

A small percentage of seafood marketers and the food service industry deliberately mislabel new (inexpensive) species for more familiar or more expensive species. Most problems are a result of unintentional mislabelling due to

- retail assistants uncertain about the full or precise identity of fish fillets on sale
- imprecise and generalised identification and labelling eg. **cooked prawn** or **green prawn** leads to problems in buying, handling, and cooking of different species of prawns- *endeavour*, *king*, and farmed (black) *tiger prawns* are three totally different products with different appearance, taste, and shelf life
- ignorance of common marketing names by many experienced seafood marketers and food service buyers
- unfamiliar spelling of some seafoods such as **schnapper** / *snapper*, **taylor** / *tailor*

Recipes and preparation details are difficult for consumers to comprehend when they are confronted with fish or seafood names they do not recognise or when their product is seemingly not compatible with the recipe.

Consumers, and seafood buyers and marketers are confused by marketing names that give little or no indication of eating qualities of the seafood product, eg *sea perch* (from the *Lutjanus* species) has eating and keeping qualities totally different from the versatile *orange roughy* (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*).

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- create a higher level of consumer confidence
- lead to increased fish consumption
- provide guidance for better storage and handling, and preparation of seafood products
- lead to improved consumer seafood knowledge

3.2 Fresh Fish Merchants and Seafood Wholesalers

Seafood retailers and wholesalers are the *shop window* of the seafood industry. The consistency and accuracy of the labelling information they provide affects consumer confidence and ultimately the potential for sales.

The multiplicity of names and deliberate mislabelling has tarnished the image of the seafood industry for consumers, other end-users, and the media. Food media personnel have to repeatedly check on seafood names and identification in order to report seafood stories accurately. This does not always happen and the seafood industry is often damaged because of stories about seafood which inaccurately reflect on locally produced product.

Electronic marketing promises to provide great opportunities to improve the marketing efficiency in the seafood industry and would be based on a uniform naming system. Without standardised seafood names it is unlikely this system could be implemented.

Adoption of uniform Marketing Names will

- increase seafood sales
- reduce the number of names that seafood merchants, exporters and importers have to carry on stock lists
- reduce training time and costs
- reduce errors and costs associated with mistaken identity
- reduce customer complaints regarding mistaken identity and mislabelling
- make seafood marketing an easier and more attractive trade
- remove much of the media suspicion and uncertainty about seafood names and fraudulent substitution
- improve industry image and public relations

3.3 Supermarkets

Supermarkets are making inroads in the marketing of fresh and frozen seafood, both Australian and imported. Staff are unfamiliar with the diversity and names of seafood. The multitude of species, together with the fact that many species have several common names impedes staff training in seafood handling for the major supermarket groups. A high percentage of supermarket staff are casual or part time, and the training required for the seafood section staff is extremely costly. Therefore it is important that the benefit of staff training is not unnecessarily undermined.

The persons responsible for purchasing seafood are also having considerable difficulties knowing the origin of products, that is Australian or overseas, and would strongly welcome any clarification of seafood names. Confusion of seafood names has undoubtedly become one of the major barriers to further penetration of seafood into supermarkets in Australia.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- reduce the number of product names that supermarkets have to carry on their stock list
- reduce training time and costs in supermarkets
- reduce errors and costs associated with mistaken identity
- reduce customer complaints regarding mistaken identity and mislabelling

3.4 Food Service (restaurants, catering and takeaways)

Food service operators are among the most innovative users of seafood, however they, like the retailing industry are experiencing great difficulty because of the lack of uniform names. With the diversity of seafood species available, problems with identification and the high cost of training large numbers of part time and casual staff are creating a major impediment to wider seafood use.

Confusion about the names of many fish species makes it difficult and expensive to train staff in seafood promotion and marketing which is crucial to a successful business.

