

Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute
Responsible Fisheries Management (RFM) Committee Meeting

October 20, 2015 at 11:00 am at the APICDA Office

717 K Street, Anchorage, AK 99501

DRAFT MINUTES

Committee Members Present

Larry Cotter

Dave Benton

Glenn Reed

Stefanie Moreland

Jim Gilmore

Ron Rogness - Absent

Mark Gleason

Jason Anderson

Tomi Marsh

Others

Susan Marks / ASMI Sustainability Director

Hannah Lindoff / ASMI Consultant

Merle Knapp- Glacier Fish

Dave Gaudet, Independent Consultant / AFDF

Commissioner Chris Hladick

Chris Norris, Government Affairs

Julie Decker / AFDF

Jeff Regnart / RFM Consultant

Peter Marshall / RFM Consultant

Vito Romito / RFM Consultant

Mike Platt / RFM Consultant

Chip Trinenen / Harvester, ASMI Committee Member

Adrienne Christensen, Native Village of Port Heiden

Cotter began the meeting and proposed to add a vote on the Vice Chair to the agenda.

Moreland wanted to discuss what would go into Executive Session and what items would be discussed in the regular session.

Motion: Moreland moved to add an agenda item, Vice Chair and to move items a,d,c, and e from Executive Session to the public agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

Election of Vice Chair:

Reed nominated Ron Rogness. Benton Seconded. Rogness was elected unanimously.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:

Motion: Gilmore moved to approve the previous minutes. Moreland asked to amend the minutes on page four, to strike a sentence about the GSSI audit from the minutes. The minutes were approved as amended.

Cotter gave his opening remarks, noting that the committee needed to finish the meeting today, and that he hoped they could be succinct. He noted that ad-hoc sub-groups had done a lot of work prior to the meeting and that the committee should pay due deference to their recommendations. Also, he asked that they bear in mind that version 2.0 is coming and not get bogged down in the weeds.

As far as goals of the committee, Cotter noted that they need to put a recommendation to the full board on version 1.3 and that needs to be done today. He asked that everyone follow the rules and asked for public comment.

There was no public comment.

Old business:

Marks opened the program project tracker document and began her program update.

- QMS update: The QMS was published in June. It needed to be publicly published online to move forward with the GSSI pilot audit. It's a fluid doc that needs continual review. The QMS includes all RFM program procedures.
- Terms of Reference (TOR): some of the proposed changes in the QMS may change the RFM committee TOR and the same applies to the Technical Committee. A TOR couldn't be found for the Technical Committee, so the RFM Team has written a draft TOR, specific to their Chain of Custody work, and Susan will work with Michael to finalize this once she officially starts.

- Marks noted that she plans to post the responses to the public comments received on Version 1.2 Fishery Management Standard. The goal is to post by the end of the month.
- Stakeholder consultations: consultations took place at Grimsby during the World Seafood Congress. Forty took place, but only eight went on the record as formal consultations. Cotter asked if they consulted with WWF. Vito confirmed yes, but that there was no comment from WWF. Cotter asked if MSC was consulted; the answer was no. The Environmental Defense Fund and FAO are some of the NGOs that were consulted.

Moreland asked if version 2 was used for the consultation. Marshall explained that they used 1.3 because we don't have version 2 yet. He explained during the consultations they asked what stakeholders would want to see in a version 2. The consultations were more suggestions for inclusion rather than a review of an existing doc. Marshall noted that they had a number of suggestions that could be put forward to the Conformance Criteria Committee (CCC).

Moreland asked about the CCC. Marshall answered that as the program owner, the ASMI Board will set the direction and objectives for Version 2. The RFM Team has topics like social welfare, environmental disasters, etc. We need a record for GSSI to see that these comments have been taken into consideration by the appropriate governance bodies (Board, CCC) and that objectives for version 2 have been decided.

Benton noted that the committee should think of scoping, scoping the issues for range of concern. Marshall explained this has been done and we are still in the early stages of version 2 development. He noted it is helpful to have the FAO give their opinion, even though it's just an opinion, it's showing paper trail.

Benton noted that people will want a paper trail and seems like having a scoping report is something we want.

Moreland asked for an update of consultations with managing agencies on 1.3. Vito answered that ADF&G input has been taken and incorporated; the Council has not yet been incorporated.

Reed asked if the committee could see a summary document of stakeholder consultations, and Vito said he would put this together and circulate to the group.

