2026

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sustainable Imported Seafood and Aquaculture Feed Transparency Bill 2026

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

(Circulated by authority of the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry)

Contents

General outline....3
Purpose....3
Why the Bill is required....3
Overview of the Bill....4
Financial impact statement....5
Impact analysis....5
Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights....6
Notes on clauses....7
Part 1—Preliminary....7
Part 2—Seafood labelling requirements....8
Part 3—Aquaculture feed traceability....9
Part 4—High-risk marine ingredients....9
Part 5—Retailer and importer due diligence....10
Part 6—Imported Seafood Transparency Register....10
Part 7—Government procurement....11
Part 8—Auditing, compliance and enforcement....11
Part 9—Administration....12
Schedule 1—Application and transitional provisions....12

General outline

SUSTAINABLE IMPORTED SEAFOOD AND AQUACULTURE FEED TRANSPARENCY BILL 2026

Purpose

The purpose of the Bill is to improve transparency, traceability and environmental accountability in relation to imported farmed seafood and the marine ingredients used in aquaculture feed.

The Bill would require meaningful origin and production labelling of designated imported farmed seafood, including in cooked and hospitality settings; require importers to obtain and retain feed-origin records; impose a positive due-diligence duty on major retailers and importers; enable restriction of products produced using prohibited high-risk marine ingredients; establish a public Imported Seafood Transparency Register; and require Commonwealth entities to procure designated imported farmed seafood only where prescribed traceability requirements are met.

The central policy principle is that if an imported seafood product depends on wild marine resources for feed, Australian consumers, regulators and public purchasers should be able to know where those resources came from and whether their harvesting contributed to ecological depletion.

Why the Bill is required

Australians purchase large volumes of imported farmed seafood. A material share of that product, especially farmed prawns, is grown on feed that may contain fishmeal and fish oil taken from wild marine fisheries. In some source regions those fisheries have been subject to intense trawl pressure, mixed low-value or "trash-fish" catches, high juvenile capture and poor traceability.

Current labelling settings often allow product to be described only as "Imported". That description does not tell a consumer the country of farming, the production method, or whether the animal was grown on marine ingredients taken from depleted or untraceable fisheries. Cooked and hospitality seafood can disappear behind still vaguer descriptions.

Existing market and certification arrangements do not, by themselves, require importers or major retailers to verify the origin of marine ingredients used in aquaculture feed. Reliance on a generic sustainability certificate can leave high-risk reduction fisheries unexamined.

Evidence from intensively fished regions illustrates the risk. Historic Gulf of Thailand trawl catch rates have been documented as falling from close to 300 kilograms per trawling hour in the early 1960s to roughly 20–30 kilograms per hour in later decades. Research has documented large proportions of juvenile commercially valuable fish within low-value and trash-fish catches used for reduction into fishmeal. Comparable pressure can arise in any poorly managed reduction fishery that supplies aquaculture feed.

The Bill does not single out any source country by nationality. The same rules would apply to every supply chain. The issue is fishing method, traceability and ecological impact. Responsible producers, including responsible Thai producers and producers in other source countries, would be able to demonstrate clean feed sourcing and obtain a commercial advantage in the Australian market.

Without legislation, Australian demand can continue to absorb product from supply chains that cannot identify vessels, landing ports, species composition, or the difference between processing by-products and whole wild-caught fish. The Bill would make feed-origin transparency a condition of continued access to the Australian market for designated imported farmed seafood.

Overview of the Bill

The Bill is a new principal Act. It is arranged as follows.

Part 1 sets out the short title, commencement, a simplified outline, objects and definitions. Designated seafood products would be prescribed by regulation, beginning with farmed prawns and other species materially reliant on marine-derived feed ingredients.

Part 2 requires retail labelling of country of farming, species, farmed or wild-caught status, and country of final processing where different. It requires hospitality and cooked-seafood suppliers to identify the actual country of origin where that information is known or reasonably ascertainable. It also requires consumer-accessible disclosure of whether marine fishmeal or fish oil was used in production feed, and whether those ingredients came from processing by-products or whole wild-caught fish.

Part 3 requires importers of designated farmed seafood to obtain and retain prescribed feed-traceability records for at least 7 years, and to obtain written supplier declarations. A supplier declaration would not discharge the due-diligence duty.

Part 4 enables the Minister to determine a fishery, fishing method or feed supply chain to be high risk. Import and sale of designated seafood produced using a prohibited high-risk marine ingredient would be restricted, subject to any transitional, exemption or remediation arrangements prescribed by the regulations.

