

Reframing the sustainable seafood narrative

Michael F Tlusty¹

Peter Tyedmers²

Megan Bailey³

Friederike Ziegler⁴

Patrik JG Henriksson^{5,6,11}

Christophe Béné⁷

Simon Bush⁸

Richard Newton⁹

Frank Asche¹⁰

David C Little⁹

Max Troell^{11, 5}

Malin Jonell⁵

¹ School for the Environment, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Boston MA 02125 USA
michael.tlusty@umb.edu

² School for Resource and Environmental Studies, Dalhousie University, PO Box 15000
Halifax, NS B3Z 1B5 Canada. peter.tyedmers@dal.ca

³ Marine Affairs Program, Dalhousie University, PO Box 15000 Halifax, NS B3Z 1B5 Canada

⁴ RISE Research Institutes of Sweden, PO Box 5401, 402 29 Göteborg, Sweden

⁵ Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Kräftriket 2B, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden

⁶ WorldFish, Jalan Batu Maung, Batu Maung, 11960 Bayan Lepas, Penang, Malaysia

⁷ International Center for Tropical Agriculture, Decision and Policy Analysis Programme, Cali
Colombia

⁸ Environmental Policy Group, Wageningen University, Hollandseweg 1 6706 KN,
Wageningen, The Netherlands

⁹ Institute of Aquaculture, University of Stirling. FK9 4LA UK.

¹⁰ Institute for Sustainable Food Systems and School of Forest Resources and Conservation,
University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-057, USA

¹¹ Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, SE-104 05
Stockholm, Sweden

Corresponding Author: Michael Tlusty, School for the Environment, University of
Massachusetts at Boston, Boston MA 02125 USA michael.tlusty@umb.edu

Acknowledgements

We thank the numerous people involved in the broader work to improve fisheries and aquaculture production across the globe. We also thank D. Love and an anonymous reviewer for challenging our presentation and improving the quality of this work.

1 **Abstract**

2 The dominant sustainable seafood narrative is one where developed world markets catalyze
3 practice improvements by fisheries and aquaculture producers that enhance ocean health. The
4 narrow framing of seafood sustainability in terms of aquaculture or fisheries management and
5 ocean health has contributed to the omission of these important food production systems from
6 the discussion on global food system sustainability. This omission is problematic. Seafood makes
7 critical contributions to food and nutrition security, particularly in low income countries, and is
8 often a more sustainable and nutrient rich source of animal sourced-food than terrestrial meat
9 production. We argue that to maximize the positive contributions that seafood can make to
10 sustainable food systems, the conventional narratives that prioritize seafood's role in promoting
11 ‘ocean health’ need to be reframed and cover a broader set of environmental and social
12 dimensions of sustainability. The focus of the narrative also needs to move from a producer-
13 centric to a ‘whole chain’ perspective that includes greater inclusion of the later stages with a
14 focus on food waste, by-product utilization and consumption. Moreover, seafood should not be
15 treated as a single aggregated item in sustainability assessments. Rather, it should be recognized
16 as a highly diverse set of foods, with variable ecological impacts, edible yield rates and
17 nutritional profiles. Clarifying discussions around seafood will help to deepen the integration of
18 fisheries and aquaculture into the global agenda on sustainable food production, trade and
19 consumption, and assist governments, private sector actors, NGOs and academics alike in
20 identifying where improvements can be made.

22 **Introduction**

23 ‘Seafood’ includes fish and other aquatic organisms originating from fisheries and aquaculture in
24 both marine and freshwater environments. In the late 1990s, a movement started to lessen what
25 was widely seen as the negative impacts of seafood production activities on source ecosystems .
26 Academics, NGOs, the private sector and policy makers created a narrative to achieve
27 sustainable seafood where developed world markets desired improvements by fisheries and
28 aquaculture producers with the outcome being to help improve ocean health (Ward and Phillips,
29 2008). Two decades into this movement, seafood remains poorly integrated into public and
30 private food policy and research (Béné et al., 2015).

31 National food security policies, goals and strategies rarely incorporate seafood (Little et al.,
32 2018). Seafood is, however, increasingly considered as a source of protein and micronutrients
33 (Hicks et al., 2019) with lower environmental impacts than competing terrestrially-based
34 proteins (Parker et al., 2018; Poore and Nemecek, 2018). It has also been shown to make
35 substantial contributions to local economies and human nutrition, particularly in low income
36 countries (Asche et al., 2015; Bene et al., 2015; Belton et al., 2018; Beveridge et al., 2013; Hlpe,
37 2014; Rööß et al., 2017a, 2017b). Yet, policy visions for ‘blue growth’ often focus solely on
38 production, rather than benefits from trade or consumption (e.g. SAPEA, 2017). Developed
39 markets (and the NGOs and certification programs supporting them) advocate for sustainable
40 seafood as a means for improving the health of the ocean ecosystems (Stokstad, 2011). Paying
41 little attention to other aspects of aquaculture and fisheries beyond the production phase (FAO,
42 2018) prevents seafood from being discussed within a wider food systems and food security
43 context (National Academies Press, 2015). These diverse and partial policy positions blur both
44 environmental sustainability concerns and the contributions seafood makes to food security,
45 human health and wellbeing (Avadí et al., 2018; Jonell et al., 2013; Kurokawa et al., 2011;
46 Pelletier et al., 2007; Ziegler et al., 2013). Yet this is not solely a policy oversight issue. NGOs
47 working on this narrative have joined together as the focused Conservation Alliance for Seafood
48 Solutions (www.solutionsforseafood.com) which has reinforced an environmental agenda for
49 seafood over sustainable seafood’s role in local and global food systems. Conversely, research
50 on ‘food systems’, a field that highlights the integrated nature of production and consumption
51 (see Béné et al., 2019), has also largely ignored the role and contribution of seafood (Halpern et

al., 2019). As evidence, only 4% of ‘food systems’ papers (n = 4,130) listed in Web of Science include the terms aquaculture, fish or seafood.¹