Cotter asked what the trends were. Vito answered that the social dimension was coming across all views. Cotter clarified that the social dimension is not part of GSSI but it's something to have down the road. Marshall noted that having Monterey Bay on the CCC was taken as a good sign of engagement with NGOs. While many stakeholders preferred not to go on record, there was recognition that the RFM was engaging within the environmental arena.

- CoC program of work- Marks continued her update explaining that the RFM Program will be on the Technical Committee meeting agenda. They have a draft version of the CoC standard for the Technical Committee to review. There was a draft program of work, and she had met with Hart on it.
- Certification body and accreditation body management- work continues. It is an ISO requirement that ASMI has to do an annual review of the existing approved CBs. ASMI completed a review of GT in June, and SCS remains to be done.

As we continue to update the docs, there is a cascading effect. When we change certain things, we have to let CBs know. SCS we need to review.

- ANSI facilitating and onboarding- we have an MOU, they move slowly, but Marks applauded Marshall and his team for staying on it. ANSI has provided a program plan. They have a boiler plate methodology on how to move a scheme forward. They are giving a window between Jan. 16-Aug. 16, a window of accreditation. At this point we are only working with ANSI on accreditation for our CoC Program, because we don't have another US based CB that is doing Fishery audits. So, ANSI is only relevant to SCS. ANSI would like onsite training in the first quarter of 2016. It would be better to have more CBs on board to do trainings.
- New Fisheries CB: Marks announced that DNV GL, based in Norway is about to return their signed contract to conduct fisheries audits. Their accreditation board is likely out of Norway or Holland, so that would be another AB that we need to work with. But, this is good news. DNV is a major player and they do a lot of MSC audits. More information will be shared with the group as this develops.
- Fisheries Management Clients- Marks noted that we have flagged this as an activity that needs to take place. She showed fisheries that are up for full assessment. Halibut and sablefish are up. Cotter asked about halibut and sablefish, how do we validate that they're on the ball and moving forward? Marks noted that there's no process to do that, its informal, we assume that they are taking the onus of responsibility. Also, the CB, GT should be reaching out to start discussions.

Cotter noted that he was concerned. What if someone has gone through a management change? Cotter suggested that a letter from ASMI to remind them that they need to get going would be a good idea. We don't want anyone to fail to comply with their timelines.

Action Item: ASMI RFM team will send a letter reminding halibut and sablefish clients that they need to work on recertification.

- Client facilitation specific to CoC- This is a high priority, as is communications. The .org website update is in full swing. Lindoff has been helping with the update. Cotter noted that the RFM quarterly update is overdue. Marks agreed, yes, it is overdue. That falls on me and I haven't had time.

Moreland noted that in Ketchikan Marks explained that there was a website update to the '.org' website happening. Tyson is overseeing this project and part of that will involve updating the 'Certification' tab and language for the RFM Program. Marks explained that she still needs to review content for these sections, and hasn't had time to do this.

- GSSI pilot audit complete- Marks agreed to table the full discussion until later.
- Marks noted that she was very happy to have Jeff on board and that we have an opportunity to have Jeff overlap with RS standards and Jeff will be taking ownership of some of these tasks soon. Gleason asked about outreach to the council or NMFS. Vito stated that there was no reply so then he went to the council. Moreland said she could follow up and make sure people follow up. Vito said that would help.

Reed asked about the Conservation Alliance. Marks explained that it's a coalition of 16 NGOs and that if you want to reach the major NGO players, this is a good way to do it as 'it's the most bang for your buck'. She planned to inquire about getting on their agenda in December. Marks noted that it's good to have Wendy on CCC. The more we get in front of this audience, the more they are aware of progress on the program, and this also creates a record of outreach.

Benton noted that creating a record is really important. He thinks it needs to be more than saying we met or had a booth. He thinks there needs to be a written solicitation of their input and even no response should be recorded. Marks noted that Vito has a record of the meetings. Benton stated that a formal letter with no response is also important.

Action Item: Cotter/Moreland will contact NMFS for follow up.

CB Outreach update:

Marks noted that the committee had documents in their packets. Marks asked that they look under the Fishery Management Certification Body section. SCS Global, we have been reaching out to gauge interest in coming on board. We've been in contact but they cancelled the call. They rescheduled to the week of Oct. 26, saying they are overworked and RFM is not a priority. We have included contact information in this document if there is interest in talking.

