

California Sustainable Seafood Initiative (CSSI)
Ocean Protection Council

CSSI Advisory Panel Meeting
March 15, 2011
Cal-EPA Building
1001 I Street, Sierra Hearing room
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Summary

Introduction

The fourth meeting of the California Sustainable Seafood Initiative (CSSI) Advisory Panel took place on March 15, 2011 in Sacramento, California at the California Environmental Protection Agency Building. The objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Review and discuss alternative programs for CA sustainable seafood certification
2. Provide advice on a California sustainable seafood certification protocol
3. Provide input toward a marketing program

Fifteen Advisory Panel members participated in the meeting. Additional participants included invited technical experts from the California Department of Fish and Game, the Marine Stewardship Council, the California Collaborative Fisheries Research Organization, and a third-party certification organization.

This meeting summary summarizes key issues discussed and key outcomes that resulted from the meeting. This meeting summary is not intended to serve as a transcript of everything said at the meeting, but rather a summary of main points discussed.

The meeting summary is organized into the following sections:

1. Update on CSSI Advisory Panel Process
2. Compare and Discuss Key Options for a California Sustainable Seafood Certification Protocol
3. Individual Panel Member Feedback on Certification Protocol
4. Marketing Presentation and Panel Input
5. Comments from the Public
6. Action Items and Next Steps
7. Attendees

Each section below provides a brief overview of the topics discussed and then highlights key comments made by Advisory Panel members or OPC staff. The meeting agenda is attached as Appendix 1. All of the PowerPoint presentations may be found on the OPC website at the following link: <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/>.

1. Update on CSSI Advisory Panel Process

Sam Schuchat (OPC Secretary and Executive Officer State Coastal Conservancy) and Valerie Termini (OPC Project Manager) reviewed the timeline, upcoming milestones, and

other updates for the California Sustainable Seafood Initiative and the Advisory Panel. Key updates included the following:

- OPC staff presented their draft sustainable seafood certification protocol to the OPC at its November 29, 2011 meeting and solicited public comment during a 30-day public comment period. OPC staff reviewed the public comments on the protocol, and, based on the comments, decided to schedule an additional Advisory Panel meeting on March 15, 2011 to further explore alternative certification protocols.
- Following the March 15 meeting, OPC staff will consider Panel input and revise its draft certification protocol and present an update to the OPC at the Council's May 12 meeting in Morro Bay, CA.
 - No decision on the protocol will be made by the Council at the May 12 meeting.
 - The Panel was invited to provide additional comments to Valerie by Friday, March 18th, in order to inform the staff recommendation for the May 12 OPC meeting. Staff noted that the Panel will also have additional opportunities after March 18th to provide input on the protocol.
- A new bill (Monning) has been proposed in the California legislature to exempt the California Sustainable Seafood Initiative (CSSI) from the Administrative Procedures Act. If the bill passes, the regulatory process required by the Act, which calls for additional review for each step in the process causing delays of 3-6 months, would not apply.

2. Compare and Discuss Key Options for a California Sustainable Seafood Certification Protocol

Valerie Termini, OPC staff, opened a discussion on key options for a sustainable seafood certification program by presenting a list of key criteria OPC staff is using to evaluate among different options. This and other meeting materials can be found on the OPC CSSI website: <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/>

OPC staff and panel members discussed and clarified the following points following the presentation of key evaluation criteria:

- The OPC is looking for a certification program that supports all fisheries, including ones that sell locally and ones that export.
- Sustainability is a moving target, and a program should include a mechanism to track changes in sustainability.
- There was general agreement that cost is an important selection criterion for a certification program. There is potential for non-profit organizations or foundations to help fund the certification program.
- The sustainable seafood certification standard should be evaluated for consistency with the Marine Life Management Act (MLMA). The more consistent the standard is with the MLMA, the less of a burden the certification process will be to the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). Panel members also recommended that OPC staff examine the consistency between the MLMA and the FOA Guidelines for Ecolabeling.

