



*Wild, Natural & Sustainable*®

Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute  
Fisheries Standard Committee (FSC) Meeting  
**August 17, 2018 from 0900 to 1300**  
Via Webinar

## **DRAFT MINUTES**

### **I. Opening items**

**a. Call to Order**-Chair Smoker calls the meeting to order at 0900

**b. Roll call**

**Committee Members Present**

Dr. William Smoker (Chair), Wendy Norden, R.J. (Bob) Allain, Dr. Tom Pickerell, Suzanne Iudicello, Eric Schwaab,

**Others Present**

Jeff Regnart, Vito Romito, Mike Platt, Sam Peacock, Dave Gaudet,

**c. Welcome Back and Quick Update**

Jeff states that RFM is still a part of ASMI and will continue to be part of ASMI for the short term. The ASMI board is considering establishing a foundation to house RFM. The board of that foundation would likely be populated by RFM Committee members and ASMI board members at least initially. That is likely to occur in the next 12 months. The program today has 7 certified fisheries in Alaska, with 2 accreditation bodies, INAB (Irish National Accreditation Bureau) and this year a second, ANSI (American National Standards Institute) has been added. ANSI has come on because a second certification body, DNV, whom is certifying flatfish, Pollock, and Pacific cod. The remaining 4 species are still being certified by SAI Global. This means that the program now has 2 certification bodies and 2 accreditation bodies, which is in line with ASMI board recommendations. Having 2 CB's likely reduces the cost of the program because of CB competition, and there has even been collaboration between the 2 CB's in approach to fisheries and building assessment teams.

Standard V2.0 has been approved as of Spring 2018 by the ASMI board, and is now on the website. This version will be used for any new fisheries which are added to RFM, as well as for re-certifications going forward. Annual surveillances may still use V1.3. At present, no fisheries have yet been assessed with V2.0, and it will likely be another year before any are. Jeff adds that he is doing more of the FSC/RFM Committee work, and that Susan Marks is still involved as a contractor role rather than a direct ASMI employee. She is helping RFM with outreach efforts, especially with processors and seafood retail entities.

### **II. Standard V2.0 Elements**

Jeff states that V2.0 is the first full re-issuance of the fisheries standard, the first since the original standard (V1.2). V1.3 was not a full re-issuance, but rather was released to address shortcomings of V1.2 in respect to benchmarking by GSSI.

- a. **Assessment Matrix**-Formerly, the Assessment Matrix had 6 sections (A-F), but now has only four (A-D), due to merging of sections. The last section, 'Serious Impacts of the Fishery on the Ecosystem,' was expanded. Each section has (A-D) has supporting clauses which support the 13 Fundamental clauses, with A-C having 30 clauses, and D having 35 for a total of 125.
- b. **Scoring Guidance**-An ask from stakeholders for V2.0 was that there be better guidance for the assessors for scoring. This has been implemented by dividing the guidance into Evaluation Parameters, with 3 in each clause. One of these is a process-based parameter, one is in regards to status, and another deals with evidence. Some clauses contain more than 3, but there is always at least these three. Scoring is based on subtraction with all evaluation parameters being worth an equal amount in score. So an average clause with 3 evaluation parameters starts with a score of 10. If there are no non-conformances, a score of 10 is received for that clause. 3 points are subtracted for each evaluation parameter for which there is a non-conformance, with 1 non-conformance with an evaluation parameter being a minor non-conformance and earning a score of 7, 2 non-conformances being a major non-conformance and scoring a 4, and 3 non-conformances being critical and earning a 1.
- c. **Important New Clauses**
  - i. **Section 12 (Ecosystem Effects of Fisheries)**-clauses have been better structured to clarify the assessment of:
    1. Main Associated (bycatch) Species-top 80% of species catch by weight based on a 3 to 5-year average
    2. Minor Associated (bycatch) Species-bottom 15% of species catch (lowest 5% is not evaluated) based on a 3 to 5-year average
    3. ETP species interactions-All ETP species interacted with
    4. Habitat interactions
    5. Ecosystem interactions
    6. Other human impacts
- d. **RFM Metrics and Thresholds**
  - i. Metrics being used are analogous with those being used for reference points and indicators in current Alaska fisheries management. Metrics are available for reference point/overfishing definitions, harvest control rules, bycatch, ETP species, habitat, and ecosystem.
- e. **Cumulative Effects of Fisheries**
  - i. This was added to Section 2, and categorized based on which elements of the fishery needed to be evaluated for cumulative effects. Those identified as being most relevant to cumulative impacts are the main associated species (bulk of bycatch), ETP species, and habitats.