In this paper we argue the sustainable seafood narrative needs to be reframed to more accurately represent the present and future role of seafood in global food systems. Doing so can create greater coherence between state and NGO attempts to steer seafood sustainability. Sustainability in a broad sense is operationally defined as production that balances socio-economic benefits while maintaining environmental integrity now and into the future (Asche et al., 2018; Kuhlman and Farrington, 2010; Tlusty and Thorsen, 2016). However, the study and measure of sustainability is often reduced to a narrow, and usually environmental, single-factor dimensionality (Béné et al., 2019, Fig. 1), such as stock status and management effectiveness, or habitat impacts of fish farming. Such reduction opens up opportunity for strategic positioning, where the sustainability claims will differ based on the definitions and metrics specific to NGO, industry, and / or national interest groups. The political nature of such decisions means that completely overcoming such conflicts is unlikely. Nevertheless reframing some of the misleading narratives that shape the choices of different sustainability metrics can help redirect sustainability agendas (and their metrics) to be more aligned and ultimately more effective. In the rest of this paper we reframe three key misleading narratives for sustainable seafood. First, seafood’s role in creating a healthy ocean needs to be reframed into a vision that integrates seafood sustainability within a broader global food system framework (Fig. 1). Second, the focus of improvement needs to be reframed beyond the narrow scope of producer practices and extended to broad issues that may arise at other or multiple nodes of the value chain (Fig. 1). Third, ‘seafood’ is a broad category, and this needs to be acknowledged as a heterogeneous category of food with equally heterogeneous environmental, nutritional and social impacts. The rest of this perspective paper discusses the role, focus, and categories of seafood, emphasizing how they need to be reframed to best integrate fisheries and aquaculture products into the global agenda on sustainable food production, trade and consumption.

1. Avoid the ‘healthy oceans’ trap

¹ Using the search string ‘food systems’ AND ‘aquacultur* OR fish* OR seafood’

Ocean health is a global public environmental good. Although marine fish stocks and a large portion of aquaculture are dependent on healthy oceans (Kleisner et al., 2013; Naylor et al., 2000), it is unrealistic for the seafood narrative to create a direct causal link between the implementation of better practices by fishers and fish farmers alone and improved ocean health. We argue that framing seafood sustainability primarily in terms of ‘ocean health’ can blur the role of seafood in global food systems in two ways.

First, NGO performance indicators largely target the effects of fishing and fish farming that include unregulated and unreported fishing, destructive fishing methods, the conversion/loss of coastal habitat, and use of marine ingredients in aquaculture (see for e.g. Agnew et al., 2009; Naylor et al., 2009). While critical, the ocean has a myriad of increasing threats beyond, but impactful to, seafood including but not limited to dead zones, plastic litter, acidification and climate change, and changes in ocean circulation (Vázquez-Rowe, 2020). We argue that the sustainable seafood movement, and all its actors, needs to broaden its scope regarding sustainability dimensions included in standards, assessments and campaigns, in order to substantively contribute to ocean health and food systems. In recent years, some NGOs and certification standards have begun to expand their focus to include indirect environmental impacts or social sustainability (e.g. MSC now considering social dimensions and the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch has an energy metric). However, given the need for immediacy of action (Lamontagne et al., 2019), this pace of change has not been enough for these schemes and programs to rightfully claim that their governance model is leading to ocean health. An important step in this direction is to move from a targeting a single issue (ocean health) to consider a broader set of environmental and socioeconomic impacts (Kittinger et al., 2017; Vázquez-Rowe, 2020, see Fig 1). This does not mean exempting seafood from applying good practices for reducing its negative environmental impacts. Rather, it should be considered as any other activity impacting the ocean and leading to trade-offs that need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Second, the ocean health narrative draws attention away from a suite of non-ocean-health issues, including the linkages between aquatic and terrestrial food production systems and impacts from freshwater aquaculture. The most prominent of these are aquatic-terrestrial linkages are through feed. Agricultural products are used in aquaculture (Froehlich et al., 2018;

Newton and Little, 2018; Troell et al., 2014), and conversely, marine ingredients provide inputs for terrestrial livestock production (Shepherd and Jackson, 2013). Similarities in land feed-crop use, water use, and effluent impacts mean that fed aquaculture has more in common with terrestrial animal agriculture than with capture fisheries (Roberts et al., 2015). Fuller recognition of the links to terrestrial systems and their environmental implications will require us to move NGOs and policy makers to move beyond ‘ocean health’ perspectives. As we argue in the following section, this will also require a more systemic understanding of seafood sustainability that extends far beyond the practices of fishers and fish farmers alone.

2. Improvements throughout the entire value chain

The sustainable seafood narrative has been overly narrow in its approach by offloading action for improvement on the shoulders of producers (Bailey et al., 2018; Bush, 2017). This productionist bias (Fouilleux et al., 2017) places a major burden on fishers and farmers frequently located in low-income countries, while actors located throughout the rest of the seafood value chain receive far less attention and pressure to improve (Bailey et al., 2018; Bailey and Egels-Zandén, 2016; Bush et al., 2013; Roheim et al., 2018). The lack of coordinated messaging of the theory of change for seafood sustainability (Roheim et al., 2018) also places the control of messaging in the hands of high-income (consuming) countries, while change through action is required by low or middle income (producing) countries (Bailey et al., 2018; Bailey and Egels-Zandén, 2016). While the sustainability of both wild and fed aquatic production require a wider set of indicators of sustainability (Ziegler et al., 2016), as discussed above (Fig. 1), a food system approach would extend responsibility to all actors in the value chain and include placing more focus on service/input providers, processors, distributors, retailers, and consumers.