Valerie then presented a table comparing a Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)-based certification process with a possible alternative that could be developed by the OPC (i.e., Process Comparison Table). The table compared the two processes at each of the various steps in the broader certification process. Valerie identified the main differences between the two processes: in particular, MSC has an established standard, process & procedures,

and management system to support it, where in an alternative process the standard, process & procedures, and management system would have to be created and supported by the OPC.

A summary of key topics discussed and key points made are for each step in the process as follows:

Establishing a Standard

OPC staff described what would be involved in establishing a standard if the MSC process was used versus an alternative process. Staff explained that the guiding legislation for the project, AB 1217, requires that the process meet requirements specified in the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) *Guidelines for Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine Capture Fisheries* (FAO Guidelines).¹ Staff further explained that MSC currently meets these requirements, but that if the OPC were to select an alternative process, it would need to establish its own standard. This standard could be built on the Caddy Questionnaire or the Rapfish model, and it would also require convening a technical committee and a transparent stakeholder process. Responsibilities OPC would have to undertake if it was to establish a standard, based on the FAO Guidelines, are explained in the meeting material entitled "Responsibilities of a Standard-setting Organization". The following items were discussed and clarified for this step in the process:

General Comments

- The FAO Code is used to evaluate the sustainability of a fishery and the FAO Guidelines are used to create a system and process to validate the use of a sustainable fishery logo.
- The certification methodology is a critical part of a certification standard.
- It appears as though the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute did not create their standard to meet the FAO Guidelines.
- It is important that agencies are involved up front in the certification of a fishery. OPC could be the co-client with a fishery association in the certification process.
- More information is needed about how data poor fisheries would be addressed in the MSC risk-based framework or through an alternative process.
- OPC staff clarified that the OPC does not hold regulatory authority.
- There should be a public comment period for establishment of a standard for either the MSC standard or an alternative standard. The OPC can provide an opportunity for public input on the standard if MSC is selected.

Comments on MSC

- MSC conducted workshops around the world to gather public input for the creation of its standard.
- Marine protected areas would be addressed in the MSC program as a management tool under the evaluation of ecosystems.
 - The Department of Fish and Game is very interested in evaluating all types of use of MPAs as a management tool.
 - MPAs were not all created equal and should each be evaluated on an individual basis.

¹ OPC staff also clarified that the FAO *Guidelines for Ecolabelling* (which specifies requirements for establishing an ecolabel) are distinct from the FAO *Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*, which articulates the requirement for responsible and sustainable fishing practices. This distinction had not been sufficiently clear in past CSSI meetings.

- MSC representatives clarified that when MSC initially established its standard, it believed the standard was at least 95% consistent with the FAO Guidelines. Now MSC believes it is 100% consistent with the FAO Guidelines. There are times when fisheries fall between the target reference point and the risk reference point. This is when you have to be concerned about the sustainability of a fishery and work with agencies and management to bring the fishery back up to the target reference point.
- There was general interest in re-evaluating whether California should use higher requirements above the MSC requirements.

There was general interest in learning more about how the MSC risk-based framework addresses certification of data poor fisheries.

Comments on Alternative Process

- In an alternative process, the OPC's Science Advisory Team (SAT) would assist in the selection process for the members of the Technical Committee.
- There are existing tools that could be incorporated into an alternative standard such as the Rapfish Model and the Caddy Questionnaire.
- The Rapfish Model could be used to evaluate data poor fisheries in an alternative standard.

Presentation of the Rapfish Model

Pete Nelson, Collaborative Fisheries Research Organization, gave a brief presentation of the Rapfish Model, a tool that was created to address data poor fisheries based on the FAO Code and could potentially be used in the development of an alternative process. The presentation can be found on the OPC website: <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/>. The following items were discussed and clarified:

- The economic component refers to the health of the fishery based on the FAO Code. The ethics component refers to the treatment and working condition of fishermen and seafood processors.
- The Rapfish Model can be used to identify where more information for a fishery is needed.
- The attributes are designed and phrased to minimize any sort of dishonest scoring.
- This is an extremely flexible assessment tool. The MSC performance indicators could be evaluated using the Rapfish Model. The Rapfish Model could be easily used to perform a pre-assessment.
- It was not clear how to compare assessed fishery stocks to unassessed fishery stocks.

