

California Sustainable Seafood Initiative (CSSI)
Ocean Protection Council

CSSI Advisory Panel Meeting

August 2-3, 2010

Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) Offices
3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110
Costa Mesa, CA

Meeting Summary

Introduction

The second meeting of the California Sustainable Seafood Initiative (CSSI) Advisory Panel took place on August 2-3, 2010 in Costa Mesa, California, at the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) Offices. The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Present and discuss different certification models, including discussion of results and impacts
- Discuss and outline core elements of a California sustainable seafood certification program

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.

The meeting summary is organized into the following sections:

- | |
|---|
| <p>A. Day One – August 2, 2010</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Agenda Review and the Advisory Panel’s Charge2. Review of Framework Questions3. Presentation of certification models<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Presentationb. Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Presentationc. Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) Presentationd. Greenpeace Sustainable Seafood Program Presentatione. Sustainable Wine Growers Presentationf. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Style Tiers Presentation4. Fisheries Matrix Presentation and Discussion5. Comments from the Public <p>B. Day Two – August 3, 2010</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recap of Discussion from Day One2. Framework Questions Discussion3. YottaMark Presentation on Traceability4. Initial Thinking on a California Certification Program5. Process Suggestions6. Comments from the Public <p>C. Action Items and Next Steps</p> <p>D. Attendees</p> |
|---|

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/2010/08/august-2-3-2010-cssi-meeting/>.

A. Day One – August 2, 2010

1. Agenda Review and the Advisory Panel’s Charge

Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West (K&W) facilitator, reviewed the objectives of the meeting, the agenda, the charge of the advisory panel, roles and responsibilities of OPC staff and the advisory panel, core tasks of the advisory panel, the ground rules, and led the group in roundtable introductions.

2. Review of Framework Questions

Eric reviewed a set of Framework Questions for the Advisory Panel to consider as they listen to the various presentations that followed (described below). The framework questions included:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the different certification models presented on Day 1?
2. Which of the certification models presented would you recommend as the foundation for a California sustainable seafood certification program?
3. What elements need to be included or modified to make the program appropriate for California?

Eric also reviewed a list of additional questions/issues for the Advisory Panel to consider as they thought about the framework questions. These include:

- Is it possible to certify fishermen without certifying fisheries?
- Is there value in a “tiered” certification? Does certification have to mean “OK to eat” or can the certification “tier” inform consumers of commitments to resource “improvement”?
- Is 3rd party certification the best option? Is 1st or 2nd party preferable?
- Is a conformity certification sufficient? Chain of custody? Both?
- Are there FMP “red flags” that would preclude a fishery from certification consideration?
- Is there a mechanism for tracking cumulative “take” by sustainable fishermen?
- How do individual transfer quotas (ITQ) factor in, if at all?
- How robust is the traceability aspect? Should it be ocean to port? Ocean to plate?

3. Presentation of Certification Models

a. World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Presentation

WWF Vice President and Managing Director, Bill Fox, gave an overview presentation on the work of WWF as it relates to sustainable seafood certification efforts. Mr. Fox presented the findings of a WWF-commissioned assessment that evaluated several international and national sustainable seafood certification programs against key

criteria. The programs assessed included Marine Stewardship Council, Friend of Sea, Naturland, Marine Ecolabel Japan, and Dolphin Safe, among others. The complete presentation can be found on the OPC website. The following questions were discussed by panel members and Mr. Fox:

Question (Q): What do you think about point of origin labeling?

Answer (A): An ecolabel is an important part of a certification program. WWF would like to see one ecolabel that fits one set of criteria so that the meaning of an ecolabel can be easily understood by the public.

Q: Are there certification programs that promote ways for fishers to improve their techniques?

A: In certification through MSC, there are conditions that are put on fisheries to improve operations. These conditions are audited annually and reassessed for improvement every 5 years during recertification. We are hoping that MSC will take a close look at bottom trawling and set criteria for how to manage this fishing practice. These guidelines put pressure on the industry to continuously improve.