**Main Associated Species:** all fisheries in the region are assessed with all major removals of the species being accounted for. Additionally, management measures are assessed for effectiveness at keeping species from being overfished and other irreversible/slowly reversible impacts.

**ETP Species:** ETP's legally recognized by national legislation, international agreements, CITES, or IUCN, with all fisheries being assessed as well as the policy/plan level. The implementation and effectiveness of the management measures are verified to ensure they are in line with the agreed objectives

**Habitats:** All *certified* fisheries are assessed, though all fisheries in region are certified. It is unclear why this decision to have differentiated language on certified fisheries vs. all fisheries was made. Bill reminds the group that the current language has been approved and so this topic should be discussed at a later date, with an amendment being made if necessary. Ensure that effects of fishing on sensitive habitats are assessed and management measures are verified to

be effective in protecting sensitive habitats, preventing growth of impact footprint, and allowing for habitat recovery where necessary through area closures or other measures.

### **III. Draft Glossary**

Jeff states that the standard was not created with a glossary, but that one has been needed and asked for previously. Dave helped with the creation of the current draft, which is being shown to the committee today for the first time. Approval is not being sought today, but general comments and opinions are.

Dave describes the creation process, stating that terms were pulled from a variety of spreadsheets and documents from ASMI, as well as the benchmark tool document glossary by GSSI, NOAA's Fishwatch glossary, FAO's portal, and general internet queries. Spreadsheets of the combined terms from the sources were evaluated by Dave and Jeff, with the majority of definitions coming from NOAA and GSSI.

Jeff adds that there were no new definitions created for this glossary, rather, all existed elsewhere but were chosen based on applicability to the program, and with terms being pulled from both the standard and the guidance document.

The acronym 'RMO' is identified as being absent from the glossary, but should be included. Suzanne requests a more broadly applicable or generic definition for 'best scientific evidence available'. It is also pointed out that the word 'available' is not always included in the term. Jeff states that it is hoped to have the glossary approved at All-Hands 2018.

### **IV. 2017 Program Updates**

Jeff reiterates that V2.0 has been approved by the ASMI Board, and the CB Assessor Training Deck has been completed. The training is being set up to occur in the first two weeks of September, but will be redone again immediately prior to V2.0's first utilization in a fishery assessment which is likely to be in roughly 1 year. The group being trained is roughly 25-30 people. He also adds that the Annual Scheme Internal Review, necessary for GSSI compliance and benchmarking, was finalized in Q4 2017. Certification Body (SAIG) and Accreditation Body (INAB) carried out an audit in Ireland in 2017. The Quality Management System Manual (QMS) have been reviewed and streamlined via Surveillance Audit method, making the process more straightforward without sacrificing robustness. Engaged with GSSI for annual audit but we are awaiting their annual review template. DNV Global Norway (second CB) has been accredited through ANSI (second AB). SCS Global has also been accredited and is performing Chain of custody work for the program. It has also been acknowledged that there is a need to improve RFM seal policing requirements within the Chain of Custody and to improve auditability.

#### **Key Planned Activities for 2018**

Q1 audit of DNV global by AB carried out, with minor questions from both the AB and CB currently being addressed. SCS Global was also successfully audited and accredited for Chain of Custody.

### **V. V1.3 DDF Updates and V2 DDF**

#### **a. V1.3**

The PSA of DDF Framework V1.3 has been updated for crab species following the Aleutian Island Golden King Crab assessment and CB feedback. There is a proposed modification to the PSA Attribute, specifically the Maximum Size attribute. This proposal is made due to the old PSA being more relevant for finfish/sharks than crab. The new proposal is aimed at producing a more specific and precise score for crab. Bob motions to approve the proposed change to the Maximum Size attribute, Eric seconds. Proposal carries unanimously with the understanding that the issue should be re-evaluated after use with a crab fishery.

#### **b. V2.0**

Vito continues that modifications were made to the DDF to reflect changes from V1.3 to V2.0. Specifically, the number of clauses in the DDF which are assessed has been increased from 3 to 4 (due to classification of bycatch as being either minor or major), and the ETP clause has changed.

**VI. GSSI Annual Review Updates**

Jeff reiterates that RFM is awaiting the GSSI Annual Review Process to begin.

**VII. Questions**

Discussion ensues regarding the short-term agenda of the FSC Committee, and the potential outcomes regarding the shifting of RFM Ownership from ASMI to a Foundation. In terms of a short-term agenda, there are no outstanding events planned. In terms of ownership shift, Jeff states that the FSC Committee would stay the same.

The topic then shifts to training, and whether the training for CB's and AB's must be accredited in some way. Vito answers that it does not have to be formally accredited.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Chair Smoker moves to adjourn, and Eric seconds. Meeting is adjourned at 1305.