Restaurateurs are sometimes given an incorrect marketing name, either knowingly or unknowingly, by the seafood merchant. There is also evidence that a small number of restaurateurs knowingly mislabel seafood on their menu to take advantage of the names of high market value species.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- lead to increased the use of seafood by the food service sector
- reduce costs of staff training
- help protect the consumer from misrepresentation

3.5 Tourism

Seafood is currently understated in its contribution to the Australian tourism industry. There is a strong demand for seafood by both international and domestic tourists.

The 1993 James Cook University study *Tourism: the expectations of tourists and the importance of Seafood* found that over \$37 million worth of seafood based meals are sold in tourism hotels and restaurants (excluding seafood retailers and takeaway shops) in the Cairns region alone each year. This study identified that seafood provides an important drawcard for the tourism industry. Coastal Australia boasts many towns who promote their seafood specialities and so it can be assumed that seafood provides an important contribution to tourism in regional areas throughout Australia.

Uniform seafood names are essential because

- domestic tourists have to try and reconcile the name with those they are familiar with. The fact that many of our species have a number of local names in different parts of the country, is a significant impediment to the seafood industry achieving its full potential in the market place.
- overseas visitors already have difficulty determining what is on offer because they have to reconcile the Australian name with those they are familiar with. This difficulty

is compounded by the fact that many of our species have a number of local names in different parts of the country.

Example

- *kingfish* from the East coast is an entirely different species from a *kingfish* served on the West coast
- Americans readily recognise *orange roughy* as a familiar popular fish but would not recognise **sea perch** as the same fish they eat at home.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- reduce consumer confusion and restore confidence
- provide a useful marketing tool to attract visitors
- enhance the reputation of food service to the tourist industry
- encourage greater seafood consumption

3.6 Fisheries Management

Most commercial and some recreational fishers fill in some form of logbook with catch and effort data. These enable fisheries scientists to make assessments of fishery stocks. The results of these assessments, along with other information, are then considered by fishery managers.

This forms the basis for decisions about the levels of catch and effort allowable in a particular fishery. Such management decisions strongly influence the sustainability of the fishery resources and the economic efficiency and profitability of the industry.

High quality data is of paramount importance in the stock assessment process and therefore the progress and success of a fishery (ie. financial and ecological).

If the wrong name is entered either in the logbook or the wrong species code is entered from the logbook into the database, then a double error has occurred. There has been catch and effort information about some species that wasn't really captured, and information lost about the species that was actually caught.

Logbooks list only a small number of names and codes, usually the commonly caught species. There is usually a blank section where the fisher can fill in their own fish names if species other than those listed are taken. As names may vary from place to place, this is a common source of misinformation as species are misrepresented by name in the logbook, and later coding by the logbook editor.

Estimations and monitoring of total catch weight are crucial when a quota management system is in place in a fishery. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) is used by scientists to gauge trends in the abundance and to identify declining stocks. Errors in species names on fishery databases inevitably leads to inaccuracies in the estimates of total catch weights and CPUE for both the species name wrongly identified and the species not identified.

Example

In the early days of the deep sea *orange roughy* fishery, some fishers wrote **ocean perch** in the logbooks instead of *orange roughy*. This mistake slipped past the then inexperienced logbook editors even though it was obvious from the shot information (ie. trawl position and depth) and the catch size, that it must have been *orange roughy*. As a result of such errors, there were cases where thousands of tonnes of *orange roughy* was entered onto the GAB database as *ocean perch*.

There has also been confusion over the names and database codes of *warehouse*, *trevalla*, and *trevally* to name a few.

Fishers need good data skills when filling out logbooks. Fishery managers and scientists who computerise and examine the information also need good data skills. All groups need a good knowledge of uniform names and a standardised approach to their usage. *Marketing Names For Fish and Seafood* is a working tool for more accurate fishery data. Unnecessary costs can be avoided by providing accurate logbook data.

Furthermore, overlaps in fisheries management jurisdictions and different fisheries legislation between states and commonwealth fisheries has been further complicated by the range of names for the same species.