Q: From the presentation, it appears as though certification programs do not do a good job at certifying ecosystems. Do you have ideas for how certification programs can improve in this area? An ideal set of criteria would evaluate the resilience of an ecosystem.

A: Certification programs have had difficulty certifying ecosystems. MSC has recently conducted a two-year study on how their certification program can embrace ecological guidelines. These guidelines were just adopted into the program.

Q: Ecosystem labeling is a pass/fail system. How does MSC certification related to the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Program.

A: If you are going through MSC certification, you set up a plan that corresponds to the Seafood Watch Green level. If dealing with fisheries associated with the Seafood Watch yellow level, MSC will put conditions on the certification to move the fishery into the green level.

Q: Why haven't certification programs embraced carbon footprint criteria?

A: The concept of carbon footprint criteria is fairly new and something that certification programs should be incorporating from WWF's perspective.

Q: What are the big picture results of MSC?

A: In the UK, there is good understanding of the MSC label and high demand for sustainable products.

Q: Are ecolabels recession proof?

A: The impression is that certification programs have momentum and are not being stifled by recessions.

Q: Are there new ecolabels that this panel should look at?

A: The Iceland ecolabel is worth looking at. In general, the effectiveness of ecolabels is hard to assess. The Iceland Ecolabel report can be found at <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/>

Q: Has anyone assessed criteria overlap of various certification programs?

A: The Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch program has reviewed it's criteria to shadow MSC criteria. WWF is working with NGOs to adopt MSC, or similar, criteria. Some ecolabels have been granting their label to a fishery if it is already MSC certified.

Q: We in the U.S. do not practice precautionary measures to the extent that this is institutionalized in Europe. How do we help people to understand a precautionary approach to certification?

A: The precautionary approach is important to a successful certification program. It must incorporate scientific uncertainty and uncertainty in management approaches.

Q: Are there organizations that help fisheries with funding the MSC certification process?

A: Yes, WWF helps fund the MSC certification of fisheries.

Q: What do you think of co-labels?

A: As long as there is a clear approach, co-labeling may work.

Q: What do you think of the French high grade label called "label rouge"? This may be a label to consider for a California certification program with a higher standard.

A: That label represents more than sustainability. It includes a specific quality of food.

b. Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Presentation

MSC Fisheries Manager, Dan Averill, gave an overview presentation of the MSC approach to sustainable seafood certification. Mr. Averill reviewed the certification structure, principles, and the fishery performance level scoring system. The complete presentation can be found on the OPC website. The following questions were discussed by panel members and Mr. Averill:

Q: Are processors in Asia showing any interest in MSC certification?

A: We are gaining a presence in Asia with opening offices in Tokyo and China. I will have to get back to you about market interest of certified seafood in Asia.

Q: Are you finding that small-boat fisheries are interested in MSC certification?

A: There are a tremendous number of small-boat fisheries that MSC would like to reach out to. They could go through the secondary risk assessment process if they can show some measure of biomass for the fishery.

Q: Can you explain the rationale for the MSC scoring system and associated conditions for certification?

A: Most fisheries would not qualify initially for a non-conditional certification (80 points or higher). Conditions have been designed to move a fishery toward a standard that would allow certification.

Q: Why doesn't MSC perform the certification in house?

A: MSC doesn't hire 3rd party certifiers; the fishery in question does. This maintains a firewall between the people who write the standards and those who do the certifying. This helps to maintain MSC's impartiality.

Q: How would a change in a fishery's fishing method (i.e., gear switch) be addressed by the MSC?

A: If it is found that a fishery is not performing within the requirements of the certification, then the certification would be revoked. The annual audits and 5-year recertification requirements are designed to catch inconsistencies like this. If the population of a fish stock fell, however, and the fishery management entity responded to the event by changing the total allowable catch (TAC) to a precautionary amount, then the fishery may not lose its certification.

Q: How do you evaluate fishery management systems?

A: It is important for the state to manage fisheries and help to establish certification standards.