It was noted that MRAG are not interested in ISO accreditation for the purpose of RFM audits after we said subsidies are off the table so they are no longer a candidate for doing audits. DNV- out of Norway- they have the application to be approved to the program and are ready to move forward. They are in final review with their legal program. Marshall noted that an approved CB can quote for fisheries certification so as soon as ASMI countersigns application they are eligible to put in applications for work. One of the key considerations for DNV was whether there was a business case for coming on board.

Cotter mentioned he thought they are already doing vessel audit and already operate here, so are they ISO? Marshall answered, yes; they have ISO through two accreditation boards. There is also DNV Global USA, so their accreditation that they have in the US for vessels might not be what they need for RFM. We will know more as we continue to work with them during onboarding.

Cotter asked is it really that simple? They get in an application, ASMI approves, and we have competition? Marks noted that it's a little more complicated. Marshall stated that they have to have a fishery to move forward with so that they can show competence to their accreditation body. Anderson asked, do they need a fishery for full assessment or can it be an audit? Marshall answered that ideally it would be an audit for full assessment, so they can show enough evidence that they can do this. Sixteen months is typically how long you give an accreditation board to get it through. In these programs, that is expected. If they are in application they are regarded as being as good as accredited.

Cotter said it was good news, finally a new CB is ready to come in and now we have two fisheries coming up that would be the best for them to get involved in. We don't control the client; they get to pick whomever they want. He asked if halibut and sablefish were also up for MSC full review. Cotter wondered if it's even possible for them to be chosen. We may never break free of the monopoly if they are looking at price.

Julie Decker stated that she thought there were more than two fisheries up for re-certification in 2016. Marshall answered that technically it's salmon, halibut and sablefish, and Pollock at the end of the year.

Moreland recalled that in Ketchikan there was some of this discussion about what is appropriate for client level discussion and this is a good document to feed that conversation.

It was noted that one of the CB prospects, ME is not planning to become ISO accredited. There are other CBs to be targeted. Core Marine has taken over and are more relevant in the US, but they haven't responded back with any interest in RFM. They do 40% of MSC work.

Discussion of RFM QMS:

The committee reviewed Procedure 8 and the Tiers of decision making. The committee agreed with suggested edits from the ad-hoc sub-group.

Governance Diagram: the committee made the following suggestions:

- a. Need to show direct communication between RFM Team & Board
- b. Don't want it implied that the CCC & Tech committees report to RFM Committee; rather it is the 'work products' that are vetted by the RFM Committee before it goes to the Board
- c. Flip-flop RFM Committee/RFM Team
- d. Tabled for later discussion (during lunch) by those who are interested

QMS Sec 6.1.14 – Discussion of introducing a 30 day Open Comment Period at the beginning of a full assessment and another 30 day window at the publication of the Draft Report.

GSSI has defined relevant stakeholders (Marshall read the definition). Gilmore suggested stakeholders be required to register at the beginning of the process, when the initial announcement of the fishery reassessment goes out (1st 30 day window). Decker emphasized that stakeholder comments can be a good thing. The committee agreed registration is a good idea to possibly help mitigate some of the costs. The CB owns the process of putting out the notification and creating the portal for stakeholders to register. Adrienne noted that we need to make this as simple as possible, and there could be a contradiction between the proposed governance diagram (noting public comment can happen at any time), and the 30 day registration period.

Benton recommended we adopt the GSSI definition of stakeholder, and then create a process for stakeholder participation in the stakeholder process. CB announces assessment is commencing and opens a 30 day window for stakeholder to register. Following draft report publication, 30 day comment period opens again only to registered stakeholders.

A determination was made to not have two, 30 day 'comment' periods. Rather, the first is a 'consultation' because there isn't anything to formally comment on yet.

MOTION: BENTON MOVED TO ADOPT LANGUAGE ON 6.1.13 & 6.1.14 OF QMS SECTION 1-7. GILMORE 2ND. MOTION PASSES.

MOTION: BENTON MOVED TO ADOPT THE GSSI DEFINITION OF STAKEHOLDER, FOR THE GLOSSARY OF THE QMS MANUAL. JIM GILMORE 2ND. MOTION PASSES.

Discussion of 6.1.16. Minimize travel by CBs. The committee asked RS Standards for clarity of what 'certification audit' is. Vito/Mike clarified it is specific to the 1st full assessment of a fishery or CoC. Gilmore suggested parsing out the different types of assessments and when onsite visits are required.