Brief Overview of the Caddy Questionnaire

OPC staff asked Pete Nelson and Dave Anderson to provide an overview of the Caddy Questionnaire, a tool to evaluate the sustainability of a fishery based on the FAO Code. The following items were clarified and discussed:

- The Caddy Questionnaire is a checklist of questions developed from the relevant sections of the FAO Code that can be used to evaluate the sustainability of a fishery. It is a tool that can be used in the development of an alternative standard.
- Whatever tool is used to assess the fisheries, DFG and those involved in fisheries management should be closely involved in the assessment and selection of fisheries for certification.

- Whatever tool is used, it should be recognized that there is an extremely wide range of fisheries knowledge across California.

Selection of Fisheries

OPC staff explained that the OPC would work with the California Department of Fish and Game, the Pacific Fisheries Management Council, and fishery associations to select which fisheries will be evaluated in a pre-assessment. The following items were discussed and clarified for this step in the process:

- DFG shared that it is essential to select fisheries based on management needs because DFG does not have additional funding or resources to support certification. Fisheries with Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) in place to respond to changes in stock abundance are likely candidates for selection.
- To be selected, a fishery will need to be represented by a fishery association.
- OPC should consider using Richard Parish's priority list to inform selection of fisheries.
- The criteria used to select the fisheries should be made public.

Selection of a Third-Party Certification Body

OPC staff explained that the OPC would solicit requests for qualifications (RFQ), informed by the FAO Guidelines, to inform selection of a third-party certification body.

Pre-assessment

OPC staff explained that the selected fisheries would be pre-assessed for sustainability. In the MSC process, the pre-assessment would be performed by the selected third-party certification body. In an alternative process, OPC could have either the third-party certifier perform the pre-assessment or create an alternative pre-assessment process, possibly using the Rapfish Model or another assessment tool. In either case, the results of the pre-assessment would be public available (i.e. not confidential) since state money would be used. The following items were discussed and clarified for this step in the process:

- Pre-assessment is supposed to be a tool to identify if there is enough information for the fishery to go through a full assessment.
- It might be best to use state funds to improve fisheries in the pre-assessment phase, prior to using funds for certification.
 - DFG clarified that it frequently prioritizes how to allocate funds. If DFG chooses to fund one thing, then it has to cut funding for something else.
 - OPC clarified that it should not be assumed that all of OPC's funding will go towards fishery certification. Only a fraction of OPC funds are allocated to fisheries issues.
 - OPC's allocation of funding to other programs, like the Collaborative Fisheries Research Organization, could also help to improve fisheries, making them more eligible for certification.
- The MSC pre-assessment can be done for multiple fisheries at once.

OPC Public Meeting

OPC staff explained that based on the results of the pre-assessment, a fishery (or fisheries) will be selected for full assessment. OPC staff will inform the Council which fisheries will go through pre-assessment and there will an opportunity for the public to comment.

Full Assessment

OPC staff explained the many steps of the full assessment, including: announcement of initiation of full certification, assessment of the fishery, identifying and setting conditions for improvement of the fishery, evaluation of the chain of custody, and client review, peer review, and public review of draft assessment reports. The following items were discussed and clarified for this step in the process:

Assessment of Data Poor Fisheries

- MSC staff clarified that they are now using the default assessment tree and no longer “build” an assessment tree per fishery.
- MSC staff clarified that the risk-based framework was created to make certification accessible to fisheries in the developing world. They clarified that the stakeholder input gathered in the risk-based framework process is used to inform what the score should be, but the certification team ultimately decides what the score will be. Stakeholders are identified by the client and via outreach by the certifier, including a workshop. Using the risk-based framework ultimately makes for a more streamlined process; however, there are additional costs for holding public meetings.