Across the value chain, a broader sustainable seafood narrative would include considerations of energy across production and distribution (Tlustý and Lagueux, 2009), processing efficiency (Stevens et al., 2018), food loss (FAO, 2011; Love et al., 2015), and social justice issues (Bailey and Egels-Zandén, 2016) related to production, trade and ultimately consumption (Bush, 2018; Pelletier and Tyedmers, 2008). Waste of various types permeates this list, and all wasted food represents embodied energy, nutrients, and water (Grizzetti et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2013; Vittuari et al., 2016). Any sustainability gains brought about by better

production will be lost if downstream actors do not value the food. The seafood sustainability narrative should adopt the mantra that *it is not sustainable if it is thrown away*.

To better address the full range of issues related to seafood sustainability the attention of the narrative should follow the efforts developed by the Global Initiative on Food Loss and Waste Reduction (FAO, 2011). This would align the seafood narrative with efforts at a larger, food system perspective. Minimizing waste is important post-production for seafood given the estimated 40-47% of edible product in the U.S. that ends up as food waste (Love et al., 2015), with North America seemingly wasting more food than any other region (FAO 2011). More attention also needs to be given to the circular use of by-products from seafood processing (Cao et al., 2015; Newton et al., 2014; Rustad et al., 2011; Stevens et al., 2018). These by-products have value for human consumption, terrestrial livestock and nutraceutical and pharmaceutical products (Newton et al., 2014). Recent estimates are that a third of global fishmeal is now from by-product sources but could be significantly increased if processing of seafood was more efficient (Jackson and Newton, 2016). Overconsumption of protein is in itself a form of food waste, as excess consumption is functionally excreted as opposed to being stored (Tlustý and Tyedmers, 2015; Wu et al., 2014). Over-consumptive waste at the consumer level has the potential to cancel any sustainability gains made at the producer level. This ultimately calls into question the equity of food distribution. Given the rich micronutrient profile of most seafood, efforts should be invested to improve access to seafood across socio-economic communities and encourage groups that commonly suffer from nutrient deficiency to adopt more seafood in their diets.

3. Embrace the diversity of seafood

The ‘seafood’ in the sustainable seafood narrative encompasses around 2,500 species (FAO, 2018; Hornborg et al., 2016) across all trophic levels from filter feeders to top carnivores, spanning finfishes, mollusks, crustaceans, cnidarians, echinoderms, amphibians, and reptiles, that can all be harvested from the wild or farmed on land, including freshwater or in the sea. This multitude of species is typically represented in reports as crude sectoral categories (e.g. fish, farmed fish, trawl fisheries) or as a single animal-source food (fish) next to beef, pork, and/or chicken (Clark and Tilman, 2017; Poore and Nemecek, 2018; Tilman and Clark, 2014). The

168 reality is that assessing the environmental impact and/or nutritional benefits of seafood requires a
169 more detailed consideration of different combinations of species, production, and processing
170 techniques (Hallström et al. 2019; Pelletier et al., 2007; Troell et al., 2014; Ziegler et al., 2013).

171 The bulk of research and advice by sustainable seafood programs is focused on those few
172 species groups traded on international markets largely destined for consumption in high income
173 countries (Ward and Phillips, 2008). Likewise, consumption patterns within high income
174 countries do not follow global production patterns (Jonell et al., 2019). In the U.S., ten species
175 account for 84% of all seafood consumed (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018). Within
176 aquaculture, shrimp, pangasius, tilapia, and salmon, are the groups that are particularly popular
177 in high income countries (Belton and Bush, 2014) yet represent only ~24% of global aquaculture
178 production by mass (FAO, 2018). A broader system perspective would address species dominant
179 in the global market. Here, 44 species represent 90% of global aquaculture production (Troell et
180 al., 2017), with seven of the top ten globally cultured species by mass being carps (FAO, 2018).
181 Taking this larger spectrum of aquatic products into account across the global food system would
182 enable greater recognition of those species that contribute to supplies of animal-source food,
183 rather than only those that are dominant in markets in high income countries.

184 One consequence of ‘lumping’ seafood into a single category is illustrated by exploring
185 the metrics used to make such comparisons. Using the common currency of energy, measured as
186 the edible energy return on investment, seafood can vary from specific case extremes of carp
187 (0.70) to shrimp (0.014) (Tyedmers, 2004). These values span the range of all terrestrial animal
188 proteins (Parker et al., 2018; Pelletier et al., 2011, 2007; Roberts et al., 2015). When averaged
189 (typically unweighted), the result is a value for seafood that homogenizes species, stock,
190 production technology and product form, and is as misleading as presenting a single average for
191 all terrestrial animal production systems. Lumping species as seafood leads to increased
192 substitutability of various forms and species (Asche, 2008), resulting in masking where price
193 signals indicating ecosystem change are not relayed to consumers (Crona et al., 2016; Deutsch et
194 al., 2011).

195 To advance food systems thinking for seafood production, more attention needs to be
196 given to generating and reporting data that highlight both the benefits and the challenges of each

species and how they are produced and processed. Illuminating the full range of species involved by more precise indicators of environmental and nutritional performance can better highlight the role seafood plays relative to other animal source foods. It can also demonstrate the relative importance of different fish within and across fisheries and aquaculture (Hallström et al., 2019). This approach will also have the direct effect of identifying the most impactful species to produce and that need improvement as well as discouraging poor performance that erodes confidence in aquaculture and fisheries at large.