Example

Estuary cod is protected in NSW but an important commercial and recreational species in Qld; variation of mud crab regulations between States

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- reduce identification problems with important species
- improve the accuracy of fishery catch effort information which forms the basis for the stock assessment process
- reduce the costs of managing the paper trail for quota managed species
- clarify management arrangements for the same species between States and consequently aid enforcement.
- reduce fishers costs for data collection

3.7 Public Health and Human Nutrition Information

The lack of positive identification and labelling of seafood products and any related confusion can be costly. The precise identification of a fish fillet, prawn meat or other processed product is particularly difficult as Health Departments have inadequate identification methods. Data is often generalised which can

- confuse the nutritional composition of foods investigated by the Commonwealth Health Department- its study on seafood is of limited value because the Department simply bought seafood products in retail outlets in various capital cities and taken the names from shop labels as being correct
- confuse the collection of precise information on seafood consumption and consumer preference which leads to inaccurate or misleading statistics
- add to time taken to positively identify any reported illness
- add to time taken for product recall in times of a public health risk such as ciguatoxin or scombroid poisoning incidents
- confuse nutritional and residue studies
- reduce the accuracy of scientific research as scientific staff purchase seafood samples from retail outlets and usually take the names on face value, and consequently incorrect data is undoubtedly being entered into data bases
- lead to delays in exports because of residue problems

Clear and unambiguous identification and labelling is becoming very important as consumers, marketers and government agencies become concerned about food nutrition, public safety, and allergic reactions to a particular type of seafood. General names such as **snapper, cod, and dory** are insufficient to satisfy growing demands for more information on foods.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- produce more reliable data on seafood consumption
- produce more reliable data on nutritional characteristics of various species
- produce more reliable data on residues and chemical analyses of fisheries products
- reduce the time taken to identify an illness due to consumption of seafood
- reduce time taken to recall suspect product
- reduce disruption to sectors not directly affected by a product recall or other specific health concern

3.8 International Trade

Many problems for exporters and importers arise because of the diversity of species in the major fish groups such as **perch, whiting, cod, salmon, and snapper**, and the fact that many of the fish in Australian waters that carry these names are not considered to be members of these groups by traders familiar with names from Europe or the USA.

Under new world trade agreements (post GATT), Australia may not be able to object to the use of recognised foreign names on seafood produced and / or packed overseas for sale in Australia if there is not a recognised uniform marketing names system for product sold on the domestic market. This could lead to imported products being labelled so as to ride on the back of the name of many of domestically produced and highly sought after species.

The confusion of seafood names in Australia has impeded opportunities for seafood exports as well as confusing the import markets. Lack of a uniform system of marketing names has also enabled deliberate misrepresentation of lower quality imports as higher value species produced either domestically or overseas.

Adoption of uniform Marketing Names will

- protect consumers from possible misrepresentation as a result of World Trade Agreements
- reduce the number of names that seafood merchants, exporters and importers have to carry on stock lists
- reduce damage to the seafood industry through health issues

4. Procedure for additions and review of marketing names

An ongoing process for review is essential to adequately reflect changes in the market regarding the supply of seafood. The major consideration for any amendment will be the justification for the addition or change of a name. Submissions for amendments will be considered in regards to

- scientific relationship of the species to other species and their marketing name
- the relevance of the name to the species
- potential degree of confusion that the new name may create for the consumer
- potential benefits to the seafood industry

Amendments may be necessary due to

- importation of seafood not currently available or known in Australia
- development of new fisheries, either wild caught or farmed
- clarification sought on existing names
- fisheries management
- stock protection intervention

Anyone may petition for amendments although the most likely persons or interests will be

- government departments and agencies involved in fisheries management, fisheries conservation, and health inspection
- fisheries scientists
- importers
- commercial fishers
- processors
- wholesalers and retailers

To petition for amendments to the *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* publication send the following information to:

Australian Seafood Extension and Advisory Service (Auseas)
IFIQ
Hercules St
Hamilton Q4011

- scientific name
- photograph of the species/fillet
- brief description
- country of origin
- region of capture, including depth
- currently marketing name used
- suggested marketing name
- **justification- detailed reasons for the alteration/addition**
- specify the fisheries agencies which support the alterations or addition
- supply a sample of the species, if requested
- contact telephone or fax numbers

Further information and justification may be sort before an amendment is authorised. Undue costs incurred in the process of evaluation may be recovered from the applicant.