Chain of Custody

- The FAO *Guidelines* require a chain of custody certification.
- MSC staff clarified that the chain of custody is designed on a company-by-company basis. Each company has to show that it has a system in place to identify a product and appropriate documentation to support it. MSC is looking into doing additional DNA testing.
- The chain of custody certification process is much quicker than the fishery certification process.
- Multiple parties in a supply chain could form an association and get certified jointly. There is cost savings associated with this type of arrangement. However, if one party in the association fails the certification, the whole association could be decertified for the chain of custody.
- The proposed California traceability program would not replace the chain of custody certification in either the MSC process or an alternative process.
- Use of the MSC logo is voluntary. A fishery or a company in the supply chain can choose to either use or not use the MSC logo. If a fishery or company chooses to use the logo, they will have to pay for it. If a company in the supply chain wants to use the MSC logo, it must do a chain of custody certification.

Costs of Certification

- Costs of fishery and chain of custody certification are based on use of the logo.
- MSC clarified that all information on spending is available in MSC’s annual report. The MSC fees support review of the process, keeping the standard up to date, and ongoing stakeholder processes.
- The cost associated with the MSC certification of an Alaska salmon fishery was discussed. It was clarified that ASMI arrived at the value for MSC certification through an independent study, however this study is not publicly available and it is unclear how specifically it arrived at the total cost.
 - Scientific Certification Systems, the third-party certification body for the Alaska Salmon fishery, reported that the recertification of the Alaska fishery cost \$120,000.00.
- The cost of licensing was discussed. There are licensing costs and process costs.

Objections Process

OPC staff explained that a formal objections process is a requirement of the FAO Guidelines. The following items were discussed and clarified for this step in the process:

- MSC staff shared that their objections procedures are under review.
- There is a significant fee for stakeholders to participate in the objections process. The independent adjudicator can waive the fee or receive funding through other mechanisms as they see fit. This fee acts as a deterrent to frivolous objections. There was a range of views expressed on this topic, including:
 - A fee should not be required to participate in the objections process.
 - A fee should be required to participate in the objections process because it ensures stakeholders are committed to the process.

3. Individual Panel Member Feedback on the Certification Protocol

OPC staff invited Panel members to provide advice on the sustainable seafood certification protocol based on their current thinking and the information discussed earlier at the meeting. Panel member feedback is summarized in brief below. OPC staff invited Panel members to provide additional input, if desired, in writing.

Timothy O'Shea, Cleanfish

Tim shared the view that MSC provides the best dollar value. He provided the analogy that "we should all be driving electric cars, but the hybrid is the best we have right now". The California components in the current draft protocol are good and should be kept. He expressed that it should be recognized that MSC has a lot to gain by getting the contract to certify California's fisheries. He suggested that OPC negotiate with MSC to a cost-sharing agreement. This will provide for shared accountability. He suggested that there is a benefit to selling this program as a public/private partnership.

Teri Shore, Turtle Island Restoration Network

Teri agreed with Tim's comments on a public/private partnership (see above). She advocated that higher standards for by-catch and endangered and threatened species still be included in the protocol. She asked that OPC staff prepare an estimated timeline for the CSSI process to share with the Advisory Panel.

Rick Algert, Morro Bay Harbor Director (retired)

Rick believes that California cannot create a more efficient program than MSC. He recommended using the MSC standard as the basis for the program, plus the California components in the current draft protocol. He expressed appreciation for Dave Anderson's public comments on the draft protocol submitted at the November 29, 2010 OPC meeting. He believes that most people want to know that their seafood is fresh and local.

Marcella Gutierrez, Terra Peninsular

Marcella recommended using MSC as the foundation of a California certification program. She recommended that OPC ensure that the certification program serve all fisheries equally. She recommended further analyzing how the MSC certification standard and process can best be applied in California.