A similar lumping is also observed nutritionally, through two broad oversimplifications. On one hand, seafood is typically seen simply as a source of ‘protein’, which overshadows its important role in providing micronutrients and essential fatty acids (Béné et al., 2015; Beveridge et al., 2013). On the other, the strong emphasis placed on essential fatty acids (EFA), particularly in high income countries, obscures the role of fish and shellfish in providing a wide range of micronutrients beyond EFAs - such as highly bioavailable micronutrients, including iodine, selenium, and vitamins B12 and D. However, micronutrient composition varies markedly between seafood products (Bimbo, 2007; Hallström et al., 2019; Vaitla et al., 2018). Furthermore, the contribution that seafood consumption makes to human nutrition is also dependent on the intersection of health and fisheries/aquaculture policies (Love et al., 2017) that must meet the needs of specific requirements of different types of consumers (e.g. children, pregnant women, the elderly), and for other social-economic factors known to impact nutritional security.

The mechanisms through which various types of seafood complement other ingredients to make for an optimal diet in different contexts is critical, especially for essential dietary nutrients in short supply to key demographics (women during pregnancy, children, etc.). The nutritional implications of substituting wild fish for farmed fish has been identified as an area of increasing concern for human nutrition (Belton et al., 2014; Little et al., 2010). Moreover, recent intentional reductions in EFA levels in farmed salmon (Shepherd et al., 2017; Sprague et al., 2016) is an example of how sustainability efforts to limit the fish inputs for aquaculture feeds (Naylor et al., 2009) may drive a global trend towards a less than optimal health outcome. Alternatives (algae, and engineered crops and yeast) are being developed, but a conscious decision is required to prevent any tradeoffs that reduce human nutritional benefit.

Ultimately, food systems can best achieve resilience and provisioning security by addressing the multifunctionality (economic, ecological, and social) of food (Hodbod and Eakin, 2015). This will allow for sustainable intensification (socially and environmentally sustainable responses that are economically efficient, Little et al., 2018) with the benefit that these systems will track environmental price signals (Godfray, 2015). This is occurring in Sweden (Brugård Konde et al., 2015) and elsewhere (Gonzalez Fischer and Garnett, 2016) where environmental performance of seafood production has been integrated into models of population-level food impact assessments, national food security planning and dietary guidelines. This demonstrates that terrestrial and aquatic food systems can work synergistically to address food systems sustainability.

Conclusion - reframing the sustainable seafood narrative for greater inclusion into the global agenda on ecosystem and human health

By highlighting the interdependence between aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems and placing seafood in the wider food system we can better understand and act in response to the varied role that fisheries and aquaculture production plays in the equitable delivery of high quality low-impact food for human consumption. This is a specific case of a broader call to equally address impacts of all food production to determine linkages underlying a better understanding of the true cumulative impact of our current food system (Halpern et al., 2019). Applying a food systems approach to seafood could enable the development of more effective state regulations and private-voluntary tools to promote more sustainable production along the entire supply chain (Bailey et al., 2018). This would help NGOs, industry, government and academia alike to move beyond the simple equating ‘sustainable seafood’ with ‘ocean health’ and allow for integration of seafood into wider policy debates centering on planetary health, food equity, and human nutrition.

Overall, we identify three direct benefits of taking a ‘seafood systems approach’, building on our arguments above.

First, conventional narrow narratives that prioritize ocean health need to be replaced with broader, more comprehensive visions of sustainable seafood production. NGOs and businesses

communicating improvements in sourcing need to address outcomes honestly. Importantly, a systemic approach will move research and policy alike beyond proximate impacts of seafood production. Instead it can enable us to understand the contributions that a full seafood system makes, alongside those from agriculture, to a set of common challenges including climate change, eutrophication, etc. along with linkages of seafood production to the wider context of each other (i.e. fisheries and aquaculture) and inter-connected terrestrial systems. From this perspective species/production/supply system combinations of seafood should move to appropriate metrics that facilitate comparison not only with one another, but also with terrestrial animal and crop production.

Second, there is a need to broaden the focus to advance beyond the productionist agenda that identifies producers, primarily in low income countries, as being mainly responsible for seafood sustainability. Instead, research and policy should expand sustainability problems and solutions away from a fixation on production and producers, to include trade and traders, processing and processors, and consumption and consumers. In that sense, a food systems perspective would highlight better the interlinkages between these practices and actors, showing that positive social economic and environmental changes can be made along the value chains that can affect sustainability.

Third, seafood should not be treated as a single broad aggregated category in sustainability assessments, but rather should be recognized as being differentiated based on varying production systems, edible yields and nutritional profiles. Communication of the benefits and impacts of seafood must adopt a nuanced approach that better accounts for the potential environmental and social consequences of this important food, and the ways in which environmental externalities can be reduced through the consumption of lower impact foods. Discussing fisheries and aquaculture products as part of a food system will increase our ability to develop lower impact future food solutions and create a more food and nutrition secure future (Hicks et al., 2019).

This paper is not the first to call for consideration of seafood within a food systems context (Béné et al., 2015; Olson et al., 2014). However, the continued lack of food system approaches to seafood sustainability continues to raise concern among the seafood research community. Many of these production systems and supply chains have laudable attributes that can be leveraged to help improve the environmental and social impact performance of food

systems globally. By developing a seafood systems approach, fisheries and aquaculture can be mainstreamed into the global agenda on ecosystem and human health. While such inclusion is not a panacea for all impacts that arise from producing food, it will contribute toward a more food-secure future.