Part 5 imposes a positive due-diligence duty on major retailers and importers. Reliance solely on a generic sustainability certificate would not, by itself, discharge the duty. Due-diligence records would be retained for at least 7 years.

Part 6 requires the regulator to establish and maintain a publicly searchable Imported Seafood Transparency Register. The regulator may require a product label to include a QR code or other digital link to the relevant Register entry.

Part 7 provides that a Commonwealth entity must not procure designated imported farmed seafood unless the supplier demonstrates compliance with prescribed traceability requirements. The Finance Minister may issue procurement rules giving effect to the requirement.

Part 8 provides for independent audits, civil penalties for false or misleading information and failure to maintain records, higher penalties for aggravated contraventions, and injunctions and remedial orders.

Part 9 deals with the regulator, information sharing, a statutory review no later than 3 years after commencement of Part 2, and the regulation-making power.

Schedule 1 stages the application of obligations over 12 and 24 months so that industry can obtain feed records and adjust supply contracts before high-risk restrictions take effect.

Financial impact statement

The Bill is expected to have a low to moderate financial impact on the Commonwealth.

Commonwealth costs would arise principally from establishing and administering the regulator function, the Imported Seafood Transparency Register, audit and enforcement activity, and the independent statutory review. Those costs would be met from existing departmental resources or considered in the usual Budget process. Precise resourcing would depend on the entity prescribed as regulator and the volume of designated product.

The Bill is not expected to have a material impact on Commonwealth taxation revenue. Civil penalties, if imposed by a court, would be paid to the Commonwealth.

Commonwealth entities that procure designated imported farmed seafood may face some additional supplier-verification costs. Those costs are expected to be absorbed within existing procurement processes.

Industry would incur compliance costs associated with labelling changes, obtaining feed-origin records and supplier declarations, due diligence, and participation in audits. Staged commencement in Schedule 1 is intended to allow those costs to be spread and to reduce the risk of abrupt supply disruption. Producers already able to demonstrate responsible feed sourcing would face lower incremental cost than operators in untraceable supply chains.

Impact analysis

A full Impact Analysis under the Australian Government Guide to Policy Impact Analysis would be prepared before introduction if the Bill proceeds as a government Bill. The following statement summarises the expected impacts for the purposes of this draft memorandum.

The problem is an information and accountability failure in imported farmed-seafood supply chains. Consumers, major retailers and public purchasers cannot reliably distinguish product grown on processing by-products or responsibly managed forage fisheries from product grown on untraceable whole-fish or trash-fish reduction fisheries.

The preferred option is a staged statutory scheme limited to designated imported farmed seafood that is materially reliant on marine-derived feed. The scheme combines labelling, record-keeping, due diligence, a public register, procurement rules and, after a transition period, restrictions on prohibited high-risk marine ingredients.

Alternative options considered in developing the policy include relying solely on existing country-of-origin labelling; relying solely on voluntary retailer certification; and imposing an immediate blanket import prohibition on farmed seafood from particular countries. Those options were rejected. Existing labelling does not disclose feed origin. Voluntary certification has not consistently required verification of marine-ingredient origin. A nationality-based ban would punish responsible producers and would not target fishing method or ecological impact.

The Bill is country-neutral. Enhanced scrutiny would follow evidence of depletion, juvenile capture, unassessed trawl effort, IUU fishing or an inability to distinguish processing waste from whole wild-caught fish.

Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights

Prepared in accordance with Part 3 of the Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011

Sustainable Imported Seafood and Aquaculture Feed Transparency Bill 2026

Overview

The Bill would establish transparency, traceability, due-diligence and enforcement arrangements for designated imported farmed seafood and marine ingredients used in aquaculture feed, as outlined above.

Human rights implications

The Bill engages, or potentially engages, the following rights:

• the right to a fair hearing and the right to be presumed innocent, in Articles 14 and 15 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR);

• the right to privacy in Article 17 of the ICCPR;

• the right to enjoy just and favourable conditions of work and related economic rights, to the extent that commercial regulation affects businesses; and

• rights associated with public participation and access to information, including as relevant to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Bill does not create criminal offences. Contraventions of the information and record-keeping requirements are civil penalty provisions. Civil penalties are not criminal in character for the purposes of Article 14 of the ICCPR where they are regulatory, do not carry a term of imprisonment, and are imposed by a court applying ordinary civil procedure. The penalty maxima are graduated by reference to the seriousness of the conduct and the size of the person. Aggravated penalties are available only where the contravention is deliberate, repeated or systemic, or results in material concealment of a high-risk marine ingredient, and a court must have regard to specified factors including culpability.

