



Wild, Natural & Sustainable®

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

March 25, 2019 from 1:00pm to 5:00pm

at

**United States Seafood
1801 Fairview Avenue East, Suite 100
Seattle, WA 98102
(206) 763-3133**

Parking information is below.

Call in information:

1-800-315-6338

Alternate Call in number: 1-913-904-9376

Access code: 89501

DRAFT MINUTES

I. Opening items

- a. **Call to order**-Meeting is called to order at 1 pm by Chair Fina.
- b. **Roll call**

Committee Members Present:

Chair Mark Fina, Stefanie Moreland, Matt Alward, Jim Gilmore, Scott Goodman, Glenn Reed, Tomi Marsh, Tommy Sheridan, Joel Peterson.

Others Present:

Jeff Regnart, Susan Marks, Jeremy Woodrow (ASMI) Megan Rider (ASMI), Hannah Lindoff (ASMI), John Burrows (ASMI) Trent Hartnell (American Seafoods), Kate Constenstein (Rising Tide), Christopher Oliver

c. Approval of agenda

Executive session is suggested to be added by Tomi and is seconded by Scott. Motion to approve made by Jim, seconded by Tomi and the motion carries.

d. Approval of minutes from 2/15/19

Jim motions to approve, seconded by Glenn. Minutes are approved.

e. Opening remarks

It is stated that the majority of meeting will be discussing the ASMI Board of Directors meeting but will also include discussion regarding the establishment of an RFM Foundation, implementation of a new logo, and updates for conversations with the MBAQ, Norway, and Iceland.

f. Goals & discussion for current meeting

The goals are to have near-final by-laws for the foundation by next meeting in April, and to have a recommendation ready for the logo.

II. Public Comment

No public comment

III. New Business

Executive Session entered at 1:10.

Executive Session ends at 2pm and normal session resumes.

a. Update and discussion on MBAq and the ASMI MBAq working group (results from meetings on 3/15/19)

MBAq meeting in Boston went well. Wireframes were sent out ahead of the meeting, depicting the proposed website updates. The site has some positives, including a good search tool, but ecolabels still appeared gray or blue. Color-coding was still prevalent, but MBAq said it was an early draft/cut. The gray for eco-certs will be blue and seem to suggest alphabetization of search results rather than going by color coding. Species naming/regional specification amongst species was not discussed. In the current layout, eco-certs are equivalent to either green or yellow, but MBAq may be open to specifying which somehow. MSC rep was also on the meeting and did not seem fully satisfied. More digging into potential assessments of Alaska fisheries to MBAq standard will be done in the meantime, with the plan will be to follow-up with MBAq in Brussels.

A potential way to appropriately elevate eco-cert fisheries in the Seafood Watch system could be to allow eco-certificate holders to contract certification bodies to undertake an additional assessment of a fishery under the Seafood Watch standard when assessing the fishery under the eco-cert standard. This would result in those fisheries being ranked under the MBAq standard (in addition to their eco-cert classification) in the MBAq system. The additional assessment could be either a full assessment under the MBAq standard or an assessment that examines only areas of disagreement between the MBAq standard and the applicable eco-cert standard. Eco-cert assessors may need training for the MBAq standard, but this additional assessment would be relatively low cost, as the assessors should have completed substantial analysis for the fishery when undertaking the eco-cert assessment.

With both Seafood Watch and MSC currently engaged in standard reviews, timing of development of this coordinated assessment process seems good. The additional assessment should not affect the eco-cert assessment, as it is in addition to the eco-cert assessment. This system could help all organizations achieve their objectives. Sustainable fisheries are given accurate representation in each program. The different programs (eco-certs/MBAq) have more complete and accurate information to use to promote fisheries meeting their standards. The concept could be piloted with a few MSC fisheries, as MSC and MBAq have been engaged in the Certification and Ratings Collaboration (CRC), which included a Performance Framework comparing the two standards.

b. RFM Foundation bylaw update

Changes made per Duncan's comments. Regular business requiring only simple majority, with more significant issues requiring a 2/3. Some discussion ensues regarding the decision to make reduce to simple majority for ordinary business. It is

clarified that the intention of the voting requirements, be it 2/3 or a simple majority, is always in reference to all board members, not just those present. Language will be altered to reflect this.

Additionally, some decisions need to be made in terms of language referencing the foundation, regarding the use of the official title of the foundation for the sake of consistency, when the name and organization of the foundation may still change in the near future. Regarding there being a board officer who is a non-director, the intention was to take pressure off the board. However, after discussion the committee decides that this language should be changed so that all officers must be directors.

An executive committee will be created to work with the exec director between sessions, with language for the committee to be created and integrated into the by-laws. It is clarified that the organization may receive gifts and donations, but no language is to be included on fund gifts/fees at this point. This relates to the business plan of the foundation, which is to be determined.

Jeff and Mark will re-draft the by-laws and go over them with Duncan.

c. RFM Foundation creation

Process must be in place to form the Foundation, along with a proposed timeline. This would include getting letters of interest and a rough idea in terms of balance of composition of the interim board (which will be comprised of 9 people). This needs to be completed ahead of April 23. Jeff and Mark will put together solicitation for interim board members, draft letter of interest, a rough balance of interests for board composition, steps for establishment, and a timeline. Interim Board will be 9 people.

The committee recommends that Clients, ASMI program members, ASMI Committee members, and CAP members recommended for targeted for board inclusion. Solicitation language and by-laws will have a wider reach and the interim board is expected to exist for 1 year.

Stefanie recommends that once letters of interest are in, that the RFM committee considers them and provides recommendations in order to maintain balance.

d. Next meeting

Bylaws and solicitation will be emailed out, and next meeting will be scheduled after that.

IV. Adjourn

Adjourn motion made by Jim and seconded by Glenn. Meeting adjourned.