MOTION TO APPROVE 6.1.16 AS AMENDED. ANDERSON 2ND. MOTION PASSES

Discussion of Procedure 1, Section 3.2. Limiting a new CB to only evaluating three fisheries. Suggestion to remove this limit.

Marshall explained why this restriction was put in place to begin with, and that it is standard procedure. It could put our accreditation credentials at risk if the new CB doesn't pass or there is an issue. Moreland suggested putting that risk to the clients. Marshall also cautioned that the program is at risk of going from one CB monopoly to another, thereby not advancing the program in the way the committee expressed they wanted to do.

MOTION TO STRIKE SENTENCE REGARDING THE LANGUAGE TO LIMIT NEW CB'S TO THREE FISHERIES. IN SECTION 3.2, MORELAND 2ND.

Procedure 2 – Suggestion to change Surveillance audit reports to become summary reports.

MOTION TO MAKE SURVEILLANCE REPORTS SUMMARY REPORTS. 2ND GILMORE

Discussion of splitting certificates, Procedure 2, 4.7:

Marshall noted that the scheme owner is required to notify the accreditation board of any changes to the program or procedures. The scheme owner can designate the responsibility of notifying the AB to the CB, but it must be clearly outlined in the QMS.

MOTION: REED MOVED TO EDIT SECTION 4.7 OF PROCEDURE 2 TO REFLECT LANGUAGE THAT A CB MUST BE NOTIFIED OF ANY SIGNIFANT PROGRAM CHANGE, AND THEN THE CB MUST NOTIFY TO AB. GILMORE 2ND.

Discussion and review of new Certificate Sharing policy language introduced by Moreland and further refined by the committee.

MOTION: REED MOVED TO ADOPT THE NEW LANGUAGE IN PROCEDURE 2 AND THE ADDITION OF IT IN PROCEDURE 1 UNDER CB REQUIREMENTS. 2ND BY MORELAND.

Recommendation to require CB to consult with fishery client regarding chosen assessment team members in advance of the audit. Page 10, Section 3.6.

MOTION: ANDERSON MOVED TO ADOPT THE LANGAGE IN THE ABOVE SECTION & GLEASON 2ND.

Review language in Procedure 2, Section 3.9. Decision to make Validation Report an option and other 'clean up' language in this section.

MOTION: MORELAND MOVED TO MAKE VALIDATION ASSESSMENTS OPTIONAL AND ADOPTION OF OTHER LANGUAGE IN THE ABOVE SECTION. GILMORE 2ND.

PROCEDURE 2, SECTION 3.13, has to do with scoring and how resolution will be found. Question on whether committee wants consensus to be reached. Suggestion to change consensus to majority. Majority opinion shall rule.

MOTION: GLEASON MOVED TO ADOPT THE NEW LANGUAGE IN THE ABOVE SECTION, REED 2ND.

PROCEDURE 2, Section 4: Surveillance audits may not need to be onsite. It will be up to the CB to determine risk and whether or not the audit may be conducted via desktop.

MOTION: GILMORE MOVED TO ADOPT LANGUAGE. MORELAND 2ND.

PROCEDURE 2, Section 5: Client's flexibility to change CBs, and when this can happen. Discussion ensued.

MOTION: BENTON MOVED TO ADOPT NEW PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR THE ABOVE SECTION. GLEASON 2ND.

Procedure 7 – Internal Program Review. This is a GSSI Requirement that Marshall read.

Marshall emphasized this is an absolute fundamental and ASMI shouldn't skimp on this or try to minimize it. He doesn't see it as too much administrative overload, it is two days. Moreland feels that review is already built into the program, and this adds another layer to it.

MOTION: BENTON MOVED to make the presentation & responsibility of this report should fall to the Sustainability Director, as they have operational oversight of the program. This report should go to the ED & ASMI Board. Suggests language to reflect this. Reed seconded.

Discussion of PROCEDURE 9 – Appeals & Complaints and Type 3 - Program complaints & CB performance and decisions.

Gilmore elaborated that this needs more work around threshold to accept an objection, who reviews the objection, etc. Suggestion to leave as is for now and revisit after GSSI audit

MOTION: BENTON MOVED TO ADOPT THE EDITED VERSION OF THE QMS TO CARRY FORWARD TO THE ASMI BOARD, GILMORE SECOND, PASSED

Discussion of RFM Standard V 1.3 & accompanying Scoring Guidance Document

This has already been reviewed by the CCC and has received additional consultation with management authorities (ADF&G, Council & NMFS)

MOTION: BENTON MOVED THAT THE BOARD TO ADOPT V 1.3 AS IT HAS BEEN REVISED, BARRING ANY ADDITIONAL INPUT BY MGMT AUTHORITIES. MORELAND 2ND.