Wayne Heikkila, Western Fishboat Owner's Association

Wayne expressed the view that the MSC program is comprehensive and doesn't need to be tweaked too much for use in California. He would like to know more about how the costs are passed on to fisheries. He shared that certification bodies are very open to negotiating the

price of certification. He recommended that OPC look into making a deal with a certifier for certification of all California Fisheries. This could save on costs. He recommended using local certifiers where possible. He forewarned that there will be a lot of changes in management and marketing, which could easily create confusion for the consumer if not handled properly.

Matthew Owens, FishWise

Matt suggested that there could be cost savings if OPC were to do its own pre-assessment using the Rapfish Model. He expressed the view that funding can be best used to collect data for fisheries prior to the full assessment. He would like to get clarity on the process to allocate funds for data collection. He recommended that the OPC share a decision tree for the selection of fisheries.

Stephanie Mutz, Commercial Fisherman of Santa Barbara

Stephanie recommended using MSC as the foundation for the certification protocol. She believes that Dave Anderson's public comment on the draft protocol was very well done and helpful. She recommended doing a brief feasibility analysis to evaluate the long term increases in the sustainability of a fishery. She recommended that OPC staff should still go talk to the fishermen and vet the proposed program. She recommended working with fishermen to gather data for the fisheries assessments. She expressed concern that certain fisheries will be left behind if a minimum MSC score of 80% is required because the fisheries are data poor and cannot afford to collect data.

Paul Johnson, Monterey Fish Company

Paul questioned whether there is the will or the funding to create an alternative process. He believes the krill fishery is a big problem, and he is concerned that it has been certified as sustainable under MSC. He also believes that whichever certification program is selected will be much better than not doing anything.

Michael De Alessi, Stanford University

Michael explained that he understood the practicality of the MSC standards, but also the desire of many on the panel to include other factors such as community fishing organizations (CFAs) and other measures of sustainability in a California standard. Since adding these standards does not seem practicable, he suggested considering how a California standard might promote CFAs without complicating the standard. One approach might be to charge a small amount for the use of the CA label and use some of that money to fund CFAs.

David Anderson, Aquarium of the Pacific

Dave recognized that there are limited resources in terms of manpower to support the CSSI. He offered his help and the help of the Aquarium of the Pacific. He suggested that he could run the Rapfish Model for California fisheries offline and share the results with the OPC. He thinks everyone is excited about supporting the certification program. He reiterated that use of the MSC logo is voluntary. He expressed concern that should AB1217 use MSC as the sole basis for the certification of sustainable seafood products here in CA, it will create the possibility that future legislation will limit the sale of locally produced seafood to products that are labeled as sustainable. He suggested, as a solution, to include a mechanism for the use of other certification schemes that meet the requirements of AB1217, even if these schemes have yet to be created.

Logan Kock, Santa Monica Seafood

Logan shared the view that participation in the Advisory Panel has been a great experience. He expressed that the FAO *Guidelines* do limit the options for a certification program. He expressed confidence in MSC as the foundation for a California certification program. He does not advocate for inclusion of too many additional California enhancements. He expressed a concern about the relevancy of MSC in California. He recommended that the OPC negotiate with MSC to arrive at a fair cost-sharing agreement. He mentioned that Santa Monica Seafood sells very little seafood with the MSC logo. He recommended that OPC figure out a marketing method that is more California friendly for the chain of custody.

Diane Pleschner-Steele

Diane expressed agreement with many Panel members' comments. She recommended that OPC create a workbook that the fisheries could use to provide information about the fishery and contribute directly to the process.

Patty Unterman

Patty supported Diane's idea of creating a workbook for the fisheries. She expressed that she values the idea of local and sustainable seafood and supports promotion of a specific label for it.

Sam King, King Seafood

Sam recommended selecting fisheries for certification based on one of the following two methods, 1) select fisheries that are most in need of data, funding, etc., or 2) select fisheries that are most ready for certification. He recommended using the Rapfish Model to evaluate fisheries. Sam recommended using MSC as the foundation for certification. He supported including the additional traceability component in the protocol.