5. How to use the handbook-this section will be finalised when the hard copy publication is available

The publication is *user friendly* and is indexed with a

- description of groups page xii/xiii
- seafood marketing names including the previous given names page 277
- scientific fish names page 301
- Australian species codes page 313

The description of groups is generalised grouping of fishes, crustaceans, molluscs and miscellaneous others designed to show lineages or associations within the section. This is helpful when trying to find a particular species when only a vague description is known. For example, when looking for *plaice* one would look through Group C-Teleostean flatfishes.

The extensive index system makes it easy and quick to check the information commonly and regularly needed by fishers, processors, marketers, scientists, fisheries researchers and managers, enforcement and inspection agencies, and the general public. The alphabetical index includes previous names with the correct name on bold type.

Example

What's the correct name for **happy moments**?

Look up the marketing names index under **happy moments** and refer to the page number given. Here you will find-

- correct marketing name in bold type at the top of the page
- photo to identify the fish
- Australian species code
- group identification
- scientific names
- previous names
- any relevant remarks

In this case, **happy moments** are *black trevally*. This fish until recently was of little commercial value but now has excellent export potential to Asia. This is an example of the benefits of standardised marketing names. Its previous names included **black spinefoot** and *black trevally*. Where this has been a minor non target fishery it may in future become a valuable targeted fishery in northern Australia because of its market potential being identified by marketers and fishers.

Marketing names may also be located by referring to the scientific name index. This is particularly useful for imported species which may or may not be caught in Australian waters. It is envisaged that given time and commitment from all parties involved, the common marketing names will be as reliable as the scientific names when describing seafood.

6. Distribution arrangements

The *Marketing names for fish and Seafood* publication will be distributed by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC), AUSEAS, and the Australian Seafood Industry(ASIC) network at state level.

To maximise distribution a nominal charge of \$10.00 per book plus postage. This is to encourage the adoption and use of the *Marketing names for fish and Seafood in Australia* by all sectors of the industry, government departments and agencies, and the general public.

Discounts for bulk purchases are available through FRDC and AUSEAS.

7. Conclusion

The profusion of names, the lack of uniform names around the country, and the resulting confusion regarding marketing names has

- added to the cost of marketing seafood
- created considerable consumer uncertainty regarding seafood,
- impeded medical, food, and market researchers, as they are uncertain about seafood actually caught, bought, or consumed
- impeded accurate catch data and possibly added to the cost of data collection and fisheries management
- made staff training unnecessarily difficult and costly
- limited growth in seafood consumption

It is envisaged that within eighteen months, the names in this publication will be legally enforceable. FRDC is funding research and the preparation of a technical manual for the positive identification of seafood using a protein fingerprinting process called electrophoresis. Electrophoresis identifies seafood irrespective of whether it is fresh or frozen, whole or processed in fillets and meat. Each species carries unique characteristics that can be identified by their protein material. This work is being undertaken by Dr Peter Last from CSIRO.

The *technical manual on seafood identification* by electrophoresis will provide an unambiguous and scientifically sound basis for the identification of seafoods to aid enforcement of Commonwealth and State fisheries regulations and other regulations designed to prevent the fraudulent mislabelling of seafood. This will assist the seafood and food service industries with product identification and staff training.