Budget discussion:

Marks presented a new budget with additional sub-categories. Further breakdown for certification was provided on a spreadsheet. GSSI benchmarking may be under cost but Marks did not recommend moving any money out of the line for now. Marks explained that she is still looking for administrative help and that is why there is more money for an unbenefited contract person. She explained that the program needs a dedicated person who can focus on and take over chain of custody.

Cotter asked about RFM committee travel. Marks explained the line is meant to show all committee costs. Accreditation costs, possibly allocated for ANSI accreditation or other ABs, so that cost will be unallocated. Materials and printing- since there has been no historical tracking for RFM or Technical program against this sub-category, many of these numbers are a guess. Agency support is primarily Edelman, but this could be for anyone who helps the program. Cotter asked how much was going to Edelman now, and Marks said there is a \$30K contract that they have fulfilled. Sponsorships and events mostly went to the World Seafood Congress. Expert contractors, includes RS Standards and Jeff Regnart. Cotter asked about a PR push and Marks confirmed that there won't be a big PR launch. Once Version 2 is released this topic can be re-visited.

Fishery certification costs: Marks explained the estimated costs. The costs are targeted as decreasing and we should be able to realize significant savings in this category. The program is on track for a 30% reduction in costs. Marshall explained the document and when the estimated dates were for audits and re-assessments, to show which fiscal year events were happening.

Is the board in the process of trimming back? Marks said her understanding is they will be looking across all programs at places to cut back. Cotter estimates around \$280,000 in saving could be realized for RFM.

Cotter noted that the committee had already discussed reducing certification costs.

AK RFM Version 2 Objectives and Recommendations-

CCC will have a webinar in early December. Benton asked, wouldn't it be better to go through the GSSI audit of 1.3 and see what the outcome will be so that could inform work on Version 2. Marshall stated that we need to begin work on Version 2 or we won't be able to make the estimated Version 2 release date in 2016. Whatever comes out of the GSSI audit can still be taken on board by the CCC and

incorporated into Version w. During the GSSI audit they will be asking about the CCC's work on Version 2 and they will want to understand the process for how it's being created, and they will want to see records of how input is being taken into consideration, etc. GSSI will want to see how stakeholder comments are handled and by whom. So for social issues, we have to present it to someone and get a yes or no. Marshall noted that suggestions need to be processed and recorded.

Cotter stated that we have a schedule to get version 2 out for public comment by a certain time next year. If you need objectives and recommendations, I don't think we should wait until February or March.

Marks noted that we need a forward for version 2 to circulate to the committee.

Cotter asked for guidance as to what types of comments ASMI needs from the Committee. Moreland asked, can't we get ahead of some of the social issues with our constitution and labor laws? Marshall said, you can draft a standard that goes in that direction, we are looking for direction from the group on what they want to pursue. Vito noted that one item out of the GSSI tool requires the standard to be applicable to small scale fisheries. This one is important requirement for GSSI, the rest can be looked at later.

Key themes that came out of the World Seafood Congress: forward planning for climate change and building resiliency in fishing communities and community resiliency in face of events, and including indigenous people in the management (take from report). It is key to collect enough data but not waste resources.

Benton asked for a scoping document or concepts and ideas we ought to think of or any of the new FAO docs that we should think about, the sooner the better. Cotter noted that we can do it by conference call or set up work groups. Moreland stated that these are Board considerations. Cotter noted that the committee needs to comment to the Board that this is an active time and we may need a teleconference on occasion to take action on items we need to proceed.

Action Item: *RFM team must put together a Version 2 Terms of Reference (or scoping document) for the RFM Committee to review before it goes to the ASMI Board*

The committee went into Executive Session.

Motion: Gleason moved to end executive session. Benton 2nd.

Motion: Benton moved that committee move forward with the timeline suggested by the RFM Team to start work on the GSSI Application Nov/Dec, for preparation for the onsite audit in early Jan. Test audit in Seattle and planning meeting for onsite audit to take place in December. Formal audit targeted for mid-January. Gleason seconded.

Passed.

Next meeting: TBD later.

Motion: Gleason moved to adjourn. Benton seconded.