The Bill would authorise the regulator to require production of records, to require independent audits, and to share information with other agencies where reasonably necessary for food regulation, biosecurity, customs, consumer protection or environmental enforcement. Those powers engage the right to privacy. The interference is limited to information obtained for the purposes of the Act, is purpose-constrained, and is directed to a legitimate objective of protecting consumers and marine ecosystems. The Register would contain supply-chain information about prescribed products rather than sensitive personal information about individuals.

Labelling, record-keeping and due-diligence duties impose compliance burdens on importers, retailers and hospitality suppliers. Those burdens are regulatory conditions of placing designated imported farmed seafood on the Australian market. They are proportionate to the objective of preventing Australian demand from supporting untraceable or destructive reduction fisheries, and they are staged so that industry has time to obtain records and adjust contracts.

The Bill promotes access to information by requiring consumer-facing origin and feed disclosure and by establishing a public Register. That supports informed consumer choice.

Conclusion

The Bill is compatible with the human rights and freedoms recognised or declared in the international instruments listed in section 3 of the Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011. To the extent that it limits any rights, those limitations are reasonable, necessary and proportionate to the legitimate objective of supply-chain transparency and environmental accountability for designated imported farmed seafood.

Notes on clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

Clause 1 — Short title

This clause provides that the Act may be cited as the Sustainable Imported Seafood and Aquaculture Feed Transparency Act 2026.

Clause 2 — Commencement

This clause provides for commencement by reference to the commencement table.

Item 1 of the table provides that sections 1 to 5, and anything in the Act not elsewhere covered by the table, commence on the day the Act receives the Royal Assent. That is the standard approach for short title, commencement, outline, objects and definitions.

Item 2 provides that Parts 2 to 9 commence on a day or days to be fixed by Proclamation. If any of those provisions have not commenced within 12 months beginning on the day of Royal Assent, they commence on the day after the end of that period. A 12-month default is used because industry will need time to obtain feed records, adjust supplier contracts and prepare labelling systems before the operative duties apply. The default period is explained for the purposes of Drafting Direction No. 1.3.

Item 3 provides that Schedule 1 commences at the same time as Part 2, so that the staged application rules operate from the commencement of the labelling Part.

Subclause 2(2) is the standard provision that information in column 3 of the table is not part of the Act.

Clause 3 — Simplified outline of this Act

This clause sets out a simplified outline of the Act. The outline is included in accordance with Drafting Direction No. 1.3A. A note makes clear that the outline is not comprehensive and that readers should rely on the operative provisions.

Clause 4 — Objects of this Act

This clause sets out the objects of the Act. The objects include improving transparency in imported seafood and aquaculture supply chains; ensuring consumers receive meaningful origin and production information; requiring traceability of marine ingredients used in aquaculture feed; reducing Australian market support for destructive, untraceable or unsustainable fisheries; promoting responsible aquaculture and lower-impact feed systems; establishing due-diligence obligations for major importers and retailers; and supporting informed consumer choice and the protection of marine ecosystems.

The objects are intended to guide interpretation of the Act, including the making of high-risk determinations and regulations.

Clause 5 — Definitions

This clause defines key expressions used in the Act.

Aquaculture feed is defined to include feed containing fishmeal, fish oil or other marine-derived ingredients.

Designated seafood product is an imported farmed seafood product prescribed by the regulations. The definition expressly includes farmed prawns and any other prescribed species materially reliant on marine-derived feed ingredients. Prescription by regulation allows the scheme to begin with prawns and be extended to other feed-dependent species on evidence.

High-risk marine ingredient means a marine-derived feed ingredient sourced from a fishery, fishing method or feed supply chain that is determined under clause 11 to be high risk, or that fails prescribed sustainability, legality or traceability criteria.

Major retailer means a retailer prescribed by the regulations that has annual Australian grocery or seafood sales above a prescribed threshold. Prescription avoids fixing a dollar threshold in the Act that would quickly date.

Marine ingredient means fishmeal, fish oil or another ingredient derived wholly or partly from marine animals.

Processing by-product means material such as trimmings, frames, heads and offcuts produced from seafood already harvested primarily for human consumption. The distinction between processing by-products and whole wild-caught fish is central to the Bill.

