Hi Terry,

I hope you are well. I am forwarding a copy of recent correspondence I have had with Stuart Baird whilst Andy Rosie is on holiday.

The SARF PAMP-2 Report is due to be published on Wednesday and we have been trying to agree a common media position with all parties in order to minimize the controversy as and when it is noticed by the media. I believe that it is in all our interests to deal with such a sensitive subject delicately and proportionately.

I am therefore disappointed that SEPA is proposing to publish a statement of intent with regard to the future use of SLICE in Scotland and to seek to justify that with pieces of information collated to justify a position. The industry has been very concerned with regard to the future use of SLICE and we have been involved in numerous discussions with your colleagues to seek to find a way forward to the mutual benefit of all. At a stroke, a published position like this will become the centre of media attention and will make it difficult for some accommodation in the future.

I would ask you, at this point, to ask your colleagues to reconsider the specific point regarding SLICE in the paper and to engage with us to find a solution for the future use of SLICE which will be acceptable to all.

Regards

Scott

Scott Landsburgh, Chief Executive, Scottish Salmon Producers' Organisation Durn – Isla Road – Perth PH2 7HG 01738 587000 dslandsburgh@scottishsalmon.co.uk www.scottishsalmon.co.uk



From: Scott Landsburgh Sent: 08 August 2016 15:25

To: 'Baird, Stuart' <stuart.baird@sepa.org.uk>

Cc: John Webster <JWebster@scottishsalmon.co.uk>; Julie Edgar

<JEdgar@scottishsalmon.co.uk> **Subject:** RE: Confidential - SEPA sea lice article for contributions

Dear Stuart,

Thank you for the proposed SEPA article to be posted on your website. It is a fairly sizeable document and would not be the style (or content) to which SSPO would use when advising the public and the media. It is therefore not possible for us to make a contribution to your article as it would be critical of the stance you have taken on the future of SLICE.

However, I do recognize that you are a regulator and have a different perspective on public comment than we do.

There is some misrepresentation within your paper and pieces of information have been collated to justify a position with which we don't agree. In particular, your statement concerning the fate of SLICE is pre-emptive, controversial and could undermine commercial confidence in the industry.

Should you publish this statement in its current format, I suspect that it will lead to a good deal of media scrutiny which will seek to undermine the industry's reputation and will probably damage all of our reputations. I had hoped on Friday to agree a consensual position based upon mutual respect for all parties and to hold a media line based on openness (without divulging unestablished concerns) and reassurance, along with a professional determination to gain more understanding of the data to enable future decision making.

I still hope that we can issue a common statement to the media that we can all support. I will get something out tomorrow for approval.

Kind regards

Scott

Scott Landsburgh, Chief Executive, Scottish Salmon Producers' Organisation Durn – Isla Road – Perth PH2 7HG 01738 587000 dslandsburgh@scottishsalmon.co.uk www.scottishsalmon.co.uk

?

From: Baird, Stuart [mailto:stuart.baird@sepa.org.uk]
Sent: 05 August 2016 17:29

To: Scott Landsburgh <SLandsburgh@scottishsalmon.co.uk>; John Webster <<u>JWebster@scottishsalmon.co.uk</u>>Subject: Confidential - SEPA sea lice article for contributions

Dear Scott and John,

as discussed during the teleconference, please find a draft article attached, for your information, which aims to present a balanced view of some of the issues surrounding the control of sea-lice in light of the imminent publication of the SARF PAMP-2 report. We plan to publish the article on SEPA's online magazine 'SEPAView', shortly before the SARF report is published, on Wednesday 10 August.

We would very much like the article to be inclusive and would therefore like to offer SSPO the opportunity to provide a contribution to the article. If you would like to make a contribution to the article then can you please send this to me by the end of the day on Monday 8th August.

Once we have received all contributions we will re-circulate the article for a quick accuracy check before publishing.

Regards

Stuart