



Wild, Natural & Sustainable®

Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute
Responsible Fisheries Management (RFM) Committee Meeting
September 5 (Thursday), 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

Chair Fina calls the meeting to order at 1 pm Pacific Time.

b. Roll call

Committee members present:

Chair Mark Fina, Julie Decker, Tomi Marsh, Matt Alward, Scott Goodman, Joel Peterson, Matt Tinning

Others:

Jeremy Woodrow (ASMI), Susan Marks(ASMI), John Burrows (ASMI), Jeff Regnart, Jeff Stephens, Jamie Goen (Bering Sea Crabbers), Chris Oliver (Alaska Seafood Co-op), , Trent Hartill

c. Approval of agenda

It is suggested that a discussion of the US logo launch be added to the Asia rollout strategy dialogue.

d. Approval of minutes from 3/25/19

Julie moves to approve, notes we should have reason for moving to exec session added. Seconded by Joel and approved.

f. Goals & discussion for current meeting

Chair Fina says we must discuss and update Iceland and Norway, MBAq, logo launch, foundation board considerations/recommendations, brief GSSI update, and discuss BOD meeting

II. Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

III. New Business

a. Update and discussion on transition talks with Iceland and Norway

- Brussels discussion w/ Iceland

A meeting occurred in Brussels with Fridrick (Iceland) and with Kristjan (Iceland), as well as Sophie Mathieson (Denmark). Iceland has stated that they are interested in coordinating with our program. After the meeting, it was suggested that the best coordination would be in the Chain of Custody (CoC) Standard, effectively merging the standards. Currently, Iceland and Alaska are working towards a joint standard and system so that an application to one would qualify for both programs.

Since the time that the board of Iceland RFM gave their approval, they have become much more enthusiastic. In addition to CoC, they are also seeking other areas of commonality since we both have FAO-based programs. Iceland will have a board meeting in November, to which Mark and Jeff have been invited to present on RFM and meet afterwards on CoC. They have also invited the Norwegians to the meeting. We submitted a list of differences between our CoC standards to the Icelanders, whom in return have drafted a joint CoC Standard.

- Addition of Denmark to discussions

- i. Denmark has also now expressed interest in joining with us, Norway, and Iceland.

- Norway RFP to develop RFM fishery standard

- i. The Norwegians are soliciting proposals to help develop their program and are seeking help from both us and Iceland. They are likely to start developing the program structure in the fall. They began the solicitation process a few days ago and are expected to make their decisions by October. In the solicitation, they have reached out to us, Iceland, and SI Global. The hope would be that they fold into the same joint CoC agreement as us and Iceland.

- ii. Julie asks about how the CB's approval of joint CoC might function. Mark answers that the CoC would only need to be approved once, with scheme owners reaching an agreement with the CB's for the procedures. Sorting out the multi-site CoC sections will take some time, as the rules for it have changed since the current version was approved. As written now it would be insufficient so it needs to be tweaked. It is likely we will eventually have a committee w/Iceland and Norway so contracts would function under all three schemes.

- iii. It is asked what the timeline is for the joint CoC vs the shift to foundation and whether that timeline will affect the joint CoC efforts. Mark answers that it does not really matter. CoC is ASAP, and the shift to a foundation should not affect anything. Jeff adds that a lot of the speed is dependent on how fast the Icelanders want to move.

- iv. Matt Tinning asks about what areas of the two standards possess underlying commonality and which are more divisive. Mark answers that CoC is easiest, then governance and the fisheries standards. Mark adds that the next stage is to align our commonalities and attempt to align our fisheries standards as closely as we can. We both agree they should be FAO-based with no logo fees and possessing ISO accreditation. Promoting/marketing the two programs still needs to be discussed, but all parties acknowledge that a joint program is desirable.

Eventually, it may make sense to invite an Icelander to be on the new RFM Foundation board. The hatchery program was a tripping point for discussions in the past, since they (Iceland) don't have a parallel program. Iceland is highly protective of their fisheries standard, but it's around 80% similar to the current Alaska RFM fisheries standard. Jeff says the Norwegian standard is the way forward as they will be pulling from Iceland and Alaska, creating a hybrid and allowing a merging of ideas to exist. We might then adopt this Norwegian hybrid standard, which would encourage Iceland to do the same.