Responsibly managed fishery means a fishery assessed under a prescribed independent standard, or determined by the Minister in writing to satisfy prescribed sustainability and traceability requirements.

Trash fish or low-value fish means mixed or low-value marine catch retained for reduction into feed products, including juvenile commercially important species where present.

The clause also picks up the meaning of civil penalty provision from the Regulatory Powers (Standard Provisions) Act 2014 and penalty unit from section 4AA of the Crimes Act 1914. This Act includes the regulations.

Part 2—Seafood labelling requirements

Clause 6 — Mandatory origin and production labelling

Subclause 6(1) prohibits a person from selling a designated seafood product at retail unless the product is labelled with the country of farming, the species, whether the product is farmed or wild-caught, and the country of final processing if that country differs from the country of farming.

The provision is directed at the current practice of describing product only as “Imported”, which conceals origin and production method.

Subclause 6(2) allows the regulations to prescribe additional information for packaging, menus, seafood counters or digital product information, including information linking to the Register.

Clause 7 — Cooked and hospitality seafood

Subclause 7(1) requires a person supplying designated seafood for immediate consumption to identify the actual country of origin if that information is known or reasonably ascertainable. The duty is knowledge-based so that a small hospitality business is not required to invent origin information it cannot obtain, but cannot hide origin that is known or available with reasonable inquiry.

Subclause 7(2) provides that a generic description such as “Imported” is not sufficient where the country of farming or harvest is known or reasonably ascertainable. The intended consumer-facing practice is wording such as “Farmed vannamei prawns — Thailand” or “Farmed prawns — Vietnam”.

Subclause 7(3) allows the regulations to prescribe form, placement and minimum prominence so that the disclosure is readable in supermarket, takeaway and restaurant settings.

The requirement is intended to apply equally to fresh, frozen, cooked, peeled and marinated seafood, seafood platters, deli-counter product, and seafood served in hospitality venues.

Clause 8 — Aquaculture feed disclosure

Subclause 8(1) requires a designated farmed seafood product to be accompanied by consumer-accessible information stating whether marine fishmeal or fish oil was used in production feed.

Subclause 8(2) requires, where marine ingredients were used, disclosure of whether they were derived predominantly from processing by-products, whole wild-caught fish, or a mixture of both.

Subclause 8(3) requires, where whole wild-caught fish were used, identification of whether the source fishery was independently assessed as a responsibly managed fishery.

Consumer-accessible information may be on-pack, at the counter, on a menu, or by digital link, as prescribed. Application of this clause is staged by Schedule 1 so that it does not apply in the first 12 months after Part 2 commences.

Part 3—Aquaculture feed traceability

Clause 9 — Traceability records

Subclause 9(1) requires an importer of a designated farmed seafood product to obtain and retain prescribed records concerning the aquaculture feed used in production.

Subclause 9(2) sets out the matters those records must identify to the extent reasonably available. The list includes the feed manufacturer and mill location; major feed ingredients; proportions of fishmeal and fish oil; proportions from processing by-products and from whole wild-caught fish; country and fishery of

origin for whole-fish marine ingredients; any certification or independent assessment; any use of mixed low-value or trash-fish catches; and any use of fish sourced from bottom or demersal trawl fisheries.

The qualifier "to the extent reasonably available" recognises that some historical lots may lack complete mill-level data, but it is not intended to allow an importer to avoid making reasonable inquiries of the supplier.

Subclause 9(3) requires records to be retained for at least 7 years and produced to the regulator on request. Seven years aligns with ordinary commercial and tax record-keeping periods.

Clause 10 — Supplier declarations

Subclause 10(1) requires an importer to obtain a written supplier declaration verifying the accuracy of feed-origin and marine-ingredient information supplied for the product.

Subclause 10(2) makes clear that a supplier declaration does not relieve an importer or major retailer of the obligation to undertake reasonable due diligence. The declaration is a necessary record, not a safe harbour.

Part 4—High-risk marine ingredients

Clause 11 — High-risk marine ingredient determinations

Subclause 11(1) allows the Minister, by legislative instrument, to determine a fishery, fishing method or feed supply chain to be high risk if satisfied that there is evidence of serious sustainability, legality or traceability concerns.