Literature Cited

- Agnew, D.J., Pearce, J., Pramod, G., Peatman, T., Watson, R., Beddington, J.R., Pitcher, T.J., 2009. Estimating the worldwide extent of illegal fishing. *PLoS One* 4. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0004570>
- Asche, F., 2008. Farming the sea. *Mar. Resour. Econ.* <https://doi.org/10.2307/42629678>
- Asche, F., Bellemare, M.F., Roheim, C., Smith, M.D., Tveteras, S., 2015. Fair enough? Food security and the international trade of seafood. *World Dev.* 67, 151–160.
- Asche, F., Garlock, T.M., Anderson, J.L., Bush, S.R., Smith, M.D., Anderson, C.M., Chu, J., Garrett, K.A., Lem, A., Lorenzen, K., Oglend, A., Tveteras, S., Vannuccini, S., 2018. Three pillars of sustainability in fisheries. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 115, 11221–11225. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1807677115>
- Avadí, A., Henriksson, P.J.G., Vázquez-Rowe, I., Ziegler, F., 2018. Towards improved practices in Life Cycle Assessment of seafood and other aquatic products. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 23, 979–981. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-018-1454-8>
- Bailey, M., Egels-Zandén, N., 2016. Transparency for just seafood systems. *Solutions* 7, 66–73.
- Bailey, M., Packer, H., Schiller, L., Tlustý, M., Swartz, W., 2018. The role of corporate social responsibility in creating a Seussian world of seafood sustainability. *Fish Fish.* 19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12289>
- Belton, B., Bush, S.R., 2014. Beyond net deficits: New priorities for an aquacultural geography. *Geogr. J.* 180, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12035>
- Belton, B., Bush, S.R., Little, D.C., 2018. Not just for the wealthy: Rethinking farmed fish consumption in the Global South. *Glob. Food Sec.* 16, 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2017.10.005>

314 Belton, B., van Asseldonk, I.J.M., Thilsted, S.H., 2014. Faltering fisheries and ascendant
 315 aquaculture: Implications for food and nutrition security in Bangladesh. *Food Policy* 44,
 316 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2013.11.003>

317 Béné, C., Barange, M., Subasinghe, R., Pinstруп-Andersen, P., Merino, G., Hemre, G.I.,
 318 Williams, M., 2015. Feeding 9 billion by 2050 – Putting fish back on the menu. *Food Secur.*
 319 7, 261–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-015-0427-z>

320 Béné, C., Oosterveer, P., Lamotte, L., Brouwer, I.D., Haan, S. De, Prager, S.D., Talsma, E.F.,
 321 Khoury, C.K., 2019. When food systems meet sustainability – Current narratives and
 322 implications for actions. *World Dev.* 113, 116–130.
 323 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.08.011>

324 Beveridge, M.C.M., Thilsted, S.H., Phillips, M.J., Metian, M., Troell, M., Hall, S.J., 2013.
 325 Meeting the food and nutrition needs of the poor: the role of fish and the opportunities and
 326 challenges emerging from the rise of aquaculture ^a. *J. Fish Biol.* 83, n/a-n/a.
 327 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.12187>

328 Bimbo, A.P., 2007. Current and future sources of raw materials for the long-chain omega-3 fatty
 329 acid market. *Lipid Technol.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/lite.200700057>

330 Brugård Konde, Å., Bjerselius, R., Haglund, L., Jansson, A., Pearson, M., Sanner Färnstrand, J.,
 331 2015. Swedish dietary guidelines-risk and benefit management report. Uppsala, Sweden.

332 Bush, S.R., 2018. Understanding the potential of eco-certification in salmon and shrimp
 333 aquaculture value chains. *Aquaculture* 493, 376–383.
 334 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2017.07.027>

335 Bush, S.R., 2017. Certify sustainable retailers?, in: *Sustainable Food Futures*.
 336 Earthscan/Routledge.

337 Bush, S.R., Belton, B., Hall, D., Vandergeest, P., Murray, F.J., Ponte, S., Oosterveer, P., Islam,
 338 M.S., Mol, A.P.J., Hatanaka, M., 2013. Certify Sustainable Aquaculture? *Science* (80-.).
 339 341, 1067–1068.

340 Cao, L., Naylor, R., Henriksson, P., Leadbitter, D., Metian, M., Troell, M., Zhang, W., 2015.
 341 China’s aquaculture and the world’s wild fisheries. *Science* (80-.).

342 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260149>

343 Clark, M., Tilman, D., 2017. Comparative analysis of environmental impacts of agricultural
344 production systems, agricultural input efficiency, and food choice. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 12,
345 64016. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa6cd5](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa6cd5)

346 Crona, B.I., Daw, T.M., Swartz, W., Norström, A. V., Nyström, M., Thyresson, M., Folke, C.,
347 Hentati-Sundberg, J., Österblom, H., Deutsch, L., Troell, M., 2016. Masked, diluted and
348 drowned out: how global seafood trade weakens signals from marine ecosystems. *Fish Fish.*
349 17, 1175–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12109>

350 Deutsch, L., Troell, M., Limburg, K., Huitric, M., 2011. Trade of Fisheries Products-implications
351 for marine ecosystems and their services, in: Köllner, T. (Ed.), *Ecosystem Services and*
352 *Global Trade of Natural Resources Ecology, Economics and Policies*. Routledge, London,
353 UK, p. 304.

