DRAFT MINUTES

I. Opening items
   a. Call to order: Meeting is called to order at 1:00 pm by Chair Fina.

   b. Roll call:
      Committee Member Present:
      Chair Mark Fina, Scott Goodman, Matthew Alward, Stefanie Moreland, Dave Benton, Glenn Reed, Tomi Marsh, Joel Peterson

      Others Present:
      Jeff Regnart (ASMI), Susan Marks (ASMI)

      Quorum is established.

   c. Approval of agenda
      Chair Fina notes that there should be an Executive Session at the end of the meeting for discussions on Boston. Motion to approve made by Stefanie, seconded by Scott.

   d. Approval of minutes from 10/22/18 and 10/30/18
      Since there was an insufficient number of committee members present for a quorum during 10/22 meeting, minutes from that meeting still need to be approved. New minutes from 10/30 need to be approved as well. Glenn moves to approve 10/22 minutes, seconded by Joel. The motion carries and the 10/22 minutes are approved. A motion to approve the 10/30 minutes is made by Scott, and is seconded by Joel. The motion carries and the 10/30 minutes are approved.

   e. Opening remarks-None
f. **Goals & discussion for current meeting** - Jeff opens by saying that there is a need to discuss further RFM development as well as updates for meetings which have occurred with Monterey Bay Aquarium (MBAq). Dates and times for Boston/Brussels meetings need to be finalized, and the committee needs to discuss what to present to ASMI BOD with next week. Mark asks for public comment and there is none.

II. **Public Comment** - No public comment.

III. **New Business**

   a. **Further Development of RFM**
   Jeff states that we have minutes from the meetings in Reykjavik, Iceland with Iceland/Norway and from the meeting with MBAq in Monterey but that these minutes are not public at this time. The Icelanders desire a slow approach for any international RFM efforts. They don’t see a near-term joint program at the present time, but do wish to discuss what one may look like in the future.

   b. **Update and discussion on MBAq and the ASMI MBAq working group (results from meeting with MBAq on 1/11/19)**
   MBAq seems willing and happy to work with ASMI RFM and appear to be able to see some advantages to cooperation. Neither side is committed at this point, but the conversation was positive. Some hesitation and uncertainty is communicated, as in the past positive meetings with MBAq have occurred with no tangible progress occurring afterwards. MBAq is re-doing their website, and with that there may be an opportunity to provide more accurate information on Alaska fisheries. Notes from the meeting were provided to MBAq, who acknowledged but did not indicate approval/disapproval of notes, but it seems they are fine with them. The next internal MBAq working group meeting will be in Boston during Seafood Expo North America in March, with the next meeting with MBAq itself also occurring during this event. MBAq is looking currently at a Buy/Don’t Buy approach rather than the current color scheme for their website.

   c. **Boston and Brussel’s RFM plans**
   As stated, follow-ups with MBAq and the next meeting of the MBAq working group will both occur in Boston during SENA, with the working group meeting to occur on the 18th. Brussels will also definitely include follow-up meetings with Iceland/Norway, and potentially meetings regarding MBAq as well.

*Executive Session-Motion made to enter by Stephanie and seconded by Scott. Committee enters executive session at 1:30 pm.

Executive session ends at 3:00 pm and normal session is resumed.*

   d. **Discussion of RFM presentation to ASMI BOD on 2/19/19**
   ASMI Board had suggested RFM be moved from governance by ASMI to being housed within an Independent foundation during the previous board meeting, but also pushed for more ASMI Board Involvement in Draft By-Laws. Chair Fina adds that there is room to satisfy that request. Discussion ensues regarding which questions/issues should be put to the board.

   It is determined that the ASMI Board will be asked to provide direction on formation of the Interim RFM Board, and that the ASMI Board should be asked to
task the Interim Board with weighing pros/cons of an expanded international RFM. It is asked that the ASMI Board approve the budget at a later meeting in April.

Mark also suggests seeking permission to look over Governance documents concerning Interim Board, as currently the ASMI Board is the ultimate decision maker, and the Interim Board would become that going forward. It is recommended that the governing bodies (Technical Committee for CoC, Fisheries Standard Committee) other than ASMI Board remain in place as governing committees. Jeff adds that Department of Law was involved in by-law draft and governance determinations, but the individual acting as the Department’s representative has left and the new individual will have to be brought up to speed.

Discussion shifts to funding, and the ASMI Board’s previous request to begin the shift of funding source to industry rather than ASMI. Thoughts need to be given for how to start that process, though it is held as imperative that industry still should not pay for the majority at this time. Stephanie adds that the ASMI Board needs to be reminded of cost of maintenance of the RFM program prior to beginning of rollout of changes, as many companies are dropping the CoC standard due to cost. A possible solution is waiving of on-site annual audits, allowing for desktop audits on certain years or multi-site CoC or joint application for CoC for companies which have agreed to certain practice, with annual audit occurring at only a sample of those sites.

IV. Discuss AFDF’s “Social Responsibility on Vessels”
Julie discusses use of Grant Funding from NOAA to work with United Fisherman of Alaska and ASMI personnel, staff, board, and contractors to try and condense important social responsibility information into two documents, both a 2 pager, and a more robust 30 pager for distribution. These will be presented in Boston, but feedback from ASMI, processors, harvesters, and CAP Members is requested. Reception was positive, but notes from OMR’s indicated that the practices outlined may not always be a best fit for international markets. The primary audience would be customers, but the documents would also be provided to certification programs. Minors are featured in the photos for the documents because that issue is one in Alaska which prevents a one-size fits all approach, but there is concern that they are over-represented in the images.

V. Newsletter
Susan states that questions on RFM program have increased following All-Hands, especially from the international community. An interview section has been added, with Julie being the first interviewee. Susan states that they are seeking input. It is asked that the content be given a thorough once-over by Jeff and Susan for sensitive material. Comments are asked to be sent by Friday 2/22.

VI. Next meeting
Meeting is proposed for March 25 at 1pm.

VII. Motion to adjourn by Joel, seconded. Meeting is adjourned.