Subclause 11(2) sets out matters to which the Minister may have regard, including severe biomass depletion; high juvenile capture; unassessed or poorly managed trawl fisheries; mixed trash-fish catches with inadequate species identification; illegal, unreported or unregulated fishing; inability to identify vessels, landing ports or source fisheries; and inability to distinguish processing by-products from whole wild-caught fish.

The determination power is framed by evidence and method, not by nationality. A note to clause 12 confirms that the restriction is not intended to operate as a blanket restriction by reference to the nationality of a producer.

Subclause 11(3) confirms that a determination is a legislative instrument and that section 42 (disallowance) of the Legislation Act 2003 applies. Parliamentary scrutiny of high-risk listings is intended.

Clause 12 — Restriction on products using high-risk marine ingredients

Subclause 12(1) provides that a person must not import or sell a designated seafood product produced using a prohibited high-risk marine ingredient.

Subclause 12(2) allows the regulations to provide transitional, exemption or remediation arrangements where adequate traceability or sustainability controls are demonstrated. The intention is to distinguish responsible producers in a high-risk region from supply chains that continue to depend on destructive or untraceable fishing, and to allow remediation rather than permanent exclusion where controls are put in place.

Application of this clause is staged by Schedule 1 so that it applies to product imported or sold on or after the day that is 24 months after the commencement of Part 2.

Part 5—Retailer and importer due diligence

Clause 13 — Positive due-diligence duty

Subclause 13(1) requires a major retailer, and an importer of designated seafood, to take reasonable steps to identify and assess environmental risks associated with the aquaculture feed supply chain of a designated seafood product.

Subclause 13(2) sets out, without limiting subclause (1), matters that reasonable steps include verifying where applicable: where the seafood was farmed; who supplied the feed; whether the feed contained marine ingredients; where those ingredients originated; whether whole wild fish were used; whether source fisheries were responsibly managed; and whether destructive trawling materially contributed to the feed supply.

Subclause 13(3) provides that reliance solely on a generic sustainability certificate does not, by itself, discharge the duty. The provision is directed at the practice of treating a certificate as a substitute for inquiry into feed origin.

The duty applies to major retailers as prescribed, so that the compliance burden is concentrated on businesses with the capacity to investigate international supply chains, including private-label arrangements. Application is staged by Schedule 1.

Clause 14 — Retention of due-diligence records

This clause requires a person subject to clause 13 to retain records of the person's due-diligence processes for at least 7 years, so that the regulator can test whether reasonable steps were in fact taken.

Part 6—Imported Seafood Transparency Register

Clause 15 — Establishment of Register

Subclause 15(1) requires the regulator to establish and maintain a publicly searchable register to be known as the Imported Seafood Transparency Register.

Subclause 15(2) sets out the information the Register must contain for each prescribed designated seafood product, including retailer or importer, product and species, country of farming and processing, feed supplier, use of marine ingredients, processing by-products and whole wild-caught fish, certification, identified high-risk feed sources, and compliance or enforcement action.

Subclause 15(3) allows the regulator to require a product label to include a QR code or other digital link to the relevant Register entry. That is intended to make feed-origin information usable at the point of sale without overcrowding physical labels.

Establishment of the Register is required from the first 12 months after Part 2 commences (see Schedule 1).

Part 7—Government procurement

Clause 16 — Commonwealth procurement requirements

Subclause 16(1) provides that a Commonwealth entity must not procure designated imported farmed seafood unless the supplier demonstrates compliance with the traceability requirements prescribed for the purposes of the section.

The intention is that public money should not be spent on seafood produced through environmentally destructive or untraceable feed chains. The requirement is capable of applying across Commonwealth

departments and publicly funded institutions that are Commonwealth entities, including defence facilities and other Commonwealth-run institutions.

Subclause 16(2) allows the Finance Minister to issue procurement rules giving effect to the section, so that the duty can be embedded in the Commonwealth Procurement Rules framework.

Subclause 16(3) defines Commonwealth entity by reference to the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013.

Part 8—Auditing, compliance and enforcement

Clause 17 — Independent audits

Subclause 17(1) allows the regulator to require an importer or major retailer to undergo an independent audit of seafood and aquaculture-feed traceability records.

Subclause 17(2) sets out matters an audit may examine, including feed documentation, supplier declarations, fishmeal origin, certification validity, chain of custody, species composition, processing by-product claims, and claims that whole wild-caught fish were excluded.

Independent audit is intended to test paper claims against chain-of-custody evidence. Application of the clause is staged by Schedule 1.