354 FAO, 2018. State of world fisheries and aquaculture, Food & Agriculture Org.

355 FAO, 2011. Global food losses and food waste - Extent, causes and prevention., in: SAVE
356 FOOD: An Initiative on Food Loss and Waste Reduction.
357 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0126>

358 Fouilleux, E., Bricas, N., Alpha, A., 2017. ‘ Feeding 9 billion people ’: global food security
359 debates and the productionist trap 1763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2017.1334084>

360 Froehlich, H.E., Runge, C.A., Gentry, R.R., Gaines, S.D., Halpern, B.S., 2018. Comparative
361 terrestrial feed and land use of an aquaculture-dominant world. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
362 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1801692115>

363 Godfray, H.C.J., 2015. The debate over sustainable intensification. *Food Secur.* 7, 199–208.
364 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-015-0424-2>

365 Gonzalez Fischer, C., Garnett, T., 2016. Plates, pyramids, planet, Food Climate Research
366 Network. [https://doi.org/ISBN 978-92-5-109222-4](https://doi.org/ISBN%20978-92-5-109222-4)

367 Grizzetti, B., Pretato, U., Lassaletta, L., Billen, G., Garnier, J., 2013. The contribution of food
368 waste to global and European nitrogen pollution. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 33, 186–195.

369 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2013.05.013>

370 Hallström, E., Bergman, K., Mifflin, K., Parker, R.W., Tyedmers, P., Troell, M., Ziegler, F., n.d.
 371 Combined climate and nutritional performance of seafoods consumed in Sweden.

372 Halpern, B.S., Cottrell, R.S., Blanchard, J.L., Bouwman, L., Froehlich, H.E., 2019. Putting all
 373 foods on the same table : Achieving sustainable food systems requires full accounting 116,
 374 18152–18156. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1913308116>

375 Hicks, C.C., Cohen, P.J., Graham, N.A.J., Nash, K.L., Allison, E.H., Lima, C.D., Mills, D.J.,
 376 Roscher, M., Thilsted, S.H., Thorne-lyman, A.L., Macneil, M.A., 2019. Harnessing global
 377 fisheries to tackle micronutrient deficiencies. *Nature*. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1592-6)
 378 1592-6

379 Hlpe, 2014. Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture for food security and nutrition. A report by the
 380 High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, commissioned by the
 381 Committee on World Food Security, Rome.

382 Hodbod, J., Eakin, H., 2015. Adapting a social-ecological resilience framework for food systems.
 383 *J. Environ. Stud. Sci.* 5, 474–484. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-015-0280-6>

384 Hornborg, S., Bergman, K., Ziegler, F., 2016. The drivers of fisheries and aquaculture
 385 production in the EU. SUSFANS Report No., 1–91.

386 Jackson, A., Newton, R., 2016. Project to model the use of fisheries byproducts in the production
 387 of marine ingredients with special reference to omega-3 fatty acids EPA and DHA. Stirling
 388 UK.

389 Jonell, M., Phillips, M., Rönnbäck, P., Troell, M., 2013. Eco-certification of farmed seafood:
 390 Will it make a difference? *Ambio* 42, 659–674. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-013-0409-3>

391 Jonell, M., Tlusty, M.F., Troell, M., Rönnbäck, P., 2019. Certifying farmed seafood, in: Vogt, M.
 392 (Ed.), *Sustainability Certification Schemes in the Agricultural and Natural Resource*
 393 *Sectors: Outcomes for Society and the Environment*. Routledge, New York, pp. 157–178.
 394 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203701737-7>

395 Kittinger, J.N., Teh, L.C.L., Allison, E.H., Bennett, N.J., Crowder, L.B., Finkbeiner, E.M.,

396 Hicks, C., Scarton, C.G., Nakamura, K., Ota, Y., Young, J., Alifano, A., Apel, A., Arbib,
 397 A., Bishop, L., Boyle, M., Cisneros-Montemayor, A.M., Hunter, P., Le Cornu, E., Levine,
 398 M., Jones, R.S., Koehn, J.Z., Marschke, M., Mason, J.G., Micheli, F., McClenachan, L.,
 399 Opal, C., Peacey, J., Peckham, S.H., Schemmel, E., Solis-Rivera, V., Swartz, W., Wilhelm,
 400 T. 'Aulani, 2017. Committing to socially responsible seafood: Science (80-.). 356, 912–
 401 913. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam9969>

402 Kleisner, K.M., Longo, C., Coll, M., Halpern, B.S., Hardy, D., Katona, S.K., Le Manach, F.,
 403 Pauly, D., Rosenberg, A.A., Samhour, J.F., Scarborough, C., Rashid Sumaila, U., Watson,
 404 R., Zeller, D., 2013. Exploring patterns of seafood provision revealed in the global ocean
 405 health index. *Ambio* 42, 910–922. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-013-0447-x>

406 Kuhlman, T., Farrington, J., 2010. What is Sustainability? *Sustainability* 2, 3436–3448.
 407 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su2113436>

408 Kurokawa, T., Koshio, M., Kaiya, H., Hashimoto, H., Nomura, K., Uji, S., Awaji, M., Gen, K.,
 409 Tanaka, H., 2011. Distribution of pepsinogen- and ghrelin-producing cells in the digestive
 410 tract of Japanese eel (*Anguilla japonica*) during metamorphosis and the adult stage. *Gen.*
 411 *Comp. Endocrinol.* 173, 475–482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2011.07.008>

412 Lamontagne, J.R., Reed, P.M., Marangoni, G., Keller, K., Garner, G.G., 2019. Robust abatement
 413 pathways to tolerable climate futures require immediate global action. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 9,
 414 290–294. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0426-8>

415 Little, D.C., Barman, B.K., Belton, B., Beveridge, M.C., Bush, S.J., Dabaddie, L., Demaine, H.,
 416 Edwards, P., Haque, M.M., Kibria, G., Morales, E., Murray, F.J., Leschen, W. a,
 417 Nandeesh, M.C., Sukadi, F., 2010. Alleviating poverty through aquaculture: progress,
 418 opportunities and improvements, in: *Farming the Waters for People and Food. Proceedings*
 419 *of the Global Conference on Aquaculture* .