Jonathan Hardy, LJ Hardy Consulting LLC

Jonathan clarified that the logo will be granted for use by a fishery only after the certification has been awarded. He also clarified that California is going to address and support under-utilized and under-marketed fisheries through a marketing campaign supported by CDFA. He shared that fisheries scientists are suggesting that fishermen & consumers start identifying species at the lower levels of the ocean food chain to eat in the future.

4. Marketing Presentation and Panel Input

Glen Yost from the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) presented how CDFA would support a marketing program from the CSSI. He shared many examples of marketing programs CDFA has previously supported and is currently supporting. His presentation can be found on the OPC website: <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/>. Panel member shared the following clarifications, comments, and advice:

Clarifications

- CDFA's role is to do a marketing analysis, make recommendations for a marketing program, and administers the program. The client (OPC) would hire an ad agency to create and implement the marketing program.
- California food producers who benefit from a CDFA marketing program must pay a fee. Organic producers and farmers market associations could potentially be exempt from the fee.

- There are many approaches that could be taken for marketing California Sustainable Seafood, including: marketing each fishery individually, marketing California sustainable seafood in general, or marketing regionally by port.
- In any marketing program, you identify who is willing to participate in the program and how much they are willing to pay.

Comments

- Sea Urchin fishermen pay approximately 1 cent per pound for a California marketing program.
- The Oregon Commission (including albacore, pink shrimp and crab) pays three quarters of a cent per pound for a marketing program. The marketing program does a fairly good job, but there is animosity within the fishery from people who do not want to pay the fee.
- The California seafood council ended because the trawl processing center was getting negative publicity and decided that its money would be better spent on lobbying.
- The Buy California Program was funded on federal grants for two years and has received no additional funding.

Advice

- A good example of a successful marketing program is the wine industry. Specifically, Oregon Tilth is a good example to follow.
- The existing councils should be included in marketing.
- Industry should drive the marketing program.
- Initial marketing should possibly be targeted to the LA Basin and the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Seafood with a California label is a value-added product, and consumers are willing to pay more for it. Since certification and marketing is a voluntary program, any fishery that wants to participate should be willing to pay a small amount.
- Marketing should be done for the long term. This could best be supported by a public/private partnership.
- David Anderson offered marketing support from "Seafood for the Future", which a non-profit seafood advisory and promotional program based at the Aquarium of the Pacific. Seafood for the Future produced a family-owner focused marketing program for Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) and is happy to provide examples to inform development of a California marketing program.
- The marketing program should focus on a particular audience, starting with school lunches.

5. Public Comment

- Marie Logan, Food and Water Watch, expressed the view that contamination of seafood is important to address in the California certification program because consumers will assume that a product is safe to eat if it is certified.
- Sarah Sikich, Heal the Bay, stated that Heal the Bay supports Food and Water Watch's suggestions (see above). She expressed interest in how fisheries will be selected for certification and suggested that the criteria for selection should be considered by the Advisory Panel. She suggested that it might be worthwhile to figure out how to help fund fisheries for pre-assessment. She stated that the peer review process is very important. She expressed support for having OPC staff develop a CSSI process timeline.

6. Closing Comments and Next Steps

Sam Schuchat thanked the Panel members for all of their time and thoughtful input. Sam noted that this will likely be the last in-person Advisory Panel meeting, although OPC staff may well contact individual Panel members for additional advice over the coming weeks.

OPC staff will present a revised draft protocol as an update to the OPC at the OPC's May 12, 2011 meeting.

Key Next Steps

1. Advisory Panel members will provide additional input on the certification protocol to Valerie by Friday, March 18, 2011.
2. OPC staff will transmit the selection criteria worksheet in MS Word format to the Advisory Panel as soon as possible.
3. OPC staff will revise the draft protocol based on the Advisory Panel's feedback and will present the resulting revision to the OPC as an update at the May 12, 2011 OPC meeting. No decision on the protocol will be made by the Council at this meeting.
4. OPC staff will be reaching out to individual panel members over the next several months to get additional feedback on the direction of the CSSI.
5. Pete Nelson will transmit Rapfish Model case studies to Valerie to share with the Advisory Panel as soon as possible.
6. OPC staff will prepare a timeline for the CSSI process and transmit this to Panel members as soon as possible. It should be noted that the timeline may need to be adjusted as the process proceeds.
7. MSC will provide Valerie with the objections procedures to share with the Advisory Panel as soon as possible.