The adoption and use of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* has clear benefits for

- seafood consumers
- economic efficiencies of the seafood industry
- fisheries management
- public health
- domestic and international trade

Executive Summary

The promotion of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia*

There is compelling evidence and justification for the adoption and use of the *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* (MNFSA). The profusion of names, the lack of uniform names around the country, and the resulting confusion regarding marketing names has

- added to the cost of marketing fish
- created considerable consumer uncertainty regarding seafood
- impeded medical, food, and market researchers, as they are uncertain about the fish species actually caught, bought, or consumed
- impeded accurate catch data and added to the cost of data collection and fisheries management
- made training unnecessarily difficult and costly
- limited growth in seafood consumption

The adoption and use of MNFSA will benefit

- economic efficiencies in the seafood industry
- accuracy and costs of fisheries management
- consumer confidence and improving seafood consumption
- cost effectiveness of training for retail and food service
- quality of public health and human nutrition information about seafood
- public image and integrity of the seafood industry
- development of domestic and export seafood markets

User acceptance of a specific name for seafood is based on familiarity- the more a certain name is used the greater the user acceptance will be for the name. To ensure the rapid adoption of this edition, there must be commitment from all sectors of industry and government.

In the development of the MNFSA publication there has, in most cases, been no cause to alter the existing fish names. It has only been necessary to standardise names where two or more names were used for the same species. As a result there are compromises. Consideration was given to ensure that the names selected are not misleading. The selection of names required balancing popularity of the currently used name with

- names used in major markets
- names generally accepted by the seafood industry and seafood consumers

Included in the new edition of MNFSA is a mechanism to allow for any necessary additions and the review of existing names if required.

Summary of Promotional Presentation

Background of the publication

Confusion about common names for seafood exists because more than one name has evolved for any one species. Several different names are used from one region to another for the same species, particularly across state boundaries. Commercial and recreational fishers, marketers and processors, scientists and fisheries managers, have all contributed to the diversity of seafood names.

Major Beneficiaries of Uniform Marketing Names for Seafood

Consumers

Many consumers are suspicious about the labels on seafood because of past experience and negative media reports regarding deliberate mislabelling.

Deliberate substitution confuses consumers about the eating qualities of better known species and impedes market development of new products. According to the 1992 PA *Fish Consumption Study* this is an impediment to fish marketing and to increasing seafood consumption.

Recipes and preparation details are difficult for consumers to comprehend when they are confronted with fish names they do not recognise or when their product is seemingly not compatible with the recipe.

Consumers, seafood buyers, and marketers are confused by marketing names that give little or no indication of eating qualities of the fish or product.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- create a higher level of consumer confidence
- increase fish consumption
- increase profitability
- provide guidance for better storage and handling, and preparation of seafood products
- improve consumer seafood knowledge

Fresh Fish Merchants and Seafood Wholesalers

Seafood retailers and wholesalers are the *shop window* of the seafood industry. The consistency and accuracy of the labelling information they provide reflects consumer confidence and ultimately the potential for sales.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- increase seafood sales
- reduce the number of names that seafood merchants, exporters and importers have to carry on stock lists
- reduce training time and costs
- reduce errors and costs associated with mistaken identity
- reduce customer complaints regarding mistaken identity and mislabelling
- increase demand and profits
- lead to better handling of seafood
- make seafood marketing an easier and more attractive trade
- remove much of the media suspicion and uncertainty about fish names and fraudulent substitution
- improve industry image and public relations

Supermarkets

Supermarkets are making inroads in the marketing of fresh and frozen seafood, both Australian and imported. Staff are unfamiliar with the diversity and names of seafood. The multitude of species, together with the fact that many species have several common names impedes staff training in seafood handling for the major supermarket groups. A high percentage of supermarket staff are casual or part time, and the training required for the seafood section staff is extremely costly. Therefore it is important that the benefits of training are not unnecessarily undermined.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- increase seafood sales
- reduce the number of product names that supermarkets have to carry on their stock list
- reduce training time and costs in supermarkets
- reduce errors and costs associated with mistaken identity
- reduce customer complaints regarding mistaken identity and mislabelling
- increase demand and profits
- lead to better handling of seafood

Food Service (restaurants, catering and takeaways)

Food service operators are among the most innovative users of seafood, however they, like the retailing industry are experiencing great difficulty because of the lack of uniform fish names. With the diversity of fish and seafood species available, problems with identification and the high cost of training large numbers of part time and casual staff are creating a major impediment to wider seafood use.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- increase the use of seafood by the food service sector
- reduce costs of training
- increase the effectiveness of business and industry training
- lead to better handling of seafood
- increase profits
- help protect the consumer from misrepresentation