420 Little, D.C., Young, J.A., Zhang, W., Newton, R.W., Al Mamun, A., Murray, F.J., 2018.
 421 Sustainable intensification of aquaculture value chains between Asia and Europe: A
 422 framework for understanding impacts and challenges. *Aquaculture* 493, 338–354.
 423 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2017.12.033>

424 Liu, J., Lundqvist, J., Weinberg, J., Gustafsson, J., 2013. Food losses and waste in china and
 425 their implication for water and land. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47, 10137–10144.
 426 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es401426b>

427 Love, D.C., Fry, J.P., Milli, M.C., Neff, R.A., 2015. Wasted seafood in the United States:
 428 Quantifying loss from production to consumption and moving toward solutions. *Glob.*
 429 *Environ. Chang.* 35, 116–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.013>

430 Love, D.C., Pinto da Silva, P., Olson, J., Fry, J.P., Clay, P.M., 2017. Fisheries, food, and health
 431 in the USA: the importance of aligning fisheries and health policies. *Agric. Food Secur.* 6,
 432 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-017-0093-9>

433 National Academies Press, 2015. A Framework for Assessing Effects of the Food System, A
 434 Framework for Assessing Effects of the Food System. The National Academies Press,
 435 Washington, DC. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18846>

436 National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018. Fisheries of the United States 2017, NOAA Current
 437 Fishery Statistics No. 2017. Fishery Statistics Division, Silver Spring, MD.

438 Naylor, R.L., Goldburg, R.J., Primavera, J.H., Kautsky, N., Beveridge, M.C.M., Clay, J., Folke,
 439 C., Lubchenco, J., Mooney, H., Troell, M., 2000. Effect of aquaculture on world fish
 440 supplies. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35016500>

441 Naylor, R.L., Hardy, R.W., Bureau, D.P., Chiu, A., Elliott, M., Farrell, A.P., Forster, I., Gatlin,
 442 D.M., Goldburg, R.J., Hua, K., Nichols, P.D., 2009. Feeding aquaculture in an era of finite
 443 resources. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 106, 15103–15110.

444 Newton, R., Telfer, T., Little, D., 2014. Perspectives on the Utilization of Aquaculture
 445 Coproduct in Europe and Asia: Prospects for Value Addition and Improved Resource
 446 Efficiency. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2011.588349>

447 Newton, R.W., Little, D.C., 2018. Mapping the impacts of farmed Scottish salmon from a life
 448 cycle perspective. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 23, 1018–1029. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-017-1386-8)
 449 [017-1386-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-017-1386-8)

450 Olson, J., Clay, P.M., Pinto da Silva, P., 2014. Putting the seafood in sustainable food systems.
 451 *Mar. Policy* 43, 104–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.05.001>

452 Parker, R.W., Blanchard, J.L., Gardner, C., Green, B., Hartmann, K., Tyedmers, P.H., Watson,
 453 R.A.W., 2018. Fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions of world fisheries. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*
 454 in press. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0117-x>

455 Pelletier, N., Audsley, E., Brodt, S., Garnett, T., Henriksson, P., Kendall, A., Kramer, K.J.,
 456 Murphy, D., Nemecek, T., Troell, M., 2011. Energy Intensity of Agriculture and Food
 457 Systems, SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-081710-161014>

458 Pelletier, N., Ayer, N., Tyedmers, P.H., Kruse, S., Flysjo, A., Robillard, G., Ziegler, F., Scholz,
 459 A., Sonesson, U., 2007. Impact categories for life cycle assessment research of seafood
 460 production systems: Review and prospectus. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 12, 414–421.
 461 <https://doi.org/10.1065/lca2006.09.275>

462 Pelletier, N., Tyedmers, P.H., 2008. Life cycle considerations for improving sustainability
 463 assessments in seafood awareness campaigns. *Env. Manag.* 42, 918–931.
 464 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-008-9148-9>

465 Poore, J., Nemecek, T., 2018. Reducing food’s environmental impacts through producers and
 466 consumers. *Science* (80-.). 360, 987–992. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaq0216>

467 Roberts, C.A., Newton, R.W., Bostock, R.W., Prescott, S.G., Honey, D.J., Telfer, T.C.,
 468 Walmsley, S.F., Little, D.C., Hull, S.C., 2015. A Risk Benefit Analysis of Mariculture as a
 469 means to Reduce the Impacts of Terrestrial Production of Food and Energy, Scottish
 470 Aquaculture Research Forum. World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF).

471 Roheim, C.A., Bush, S.R., Asche, F., Sanchiro, J.N., Uchida, H., 2018. Evolution and future of
 472 the sustainable seafood market. *Nat. Sustain.* 1, 392–400.