Note: In order to provide additional information for panel members, the following has been taken directly from the document, '*The Principals and Criteria for sustainable fishing*' from the MSC website regarding fishery management systems at:

http://www.msc.org/documents/scheme-documents/msc-standards/MSC_environmental_standard_for_sustainable_fishing.pdf

A. Management System Criteria:

1. The fishery shall not be conducted under a controversial unilateral exemption to an international agreement.

The management system shall:

2. Demonstrate clear long-term objectives consistent with MSC Principles and Criteria and contain a consultative process that is transparent and involves all interested and affected parties so as to consider all relevant information, including local knowledge. The impact of fishery management decisions on all those who depend on the fishery for their livelihoods, including, but not confined to subsistence, artisanal, and fishing-dependent communities shall be addressed as part of this process;
3. Be appropriate to the cultural context, scale and intensity of the fishery – reflecting specific objectives, incorporating operational criteria, containing procedures for implementation and a process for monitoring and evaluating performance and acting on findings;
4. Observe the legal and customary rights and long term interests of people dependent on fishing for food and livelihood, in a manner consistent with ecological sustainability;
5. Incorporates an appropriate mechanism for the resolution of disputes arising within the system;
6. Provide economic and social incentives that contribute to sustainable fishing and shall not operate with subsidies that contribute to unsustainable fishing;
7. Act in a timely and adaptive fashion on the basis of the best available information using a precautionary approach particularly when dealing with scientific uncertainty;
8. Incorporate a research plan – appropriate to the scale and intensity of the fishery – that addresses the information needs of management and provides for the dissemination of research results to all interested parties in a timely fashion;
9. Require that assessments of the biological status of the resource and impacts of

- the fishery have been and are periodically conducted;
10. Specify measures and strategies that demonstrably control the degree of exploitation of the resource, including, but not limited to:
 - a) Setting catch levels that will maintain the target population and ecological community's high productivity relative to its potential productivity, and account for the non-target species (or size, age, sex) captured and landed in association with, or as a consequence of, fishing for target species;
 - b) Identifying appropriate fishing methods that minimise adverse impacts on habitat, especially in critical or sensitive zones such as spawning and nursery areas;
 - c) Providing for the recovery and rebuilding of depleted fish populations to specified levels within specified time frames;
 - d) Mechanisms in place to limit or close fisheries when designated catch limits are reached;
 - e) Establishing no-take zones where appropriate;
 11. Contains appropriate procedures for effective compliance, monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement which ensure that established limits to exploitation are not exceeded and specifies corrective actions to be taken in the event that they are.

Q: Do you have cheaters?

A: We are as diligent as we can be, and some fisheries have lost their certification due to discrepancies.

Q: How do you trace steps in a fishery's MSC chain of custody?

A: There is a supplier directory on the MSC website where you can enter the code on the label to find the source of the product. This is the MSC website address where you can insert the source code:

<http://cert.msc.org/supplierdirectory/VController.aspx?Path=be2ac378-2a36-484c-8016-383699e2e466&NoLayout=true>

Q: What small artisanal fisheries have been certified by MSC?

A: A Portuguese Sardine fishery has been certified using the risk based framework. Gear type is important to assess as part of the certification. The UK Sussex project is a good method for assessing which fisheries should be prioritized for certification. The link to the UK Fisheries report is on the OPC website:
<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/07/cssi-meeting-materials-august-2-3-2010/>

Q: How are stakeholders identified in the MSC certification process, and who are they?

A: Stakeholders are identified by the fishery client in the pre-assessment phase. In the full assessment phase, the certification process is supported by a stakeholder group.

Q: How does MSC decide which retail partners to partner with?

A: That depends on the particular agreement with the retailer. We have identified good partners to leverage MSC products.

Q: Why have fisheries withdrawn from MSC certification?

A: There are many reasons. In some cases, the certification process was not a good fit for the correct client. In others, adequate funding was not available.

Almost 40% of fisheries that go through pre-assessment don't go through certification.

Q: Have any government organizations hired MSC for certification?