Tourism

Seafood is currently understated in its contribution to the Australian tourism industry. There is a strong demand for seafood by both international and domestic tourists.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- reduce consumer confusion and restore confidence
- provide a useful marketing tool to attract visitors
- enhance the reputation of food service to the tourist industry
- encourage greater seafood consumption

Fisheries Management

High quality data is of paramount importance in the stock assessment process and therefore the progress and success (ie. financial and ecological) of fisheries management. Fisheries management relies on the integrity of this data when developing fisheries management plans and policies. Inconsistencies in fish names corrupts the value of this information.

Furthermore, overlaps in fisheries management jurisdictions and different fisheries legislation between states and commonwealth fisheries has been further complicated by the range of names for the same species.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- reduce identification problems with important species
- improve the accuracy of fishery catch effort information which forms the basis for the stock assessment process
- improve fisheries management
- reduce the costs of managing the paper trail for quota managed species
- clarify of management arrangements for the same species between States and consequently aid enforcement.
- reduce fishers costs for data collection

Public Health and Human Nutrition Information

The lack of positive identification and labelling of seafood products and any related confusion is costly. The precise identification of a fish fillet, prawn meat or other processed product is particularly difficult as Health Departments have inadequate identification methods. Data is often generalised.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- produce more reliable data on seafood consumption
- produce more reliable data on nutritional characteristics of various species
- produce more reliable data on residues and chemical analyses of fisheries products
- reduce the time taken to identify an illness due to consumption of seafood
- reduce time taken to recall suspect product
- reduce disruption to sectors not directly affected by a product recall or other specific health concern

International Trade

The confusion of fish names in Australia has impeded opportunities for seafood exports as well as confusing the import markets. Lack of a uniform system of seafood names has also enabled deliberate misrepresentation of lower quality imports as higher value species produced either domestically or overseas.

Adoption of uniform marketing names will

- protect the seafood industry from seafood naming implications as a result of World Trade Agreements
- reduce the number of names that seafood merchants, exporters and importers have to carry on stock lists
- make seafood marketing an easier and more attractive trade
- reduce damage to the seafood industry through health issues
- improve industry image and public relations

Procedure for additions and review of marketing names

An ongoing process for review is essential to adequately reflect changes in the market regarding the supply of seafood. The major consideration for any amendment will be the justification for the addition or change of a name. Submissions for amendments will be considered in regards to

- scientific relationship of the species to other species and their marketing name
- the relevance of the name to the species
- potential degree of confusion that the new name may create for the consumer
- potential benefits to the seafood industry

Distribution arrangements

The *Marketing names for fish and Seafood* publication will be distributed by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC) and the Australian Seafood Industry Council (ASIC) network at state level.

To maximise distribution a nominal charge of \$10.00 per book plus postage. This will encourage the adoption and use of standard names by all sectors of the industry, government departments and agencies, and the general public.

Conclusion

The profusion of names, the lack of uniform names around the country, and the resulting confusion regarding marketing names has

- added to the cost of marketing seafood
- created considerable consumer uncertainty regarding seafood,
- impeded medical, food, and market researchers, as they are uncertain about the seafood species actually caught, bought, or consumed
- impeded accurate catch data and added to the cost of data collection and fisheries management
- made training unnecessarily difficult and costly
- limited growth in seafood consumption

It is envisaged that within eighteen months procedures will be underway to make the names legally enforceable. FRDC is funding research and the preparation of a technical manual using a protein fingerprinting process called electrophoresis which will provide an unambiguous and scientifically sound basis for the identification of seafoods. This will aid enforcement of Commonwealth and State fisheries regulations and other regulations designed to prevent the fraudulent mislabelling of seafood. It will assist the seafood and food service industries with product identification and staff training.

The adoption and use of *Marketing Names for Fish and Seafood in Australia* has clear benefits for

- seafood consumers
- economic efficiencies in all sectors of the seafood industry
- fisheries management
- public health
- domestic and international trade.