473 Röö, E., Bajželj, B., Smith, P., Patel, M., Little, D., Garnett, T., 2017a. Protein futures for
 474 Western Europe: potential land use and climate impacts in 2050. *Reg. Environ. Chang.* 17,
 475 367–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-016-1013-4>

476 Röö, E., Bajželj, B., Smith, P., Patel, M., Little, D., Garnett, T., 2017b. Greedy or needy? Land
 477 use and climate impacts of food in 2050 under different livestock futures. *Glob. Environ.*
 478 *Chang.* 47, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.09.001>

479 Rustad, T., Storrø, I., Slizyte, R., 2011. Possibilities for the utilisation of marine by-products. *Int.*

480 J. Food Sci. Technol. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2011.02736.x>

481 SAPEA, 2017. Food from the Oceans - How can more food and biomass be obtained from the
 482 oceans in a way that does not deprive future generations of their benefits? Berlin.
 483 <https://doi.org/doi:10.26356/foodfromtheoceans>

484 Shepherd, C.J., Jackson, A.J., 2013. Global fishmeal and fish-oil supply: Inputs, outputs and
 485 marketsa. J. Fish Biol. 83, 1046–1066. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.12224>

486 Shepherd, C.J., Monroig, O., Tocher, D.R., 2017. Future availability of raw materials for salmon
 487 feeds and supply chain implications: The case of Scottish farmed salmon. Aquaculture.
 488 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2016.08.021>

489 Sprague, M., Dick, J.R., Tocher, D.R., 2016. Impact of sustainable feeds on omega-3 long-chain
 490 fatty acid levels in farmed Atlantic salmon, 2006-2015. Sci. Rep.
 491 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep21892>

492 Stevens, J.R., Newton, R.W., Tlusty, M., Little, D.C., 2018. The rise of aquaculture by-products:
 493 Increasing food production, value, and sustainability through strategic utilisation. Mar.
 494 Policy 90, 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MARPOL.2017.12.027>

495 Stokstad, E., 2011. Seafood eco-label grapples with challenge of proving its impact. Science (80-
 496 .). 334, 746. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.334.6057.746>

497 Tilman, D., Clark, M., 2014. Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health.
 498 Nature 515, 518–522.

499 Tlusty, M.F., Lagueux, K., 2009. Isolines as a new tool to assess the energy costs of the
 500 production and distribution of multiple sources of seafood. J. Clean. Prod. 17, 408–415.
 501 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.08.001>

502 Tlusty, M.F., Thorsen, Ø., 2016. Claiming seafood is ‘sustainable’ risks limiting improvements.
 503 Fish Fish. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12170>

504 Tlusty, M.F., Tyedmers, P.H., 2015. Eat Too Much Protein, Piss Away Sustainability [WWW
 505 Document]. Triple Pundit. URL [https://www.triplepundit.com/2015/11/eat-much-protein-](https://www.triplepundit.com/2015/11/eat-much-protein-piss-away-sustainability/)
 506 [piss-away-sustainability/](https://www.triplepundit.com/2015/11/eat-much-protein-piss-away-sustainability/) (accessed 12.11.17).

507 Troell, M., Jonell, M., Henriksson, P.J.G., 2017. Ocean space for seafood. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*
508 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0304-6>

509 Troell, M., Naylor, R.L., Metian, M., Beveridge, M., Tyedmers, P.H., Folke, C., Arrow, K.J.,
510 Barrett, S., Crépin, A.-S., Ehrlich, P.R., 2014. Does aquaculture add resilience to the global
511 food system? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 111, 13257–13263.

512 Tyedmers, P.H., 2004. Fisheries and Energy Use, in: CLEVELAND, C. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of*
513 *Energy*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 683–694.

514 Vaitla, B., Collar, D., Smith, M.R., Myers, S.S., Rice, B.L., Golden, C.D., 2018. Predicting
515 nutrient content of ray-finned fishes using phylogenetic information. *Nat. Commun.*
516 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06199-w>

517 Vázquez-Rowe, I., 2020. A fine kettle of fish : the fishing industry and environmental impacts.
518 *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Heal.* 13, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2019.08.004>

519 Vittuari, M., De Menna, F., Pagani, M., 2016. The hidden burden of food waste: The double
520 energy waste in Italy. *Energies* 9, 660. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en9080660>

521 Ward, T.J., Phillips, B.F., 2008. *Seafood Ecolabelling: Principles and Practice*. Wiley-Blackwell,
522 Oxford, UK.

523 Wu, G., Bazer, F.W., Cross, H.R., 2014. Land-based production of animal protein: Impacts,
524 efficiency, and sustainability. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1328, 18–28.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12566>

526 Ziegler, F., Hornborg, S., Green, B.S., Eigaard, O.R., Farmery, A.K., Hammar, L., Hartmann, K.,
527 Molander, S., Parker, R.W.R., Skontorp Hognes, E., Vázquez-Rowe, I., Smith, A.D.M.,
528 2016. Expanding the concept of sustainable seafood using Life Cycle Assessment. *Fish*
529 *Fish.* 17, 1073–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12159>

530 Ziegler, F., Winther, U., Hognes, E.S., Emanuelsson, A., Sund, V., Ellingsen, H., 2013. The
531 Carbon Footprint of Norwegian Seafood Products on the Global Seafood Market. *J. Ind.*
532 *Ecol.* 17, 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9290.2012.00485.x>

534

535

Figure 1. The broad to narrow approach for sustainability, and how that influences the narrative for sustainable seafood. Broadening the approach for the role and focus of sustainability initiatives while narrowing the approach to species – production system categories will clarify the narrative for sustainable seafood.





Figure 1. The broad to narrow approach for sustainability, and how that influences the narrative for sustainable seafood. Broadening the approach for the role and focus of sustainability initiatives while narrowing the approach to species – production system categories will clarify the narrative for sustainable seafood.



Conflict of Interest statement

For the submission *Reframing the sustainable seafood narrative*

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.