A: Yes, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is an example.

c. Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) Presentation

ASMI Executive Director, Ray Ruitta, gave an overview presentation on Alaska's approach to sustainable seafood certification. Mr. Ruitta also reviewed key changes to ASMI's approach to verification, where ASMI recently decided to have 3rd party certification of the extent to which Alaska fisheries meet the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) guidelines for sustainable fisheries. The complete presentation can be found on the OPC website. The following questions were discussed by panel members and Mr. Ruitta:

Q: It appears as though the Alaska certification is an ecolabel. Has MSC helped you create this certification program?

A: MSC has helped Alaska with its certification program quite a bit. It is a mutually beneficial relationship. Alaska's goal is to provide an equal access certification for all fisheries, including fishers that sell directly off their boats.

Q: Is the Fishwatch program used in Alaska?

A: We point to the program as a source information for our existing program, but I don't know that we use it as part of the certification criteria.

Q: You call the logo a source logo. Does this mean that you are marketing fish as caught in Alaska?

A: Yes, the goal is to promote Alaska as the origin of seafood. Alaska can't afford to lose brand equity.

Q: Can you share the criteria for management that you are evaluating in your certification process? What are the components of the evaluation of the management system?

A: Those criteria are currently being established and will be posted on ASMI's website when completed. The criteria will be very similar to MSC criteria.

Q: In order to be certified, must the fish be landed in Alaska?

A: The fish must be caught within Alaska's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Q: How is the Alaska government involved in establishing what fish is suitable for consumption.

A: The Alaska government is involved in the management of the fisheries and sits on the ASMI board. We are a state board and members are appointed by the governor.

Q: Does Alaska have any smaller fisheries that are being assessed for certification?

A: No, we do not have any "small" fisheries that are being assessed right now.

d. Greenpeace Sustainable Seafood Program Presentation

Greenpeace Senior Marketing Campaigner, Casson Trenor, gave an overview presentation of Greenpeace's views of and approach to sustainable seafood certification and fisheries management. Mr. Trenor explained that Greenpeace has a sustainable seafood retail marketing project which identifies the largest seafood retailers and ranks their seafood based on the four main criteria: existence of a sustainable fisheries policy, seafood sustainability initiatives, labeling and transparency, and sales of Greenpeace 'Red Listed' fisheries. He expressed that California has an opportunity through this California certification program to set a higher industry standard for sustainable seafood. He also shared his experience in opening the first sustainable sushi restaurant. He explained that his customers want to feel good about what they eat and to know if the food is local and sustainably caught. His presentation did not include a PowerPoint. The following questions were discussed by panel members and Mr. Trenor:

Q: How do you know that the seafood you sell at your restaurant is sustainable?

A: We select our seafood based on the Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch ranking program. I will not serve red-listed fish. In general, it is important for restaurants to be able to know with assurances that the fish they are serving is sustainable.

Q: People are interested in getting seafood from small artisanal fisheries; however, there are relatively few artisanal fisheries left in California. It seems as though certification works well with large-scale fisheries and retailers, but how does it work for artisanal fisheries?

A: It is important to maintain artisanal fisheries. One way to encourage this is to provide information on seafood that is caught locally and seasonally, in contrast to only certifying huge retailers. Certification should accommodate both large and small fisheries and promote the gradual shift toward sustainability for all fisheries.

Q: Can you give us tangible examples of how Greenpeace's retail marketing project has changed purchasing patterns?

A: I don't think that Greenpeace is responsible for any one change in marketing strategy. I believe we have done our part. Greenpeace has been critical of MSC and believe that there are some important changes that MSC needs to make.

Comment: It would be good to use the term "family fishermen" instead of "artisanal fisheries." Sustainability in many people's minds is defined as a three-legged stool balancing community, economy and environment. It is important to balance coastal communities with viable fisheries (large and small). The way to bring back family fishermen is through market recognition.

e. Sustainable Wine Growers Presentation

The Wine Institute's Director of Environmental Affairs and the California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance's (CSWA) Executive Director, Allison Jordon, gave an overview presentation on the Sustainable Wine Growers certification program, including challenges and lessons learned that may be useful to the CSSI effort. Ms. Jordon participated by webinar. In particular, she shared the program's evolution from first party self-assessment to third party audits. The complete presentation can

be found on the OPC website. The following questions were discussed by panel members and Ms. Jordon:

Q: Do you think the wine industry has benefited from this certification? If so, how?

