International ColdWater Prawn Forum 2011

Introduction:

The International ColdWater Prawn Forum is a non-profit organization, based on the voluntary work of its Steering Committee. It is aiming at providing a platform for different stakeholders in the Coldwater Prawn sector and to raise awareness for Cold Water Prawns.

In November 2010 a new Steering Committee was formed to initiate a new conference of the Coldwater Prawn Forum. The Steering Committee members were following persons from Coldwater Prawn sector:

- Alfred ER Jakobsen, Knapk, Greenland
- Simon Jarding, Royal Greenland, Denmark
- Yngvi Óttarsson, Icelandic Export Center Ltd., Iceland
- Tor-Edgar Ripman, Norges Råfisklag, Norway
- Steve Spicer, Ocean Choice International, United Kingdom
- Keith Sullivan, Fish, Food and Allied Workers, Canada
- Øystein Petterson, Norway Prawns, Norway
- Jens Møller, GEMBA Seafood Consulting A/S, Denmark –Secretariat ICWP 2011

It was agreed upon London as the location and preferably Fishmongers’ Hall as the venue, while the duration of the event was supposed to not exceed one day. From December 2010 to November 2011 the Steering Committee have had more than 12 telephone conferences and one Steering Committee meeting in Brussel (May 2011).
The Conference:

On November 23rd 2011, the ICWPF-conference therefore took place at Fishmongers’ Hall in London, supported by five different sponsors from the Seafood sector. It lasted the entire day and offered an optional conference dinner in the evening that provided the possibility to get to know other participants in an informal setting.

In total 145 participants from nine different countries\(^1\), took part in the conference of which 129 joined the dinner. Two moderators and 17 high profile speakers from within the Seafood sector were holding presentations in four different sessions concerning:

- Recent Status, Production & Market
- Health & Product Quality
- Sustainability, Certification & Management
- Opportunities & Challenges for the Prawn Sector

An additional part of the conference was the informal industry meeting at Fishmongers’ in the morning following the conference, the 24\(^{th}\) of November. The meeting was highly informational and provided a very good opportunity to overview the sector. It was also an additional opportunity to get a feed-back from some participants.

Evaluation of Questionnaires:

In order to evaluate the conference day, the organizer asked the delegates to fill out a questionnaire that was enclosed in the conference material. In total 35 persons provided their feed-back on the conference.

A central question in the questionnaire was the question: “Would you would like to attend the ICWPF2013 in case such is organized”. The reaction was very positive, 31 persons (three persons did not answer this question) shared the opinion that they would like to join the next conference. Only one person indicated what he/she will not attend the next ICWPF event.

Regarding the main reason for attending the conference, the most important one was “networking” (26 answers), closely followed by “content” (24) and “speakers” (6). In addition, the conference was able to live up to these expectations for all delegates. As a result, the rating of the event was also positive with 28 excellent or good ratings, whereas 4 participants replied fair and no one poor.

\(^1\) These were Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Greenland, Estonia, Russia, Canada, UK, Germany and the US.
In order to find out about the interest for the different sessions, the rating of the venue and the quality of the food, the respondents were asked to provide their opinion in detail. The result can be identified in the following table.

The questionnaire underlines the general positive attitudes of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Recent Status, Production &amp; Market</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: Health &amp; Product Quality</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Sustainability, Certification &amp; Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 4: Opportunities &amp; Challenges for the Prawn Sector</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food &amp; Beverage</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also shows that the most interesting speakers were holding presentations in session 1 and 4, which matches with the responses to the open question “additional comments”. The least appreciated session was number 3.

However, the overall response to the conference was positive and the results from the questionnaires matched the feedback that the organizers got during the conference.

The food and beverages were according to the standard. Additionally, the historical venue was appreciated, although it has to be pointed out that the acoustics proved to be a challenge to the audience.

---

2 You can find a list of the comments concerning this question attached to this document.
Conference Dinner:

The Conference dinner at Fishmongers’ Hall was booked by the majority of the participants (129 participators) and appreciated as an opportunity to get to know old and new contacts.
Organizers comment:

The conference brought together different stakeholders from within the sector, whereas the majority of the participants were representing the producers and traders. It was a conference where some delegates were already familiar with each other.

The organizer suggest for future events to attract more retailers and new actors from within the field in order to get relevant inspiration for the prawn industry. It might, for example, also be helpful to invite more speakers from other (Seafood-) sector.

A positive circumstance was noticed in the intention of the different actors to cooperate more in the future. The competition from warm water prawns in the market and the high demand of CWPs is creating a sense of partnership amongst the various stakeholders in order to face and overcome new challenges by the competitors.

Overall the organizer considers the conference a successful event because it enabled the participants to get to know other relevant (international) persons from the sector. This opinion was on the one hand confirmed by the feedback during the conference and on the other hand by the anonymous questionnaire.

The ICWPF2011 “restarted” the common activity in the Cold Water Prawn sector after a five years break. An ICWPF organized in 2013 seem to be a convenient opportunity for the sector to get together again. In case an ICWPF2013 is organized a 1.5 day or two days conference could be an opportunity to fulfill the delegates’ expectations concerning networking.

In 2012 more cooperation in workshops based on different topics could be another opportunity for the sector. The works in such workshops could create more “ownership to ICWPF” for the whole sector and could be the foundation for topics in ICWPF2013.
Comments from open questions of the questionnaire:

What was the most beneficial aspect of the conference?

- "the market presentation”
- "meeting industry players”
- “attributes of CWP”
- “presentation university Tromsø”
- “the last one 15.15-16.15”
- “the opportunity to hear what's going on in the industry, who is doing what and what countries are the most interesting for prawns”
- “new marketing opportunities”
- “future availability and commercial Information/indicators”
- “Attributes of Prawns, Media Messaging”
- “-networking and talks about the market”
- “giving a lot of good self-confidence for the whole industry, very educational speech from Michaela Aschan”
- “session one”
- “meeting all in the industry”
- “recent market info”
- “topic 1”
- “networking”
- “overall view”

Additional comments:

- “room and sound does not work, go to a professional conference hotel”
- “the acoustics made it difficult to hear”
- “more discussions, some topics too technical”
- “need a session for discussion”
- “for years now we hear problems but what about the opportunities?”
- “improvement in sound quality”
- “additional time for more interaction would be useful particularly exploring potential solutions to industry challenges”
- “Less speakers more time spare on content ie. Marketing, future quotas and impact and commercials”
- “difficult acoustics, venue otherwise was great”
- “A prior to the conference “What would you like to know about CWP?”
- “sound in conference could be better!”
- “Hold it in Canada 2013!”

Please specify main reason “other”

- “Media”