- b. Update and discussion on MBAq and the ASMI MBAq working group
 - MBAq is in the process of a website re-design. At present, Eco-certs are represented on their site as being "at-least" yellow (good alternative) meaning it might be best choice but might not. This classification will not change but the color representative of eco-certification will be blue instead of grey. They have heard from us on making Alaska more prominent, but we don't yet know how it will look in the finished site. We suggested a parallel assessment by MBAq for MSC/RFM certs, but that is up in the air largely because they don't want to be viewed as a certification. Jeff states Julie's AFDF letter was heard and changes are being made. We expect the new version of the site to be seen by us around mid-October. Ryan Bigelow will be in on the phone at All-Hands during the WG meeting. He is their primary web design individual there. They are also re-doing their pocket guides and the app.
 - Susan says the template letter we wrote was really written for industry and that John Salle was disappointed with industry's lack of engagement. Many said they did not receive the letter, but the letter click-through data said otherwise. The committee recommends a re-send and Jeff says we will discuss this during MBAq working group.
- c. Public Comment period for MBAq Seafood Watch standards 8/19/19-10/18/19
 - MBAq would like our input on their fisheries standards. We would send out highlights of issues to help pinpoint areas people may want to read.
 - Matt asks about RFM getting eco-cert status by MBAq. We elected not to because we didn't want to join with them too tightly. MSC has similar gripes with this as well.
 - The committee notes that they want to engage in further discussion on joint assessment.
- d. RFM Logo Update/Japan CoC
 - All applications in Phase I (US, UK, EU [English], Japan, China, Hong Kong) have been filed except China. Included in the Phase I applications are also translations for Japan and China/Hong Kong. EU translations will be done w/ Phase II. The logo was launched in Japan 2 weeks ago and there was an accompanying press release for the purpose of Trident's use. No news has yet been released in the US. For the Asia market, we don't have any activities planned. SAI global is in Asia, but in China specifically making them unsuitable as the Japanese auditor. Current auditor in Japan (Omnita) is not ISO accredited. Japan OMR is doing excellent work but is frustrated and needs our assistance/guidance in the rollout.
- e. Discussion of how best to direct RFM marketing efforts in US and Asia - ETP funds
 - The new logo strategy for Asia was put together by International Director Hannah Lindoff. With this strategy, we also received a lot of questions

regarding US strategy. The new Terms of Use and Brandmark Guidelines are both now complete and available.

- Jeremy says we aren't sure what the expectations are for ASMI staff for the RFM rollout. Susan adds we don't want a half-done plan to go forward in US. Mark adds we don't want to shift this to a foundation just for it to disappear in a year. John Salle and the Domestic Committee have said previous efforts to market it have not resulted in any tangible uptick. A sales tact is going to be needed. Discussion ensues around the difficulty in conveying the value when it's not being asked for...as an example, the Japan Olympics provided an opportunity because of programs asking for it due to GSSI benchmarking.

Jeff suggests a small committee puts together a strategy document for ASMI staff in the domestic market. Julie motions to create a sub-committee of domestic and RFM committee members to create a marketing strategy for the domestic market. Joel adds that a value communication tool (one-pager) would be helpful. Susan adds that the toolkit does that, but may be too wordy. There is a quick guide that would be suitable but it needs the logo switched out, and a CoC one-pager is needed. Mark states that we need to focus in on piggy-backing capability of RFM and MSC programs.

f. Review Foundation applications

- There will be both an Interim Board and a Final Board. Applications are in from internal solicitation for the Interim Board but the list is not yet closed. 16th of August was the end date to submit but the ASMI Board can add more if they decide to. 1 or 2 current Board members would like to be on it. The Interim Board will be 9 members, 8 names submitted. The Interim Board will last 1 year, and consideration should be made for forthcoming permanent board and seats for intl members (Iceland, Norway, and Denmark) and for NGO's.

g. GSSI update – MOCA and possible new committee of recognized programs

- We met in May with other GSSI accredited programs due to GSSI's lack of communication. Audits were not completed in a timely manner and there was misinformation communicated second and third-hand. Herman from GSSI responded that he's taking the issue up the ladder. Because GSSI is a cornerstone, we need to make sure that they keep us in the loop. Jeff adds that we successfully passed the tri-annual surveillance hurdle.

h. Review discussion from ASMI BOD meeting 9/3/19

CoC, MBAq, and the Interim Board were discussed in summary briefly.

i. Next meeting

Tentative plan to meet during All-Hands. Likely on the second-day. This will be finalized shortly and communicated to Committee members.

Tomi asks if we have an ask to the board. The group decides to ask for an update on interim board, and direction for collaboration w/ASMI staff and on practical things to be completed.

IV. Adjourn

Motioned by Mark seconded by Tomi. Adjourned.