A: The program was launched only six months ago and it is too early to tell. The program is starting to generate interest and brand loyalty. The next step is to introduce the program to large retailers and see if they will recognize it.

Q: Have you noticed a difference between self-assessment and third party audits?

A: Third party audits seem to be an important component of the certification program and help the program be better recognized from a regulatory perspective. There is value in documenting the process by helping growers to understand what they can do better.

Q: Since the label is not used on the wine bottle, how do you address wine bottles that were produced before the certification program?

A: That is a chain of custody issue. An on-site audit is conducted the first year, with remote audits on year two and three. Improvements must be shown every year, similarly to MSC. We follow the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) model. We heard from some outreach we conducted that stakeholders were general not in favor of using the label on the bottle.

Q: Who develops the self-assessment workbooks, and what is the funding source?

A: Share Harvest consulting helped the Sustainable Wine Growers develop the workbook. The Lodi framework was used as the basis for the workbook. Funding was provided by a grant from the Community Farm Alliance and the industry.

Q: Is there a connection between the program's three main components: continued improvement, awards, and workshops?

A: Yes, all three of these components will help us gather information about the program, improve it, and inform how to direct resources for education.

Q: How have you involved other organizations in the development of the certification standards?

A: Yes, we've involved other organizations. We heard criticism that the program is too flexible. If the goal is to create change, then this program is the correct model.

f. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Style Tiers Presentation

LEED's CEO of CTG Energetics and Chair of the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) technical committee, Dr. Malcolm Lewis, gave an overview presentation on the LEED style tiers certification program, including components that may inform or be useful in creating a California sustainable seafood certification program. Mr. Lewis specifically reviewed LEED's four tiered approach to certifying green development. The complete presentation can be found on the OPC website. The following questions were discussed by panel members and Mr. Lewis:

Q: Is the cost for certification uniform?

A: The certification does not have a high overhead, and the industry is comfortable with the costs for certification. Contactors are currently fully comfortable with the process and cost.

Q: Once a building is certified, is there a proportion of buildings moving up on the scale of LEED certification over time?

A: LEED is now making the transition from certifying buildings to moving buildings up the certification tiers. Also, we are trying to raise the bar for each tier of certification fast enough so that developers always have a higher standard to aspire to.

Q: When you look at where we are as a planet, how much do you see water being a focus of certification from your perspective?

A: Water is a major focus. There is not a strong incentive to certify water because it is so cheap.

Q: The majority of Americans are not interested in sustainable seafood. It seems like LEED started from a very similar place. How have you changed the perspective of the need for LEED certification?

A: LEED became prevalent through government mandated regulations. Once there is a credible set of sustainable seafood standards, then it will be established. This takes long-term generational change through education.

Q: Why did LEED choose a multi-tiered approach versus a prescriptive approach?

A: LEED chose a multi-tiered approach because the market is smarter than you are. If you give people options, they will find the correct route for themselves. Building construction is an integrated process and cannot be accomplished with a "checklist" approach.

4. Fisheries Matrix Presentation and Discussion

Advisory Panel member Diane Pleschner-Steele presented a draft fisheries matrix that describes the status of California fisheries based on 2008 data. This matrix should be considered as an initial attempt to consolidate information about all California fisheries. It is a living document and a starting point for the panel's discussions of California fisheries. The complete presentation can be found on the OPC website. The panel was asked to consider the following questions while reviewing the matrix:

- 1) Which criteria are most important to determine whether a fishery is sustainable?
- 2) To what seafood does the certification apply?
 - a) Caught in CA-managed fishery? Caught in a CA-U.S. co-managed fishery? Landed in CA ports? Sold within CA? Combination?

The following items were discussed by panel members regarding the fisheries matrix:

- Panel members clarified that fishers must have a California permit to land fish in California. Many panel members supported this as a primary criterion by which fisheries would qualify for certification in California.
- The panel discussed whether California managed fisheries, federally managed fisheries, or both should be eligible for California certification. Some thought that there is not enough stock data for California only managed fisheries to qualify for certification. Others thought that federally managed fisheries have additional

issues that are too big for a California based program to work around. There was some emerging support for including both California and federally managed fisheries in the certification program.

