



Wild, Natural & Sustainable®

Conformance Criteria Committee

V2 Standards Webinar

Dec 16th 2015.

Via Teleconference / GoTo Meeting

Attending: William Smoker, Bob Allan, Suzanne Iudicello, Tom Pickerell, Norman Graham, Eric Schwaab, Meredith Mendelson, Wendy Norden

RFM Team Presenting: Susan Marks, Vito Romito, Jeff Regnart, and Peter Marshall

Listening In: 10 plus undeclared.

Refer to Slide Deck

1. Welcome and Introductions

Susan Marks confirmed that there were no apologies.

2. RFM Program update since the last CCC meeting

Peter Marshall gave an update from the last meeting

- Stakeholder Consultation meetings on RFM held World Seafood Congress – wc 7th Sept 2015 Grimsby UK (re V1.3 and V2)
- RFM Annual Internal Review Oct 2015 – Updates presented at All Hands meetings WC 26th Oct 2015
- RFM Fishery Standard V 1.3 and Associated Scoring Guidance Approved by ASMI Board Nov 30 2015
- Revised RFM QMS and Procedures approved by ASMI Board Nov 30 2015
- New Proposed RFM V2 TOR presented to ASMI Board Nov 30 2015
- GSSI Application Submitted for RFM Program 15th Dec 2015
- GSSI Desktop Audit Wc Dec 18 to Feb 2016
- New Fishery CB – DNV Global

3. V2 Standard Components Review / Presentation

Vito Romito and Jeff Regnart gave an overview of proposed V2 components

- **New elements for Version 2.0 (metrics, cumulative effects of fishing, FAO guidelines integration)**
- **Integrate Stakeholder Input (mainly ENGOs comments and WSC interviews)**

- **Assessment costs efficiencies and increasing standard accessibility (multispecies context, data deficient add-on)**
- **General Housekeeping changes on the RFM standard (cleanup and restructure)**

Key Questions/Comments by Committee

Wendy Norden:

Q. What are the proposed areas that will be covered by Metrics?

A. Metrics will cover stock assessment, bycatch, ETPs, habitat and Ecosystem components at a minimum, but other areas may also be enriched with guidance, such as areas in Section 7 (the PA), areas under 8 (Management Measures) and clauses dealing with enhancement activities under Section 14.

Q. What do cumulative effects entail in terms of specific areas of assessment?

A. Areas dealing with bycatch, ETPs and potentially habitat and ecosystem components will be assessed cumulatively. The priority is however for species and then for habitat and ecosystem, given the potential difficulties with quantifying habitat and ecosystem effects.

Q. In relation to the Data Deficient Framework, what documents and reports have been reviewed before selecting the proposed risk assessment tools?

A. NMFS papers, specifically a PSA application on 166 US stocks by Patrick et al. 2009, MSC and Monterey Bay Aquarium Standards and other such applications of risk assessment tools.

Norman Graham:

Q. What reference document have been selected for deep sea fisheries articles and what is the applicability of these to fisheries in Alaska?

A. The FAO International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas was one of the key documents reviewed. The definition of Deep Sea Fisheries is unclear between FAO sources, and can be summarized as high seas fisheries outside on country's jurisdiction and fisheries that operate a depths between 200 and 1000 meters.

The applicability to Alaska is limited given that all fisheries in Alaska occur within the EEZ (i.e. national jurisdiction) and no fisheries occur in international waters/high seas. Some areas within the document could be useless as guidance for Version 2.0

Susanne Iudicello

Q. What is the basis for proposing a multispecies context to the assessment and is certification not going against multispecies by assessing at a finer and finer scale (i.e. species level)?

A. It would make sense in Alaska to assess fisheries using a multispecies approach, since the federal and state managers already do so with many fisheries, namely the groundfish and BAI crab fisheries, the salmon and GOA crab fisheries. A multispecies approach to certification would be equivalent at a minimum to existing assessment at the species level. Evidence for general type clause would be at the complex level and other would be at the species level (i.e. stock status evaluation, ecosystem impacts). This approach would also enable non conformities to be assigned at a finer scale if necessary.

Q. Would it be reasonable to progress a multi species approach to certification by creating an assessment tree indicating which clauses to work on at the species and the complex level and providing instruction for those?

A. Yes it would be very useful and in a sense that is the preferred approach and one that has already been discussed. The plan is to create an assessment tree for the multispecies context.

No further questions

4. Meeting Adjourned

Next meeting Webinar Feb 2016 and Meeting March 2016 Boston