7. Attendees

Advisory Panel Members:

David Anderson, Aquarium of the Pacific
Diane Pleschner-Steele, California Wetfish Producers
Jonathan Harty, LJ Hardy Consulting LLC
Logan Kock, Santa Monica Seafoods
Matthew Owens, FishWise
Marcella Gutierrez, Terra Peninsular
Michael De Alessi, Stanford University
Patricia Unterman, Hayes Street Grill
Paul Johnson, Monterey Fish Company
Rick Algert, Morro Bay Harbor Director (retired)
Sam King, King Seafood
Stephanie Mutz, Commercial Fisherman of Santa Barbara
Teri Shore, Turtle Island Restoration Network
Timothy O' Shea, Cleanfish
Wayne Heikkila, Western Fishboat Owner's Association

Invited Technical Experts:

Dan Avrill, Marine Stewardship Council
Glen Yost, California Department of Food and Agriculture
Jim Humphreys, Marine Stewardship Council
Mike Decesry, Marine Stewardship Council

Pete Nelson, California Collaborative Fisheries Research Organization
Sabina Daume, Scientific Certification Systems
Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game

OPC Staff:

Sam Schuchat, OPC Secretary and Executive Officer State Coastal Conservancy
Valerie Termini, OPC Project Manager

Public Attendees:

Marie Logan, Food and Water Watch
Sarah Sikich, Heal the Bay
Eric Chung, Conservation Strategy Group (CSG)

Facilitators:

Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West
Briana Moseley, Kearns & West

APPENDIX 1

AGENDA

California Sustainable Seafood Initiative

Advisory Panel Meeting #4

March 15, 2010 (10:00 AM – 5:15 PM)

Cal-EPA Building
1001 I Street, Sierra Hearing room
Sacramento, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

4. Review and discuss alternative programs for CA sustainable seafood certification
5. Provide advice on a CA sustainable seafood certification protocol
6. Provide input toward a marketing program

Public comment will take place at approximately 2:00 PM on March 15, 2011

AGENDA

Time	Topic
9:30 AM	<i>Arrivals and refreshments</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review
10:15 AM	Review status of Advisory Panel process and outline anticipated next steps
10:30 AM	Compare and discuss key options for CA sustainable seafood certification protocol <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)• Alternatives
12:00 PM	<i>Lunch</i>
12:45 PM	(Continued) Compare and discuss key options for CA sustainable seafood certification protocol
2:00 PM	Public Comment
2:30 PM	<i>Break</i>
2:45 PM	Provide individual feedback on certification protocol; address evaluation criteria
3:45 PM	CA Dept. of Food and Ag presentation on marketing program
4:30 PM	Advisory Panel provides input on marketing program
5:00 PM	Recap, Next Steps, and Thanks

5:15 PM	Adjourn
---------	---------

Supporting meeting materials

1. *Process Comparison – MSC and Alternatives
2. *Program Comparison Worksheet
3. *Responsibilities of a Standard-setting Organization
4. *FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (i.e., FAO Code), FAO
5. *A Checklist for Fisheries Resources Management Issues seen from the Perspective of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (i.e., Caddy Questionnaire), FAO
6. *Guidelines for the Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine Capture Fisheries, FAO
7. *MSC Fisheries Certification Methodology, Marine Stewardship Council
8. *Hawaii Longline Fishery Caddy Questionnaire Examples – excerpts from the document: Using questionnaires based on the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries as diagnostic tools in support of fisheries management, by Global Partnerships for Responsible Fisheries
9. Public Comment on Draft OPC protocol – go to <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/>

*Hardcopy handouts will be provided at meeting