



Wild, Natural & Sustainable®

Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute
Responsible Fisheries Management (RFM) Committee Meeting
Friday, April 6, 2018, 9am to 12 noon AK

**Location: Cook Inlet Boardroom on the first floor of the Anchorage
Hilton**

Or

Call in information:
1-800-315-6338

Alternate Call in number: 1-913-904-9376
Access code: 89501

DRAFT AGENDA

I. Opening items

- a. Call to order 9am**
- b. Roll call**
- c. Approval of agenda**
- d. Approval of minutes**

Decker motions to approve minutes from the January 25 meeting; Goodman seconded; motion was passed unanimously.

e. Opening remarks – none.

f. Goals & discussion for current meeting -

Fina: Put together goals for the BOD to review in May
Seeking guidance from the board on what to pursue.
Feedback on presentations for Brussels (now and after meeting).

II. Public Comment – Mark opens for public comment. No public comments are made.

III. New Business

a. Update on PSPA/RFM presentation and PSPA Board motion

- After Regnart and Fina gave a presentation at PSPA, PSPA made a motion that they (PSPA) supports RFM bringing options to ASMI board; 1yr cont. funding to help support transition of program and then transition of program to a foundation.
- Discussion of emailing the PowerPoint presentation given to PSPA – out to committee members.

b. Industry Workshop update/Brussels

- First considered maintaining presentation at the “101” level.
- Currently concerned that the discussion and presentation is consistent with where program may be headed.
- Our presentation does talk about all 3 options, which are all still being considered.
- Need to keep message consistent across audiences: direct marketers and management, “what is this program and what does it do for you.”

c. Discussion of RFM Options

- Regnart & Fina review the Boston meeting notes on development of an International RFM - FAO based certification. Meeting included representatives of 6 or 7 countries.
 - Propose presentations to ASF from Alaska and Iceland RFM programs and global seafood assurances program. The 3 presentations may have some overlap. ASF’s consideration may affect our choice of direction. May be some move to develop a steering committee or interim board at or after Brussels to develop an international program.
 - Proposal for a Global Seafood program that includes both wild capture and aquaculture was discussed. The aquaculture representatives would like to move quickly to develop this program. There is some trepidation for how to navigate being under same umbrella as aquaculture.
 - AK industry will need to work to ensure it maintains a strong position in either an international RFM or a GSA structure.
 - Currently, neither program is fully developed and AK RFM is not ready to commit to either. It can monitor progress and choose the appropriate path in the future.
- Schultheis asks for a timeline regarding making decisions at board level.
Fina responds that they are looking for direction in May regarding development of a foundation outside of ASMI. Between May and All Hands this would give the committee the opportunity to review standards and administration documents with an eye toward transitioning the program.
Decker – voices concern about putting RFM with NGO. Need to guard our current ability to move it at a time where it will be successful long term.
- Discussion noted that any movement of the program would require that it serve the best interest of the State
 - In addition intellectual property and copyright implications would need to be considered.
 - Any foundation would need a governance body independent of ASMI.
 - The program will require a long term plan w/ long term funding.
 - Under the Alaska Foundation, there is concern that the market reach may be too small – i.e., we need more product in the program than Alaska can provide to be effective.
 - The RFM foundation may be able to get funding through ASMI for a year or partial year, support through the transition.
 - If we chose to move to an international program, certificate holders may continue audits under existing standards (i.e., AK or Iceland standards). The Pro’s and Con’s of each approach was discussed by the committee.

AK RFM Foundation:

Pro

Avoids controversy that arises from alternatives that involve non-Alaskan interests at the outset
Maintains greatest Alaska control over the program
Program maintains current credibility as FAO based and GSSI benchmarked
No need to redevelop standard
Alaska source is emphasized
Offers greatest flexibility for other partnerships (can be viewed as the first step) as those opportunities are more clearly/fully defined

Con

Potentially narrow stakeholder group could jeopardize credibility
Costly to rely exclusively on Alaska industry/interests for funding

Benefits and market uptake may be limited since program would represent only a small share of the seafood market (exclusively Alaska products)

International FAO Based Fishery Standard:

Pro

Globally appealing program would provide market strength
Avoids monopoly power in a single certification scheme
Cost efficiency from geographically broad program
Broad based industry and market representation ensure stability and credibility
Potential RFM alternative to MSC
Well defined governance could ensure best interests of well managed fisheries are served

Con

Some loss of Alaska control – could lead to prioritizing interests of other regions
Potential controversy of merging existing program with other regions
Potential complications of revising/merging standards
Governance could be complicated by involving non-Alaska interests

Global Seafood Assurance program:

Pro

Globally appealing seafood program provides greatest market strength
Avoid monopoly power in a single certification scheme
Joining with experienced program management could provide benefits (potential from experience working with markets and in managing standard development)
Administrative cost efficiencies have potential to be greatest

Con

Politics of association with aquaculture interests could be complicated
Greatest risk of loss of control
Establishing governance is most complicated since most interests are present
Potential controversy of merging existing program with other regions
Potential complications of revising/merging standards

- Question is posed to the group by Fina: is this enough detail for the ASMI board presentation. Do we need to do something more?

Marsh asks if this is the only RFM program?

Fina: Iceland has one as well.

Schultheis asks why GSA wants to be involved

Fina: It strengthens their program to have a wider variety involved. They look at it as being a build upon of their credibility. Also they are interested in certified fish meal as an input on their farms.

d. Next steps and work products –

- Prioritize Brussels, and focus after that on the next steps: ASMI board presentations.

- work group will meet Tuesdays for the next two weeks.

Goodman asks about interest level received at Boston.

Fina/Regnart: In Boston a significant number of fisheries were represented that feel they want to move forward with exploring development of that program. What is hoped for in Brussels is to walk out of meeting with approval of an interim board or steering committee to being development of that program. We're hoping we come out of Brussels with critical mass to develop it.

- e. **What should we be planning on presenting to the AMSI BOD in May?** Committee moved (Motion by Julie Decker, seconded by Scott Goodman) to request board for continued funding for the next year and for approval to begin development of an Alaska foundation that would be intended to take over administration and ownership of the RFM program.
- f. **Next meeting**
 - Next meeting will be planned after BOD in May. However, in the meantime work group will continue to meet Tues at 10am Seattle time.

IV. Adjourn 10:35am