Clause 18 — False or misleading information

Subclause 18(1) provides that a person must not knowingly or recklessly provide false or misleading information required under the Act. The fault elements of knowledge or recklessness confine the provision to culpable misstatement, including false feed-origin claims and misrepresented certification.

Subclause 18(2) makes a contravention a civil penalty of 2,000 penalty units for a body corporate and 400 penalty units for an individual. The maxima are set at a commercially meaningful level for large importers and retailers.

Clause 19 — Failure to maintain records

This clause creates a civil penalty for failure to maintain or produce records required under the Act. The penalty is 500 penalty units for a body corporate and 100 penalty units for an individual. The lower maxima reflect that some record failures will be administrative rather than deceptive. Repeated or systemic failures may be dealt with under clause 20.

Clause 20 — Aggravated contraventions

Subclause 20(1) allows a court to impose a civil penalty of up to 10,000 penalty units for a body corporate where a contravention is deliberate, repeated or systemic, or results in material concealment of a high-risk marine ingredient.

Subclause 20(2) requires the court to have regard to the size of the business, duration of the contravention, environmental risk, degree of culpability and any previous contraventions. The provision is intended to ensure that deliberate concealment of prohibited feed sources is treated more seriously than an isolated administrative error.

Clause 21 — Injunctions and remedial orders

This clause allows the regulator to apply to a court of competent jurisdiction for an injunction or remedial order. A remedial order may require correction of labels, publication of corrective notices, withdrawal of non-compliant products, or implementation of improved traceability controls. Remedial orders are

intended to put consumers and the market back into the position they would have been in had the contravention not occurred, in addition to any civil penalty.

Part 9—Administration

Clause 22 — Regulator

Subclause 22(1) allows the Minister, by legislative instrument, to prescribe a Commonwealth regulator to administer the Act. Prescription allows the function to be conferred on an existing portfolio body with food, fisheries or consumer-regulation capability rather than requiring a new statutory office in the principal Act.

Subclause 22(2) allows the regulator to issue guidance, approved forms and technical standards consistent with the Act. Guidance is not a substitute for the statutory duties.

Clause 23 — Information sharing

This clause allows the regulator to share information obtained under the Act with a Commonwealth, State or Territory agency if satisfied that sharing is reasonably necessary for food regulation, biosecurity, customs, consumer protection or environmental enforcement. The purpose limitation is intended to confine use of the information to related public functions.

Clause 24 — Review of operation of Act

Subclause 24(1) requires the Minister to cause an independent review of the operation of the Act to commence no later than 3 years after the commencement of Part 2.

Subclause 24(2) requires the review to consider the effectiveness of labelling, feed traceability, retailer due diligence, compliance, consumer understanding and impacts on responsible seafood producers. The last matter is included so that the review tests whether the scheme is rewarding responsible producers rather than operating as a de facto nationality ban.

Subclause 24(3) requires the report to be tabled in each House of the Parliament within 15 sitting days after the Minister receives it.

Clause 25 — Regulations

This clause is the standard regulation-making power. Regulations may prescribe designated products, major-retailer thresholds, additional labelling information, record requirements, high-risk criteria, Register fields, procurement traceability requirements, and transitional or exemption arrangements.

Schedule 1—Application and transitional provisions

Item 1 — Definitions

This item defines commencement day as the day Part 2 commences. Staged obligations are counted from that day rather than from Royal Assent, because the operative labelling Part may commence by Proclamation after Assent.

Item 2 — First 12 months after the commencement day

During the first 12 months after Part 2 commences, the origin, species and farmed-or-wild labelling requirements in clauses 6 and 7 apply, importer reporting requirements apply to the extent provided by the regulations, and the regulator must establish the Register. Feed-origin consumer disclosure, the full due-diligence duty and independent audits are deferred.

Item 3 — Period beginning 12 months after the commencement day

From 12 months after the commencement day, clause 8 (aquaculture feed disclosure), clause 13 (due-diligence duty) and clause 17 (independent audits) apply to designated seafood imported or sold on or after that day. This stage is intended to give industry a year of origin-labelling practice before feed-origin disclosure and formal due diligence are required.

Item 4 — Period beginning 24 months after the commencement day

From 24 months after the commencement day, clause 12 (restriction on products using prohibited high-risk or untraceable whole-fish marine ingredients) applies, together with any additional prescribed consumer-facing feed information requirements. High-risk restrictions are deferred so that determinations can be made on evidence and so that responsible producers have time to demonstrate traceability or remediate supply chains.