From: John Webster <JWebster@scottishsalmon.co.uk>
Sent: 01 July 2016 12:52
To: Richard Slaski
Cc: Alastair Mitchell; Adrian, Alex; Craig Burton; David Sandison; Douglas Sinclair; George Lees; Iain Sutherland; Nick Lake; Oliver Routledge; Piers Hart; rob.raynard@scotland.gsi.gov.uk; William Ritchie; Anton; [redacted]
Subject: Re: SARF098 PAMP Refresh

Richard
Thank you for sending this on. I will read the attachments as soon as I can and revert if I have any comments on the detail.
In the meantime, one or two initial thoughts on indents 2 and 3.
Emails from SAMS: without having read these, I wonder if the messages about further comment are coming from SAMS or from Tom/Kenny. I'm not convinced these are one and the same. SARF already has experience of people employed by SAMS failing to deliver in accordance with contractual requirements and this was addressed by senior officers of SAMS.
It strikes me that the team that did this work have had ample opportunity to say what they think; and if they had put a little more thought into what they've said so far, this saga might have been far less protracted than it has been. In all such circumstances, commissioned work can only ever tell part of the story, and I believe the project report already opines, in a number of respects, in an unwarranted way. It also strikes me that they seem to feel they have the right to have the last word when this is, after all, SARF's property to do with as the Board judges appropriate.
I wholeheartedly support your position on the identity of referees. It is not for contractors to know who we ask to referee reports or to judge who is fit to referee reports and who is no, and I would be very disappointed if there was any sort of implication that our referees either had some sort of agenda, or that they were not competent to do the job. If this is indeed the message, it sounds defensive and does those concerned no credit.
Press release: why on earth would we think about issuing a press release when, in the grand scheme of things, the work is not that significant? And why would we make an exception to the general rule that reports go on the website and that's that? I think SAMS should be instructed now that there will be no press release to accompany publication of the report on our website and that we would expect them not to issue their own. In my view, the same principle should apply re publication other than on the SARF website.
Regards
John

On 1 Jul 2016, at 12:06, Richard Slaski <r.slaski@sarf.org.uk> wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,
>
> There are several issues concerning the SARF098 PAMP Refresh project for your consideration:
>
> 1. **The final complete report document**
>
> This is attached as a PDF file with three components: a revised PREAMBLE for your consideration/approval, the SARF Review, and the original SAMS 2016 Report. Changes will have to be made to the inner front page eg ISBN etc. Subject to your approval, this "package " will be published on our website.
>
> 2. **The emails received from SAMS**
>
> These are attached in a single Word document. It seems that there are two main issues for the SARF Board to consider:
>
> - SAMS seem to be requesting the ability to add some further 'comment text'. Please let us have your thoughts on this, but we would point out that SAMS had an opportunity to amend

their report after its first draft. We would also be concerned whether, once the Board saw any new 'comment' from SAMS, it would feel the need to then add its own further 'comment on the comment'.

- SAMS is concerned about clarity on the identity of some of the referees, but on this point SARF's rules are very clear: **the identity of all referees is always strictly protected**. If details about referees do emerge in the fullness of time, it will be because someone has broken that fundamental SARF rule.

3. **Press Release**

Tom asks about a joint press release. SARF does not ordinarily get involved in such matters, and we wouldn't know who to send a 'press release' to if we did try to create one. Nevertheless, we are very happy to take advice and instruction from the Board on this: many of you will have much more experience on such matters within your organisations. It might be seen as helpful if a suitable joint press release i.e. SARF and SAMS is produced.

At this stage we would ask Directors for their feedback:

- Your **approval** of the text amendments to the Preamble section. If you wish to suggest further amendments to the text, please cc. all colleagues in order to facilitate the subsequent adoption of any changes
- Your thoughts on the issue of a Press Release, specifically:
    - Does SARF need to prepare one
    - If so, should it be a joint one with SAMS
    - Can your organisation assist with suggestions about what the Release should contain
- Please let me have any further comments to both this covering email and any aspect of the proposed publication of the "package" on our website.

If you could respond by **Wednesday 11th July**, that would be most helpful.

The final stage of consultation relating to this project will involve the final approval of the Board to publish the full report "package" – if necessary as amended by this current consultation exercise.

Kind regards,
Richard

Richard Slaski
Secretariat
Scottish Aquaculture Research Forum (SARF)
PO Box 7223 Pitlochry PH16 9AF
Tel: 01738 479486
Company Registered in Scotland - SC267177
Charity Registered in Scotland - SC035745
EU State Aid Registration No: X939 2009
Website: www.sarf.org.uk

Confidentiality This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from the disclosure under law. If you are not the intended recipient (s) please note that any form of distribution, copying or use of this communication or the information in it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

<SARF098 - WHOLE DOCUMENT 30 June 2016.pdf>

<SARF098 Emails Received from SAMS.docx>