- Some panel members expressed interest in including a “socioeconomic” column in the matrix for identifying the degree to which a fishery has impacts on California.
- Panel members emphasized the importance of having a California specific label.
- Panel members clarified that it is essential for most fishermen to participate in a portfolio of fisheries in order to make a decent living.
- Some panel members expressed interest in taking a “continuous improvement” approach to certification. Communities are a component that can continuously be improved upon.
- Some panel members expressed that establishing a solid foundation of criteria for sustainability should be done first, and marketing should be secondary.
- Many panel members suggested using a combination of MSC and the Alaska program as a foundation for the California certification program.
- Some panel members suggested tracking the implementation of marketing efforts.
- Some panel members expressed interest in using the FAO standards as the baseline criteria for a California certification program. Others noted that this is consistent with AB 1217 and that MSC is also based on the FAO standards.
- A panel member offered additional stock assessment information to include in the Fisheries Matrix.

5. Comments from the Public

No members of the public chose to provide comments on day one.

B. Day Two – August 3, 2010

1. Recap of Discussion from Day One

Eric Poncelet, K&W facilitator, reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives for day two. Erinn McKell, Sea Grant Intern with the California Natural Resource Agency, recapped the advisory panel’s comments from the previous day.

2. Framework Questions Discussion

The framework questions (listed in section A.2 above) presented on day one were discussed in-depth by the advisory panel. Below is a recap of key topics discussed, including the strengths and weaknesses of the various certification models presented, and approaches to certification that could/should be incorporated into a California Sustainable Seafood Certification program:

- a. Panel comments on strengths and weaknesses of certification programs presented, and preliminary recommendations:
 - Some panel members expressed that MSC does not limit the certification of artisanal fisheries, but rather the lack of organization and communication within a fishery is what limits successful certification. Some criticized MSC for being too expensive and having an onerous process. Others liked the MSC

criteria as a baseline for a California certification program that could have addition criteria from other programs added to it. Some liked the MSC program because it followed a precautionary approach by placing the burden of proof of sustainability on the fishery. Panel members noted that MSC has many criteria that go beyond the FAO guidelines, including: peer-review component, building plans, accessibility, low trophic level species, and consistency with ISEAL, a global association for social and environmental standards.

- Some panel members suggested using the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute program as a foundation for the California certification program. Others thought that the Alaska program did not have adequate criteria and assumes fisheries are sustainable without adequate proof. Some panel members criticized the Alaska program for focusing more attention on the source label than on the eco-label.
- Some panel members liked the LEED certification model because it spurred conversation within the industry regarding sustainable practices. The same effect could be created by the California certification if a solid foundation of information about California fisheries is provided.
- Some panel members expressed that a good foundation for the California certification program would be a combination of the Alaska, Greenpeace, and LEED programs. This would include a combination of community-based management for sustainable fisheries, identifying the sources of seafood, and use of established associations.
- Some panel members liked the self-assessment aspect of the Sustainable Wine Growers program because the growers owned the program as their own and took pride in it. Then third party auditors verified the self-assessments.
- Panel members generally acknowledged that there are desirable elements of each of the certification models that were presented.

b. Other Panel recommendations regarding a potential certification approach for California:

- Panel members expressed interest in certifying artisanal producers as well as larger fisheries.
- Panel members expressed interest in defining the target audience of the certification before defining the certification criteria. Are we trying to identify the individual fisherman who is using sustainable practices? Or are we trying to identify the region/California as a sustainable source of seafood?
- Some pointed out that many California fisheries are already managed by state or federally resource management agencies and should be recognized as managed through the certification program.
- Some panel members recommended that international markets not be considered in this process as a primary audience because there is not enough money to market the program internationally in addition to certifying California fisheries and marketing the program in California. It is also important not to market any seafood until it is certified.
- OPC staff suggested that the label could have three main components: one indicating sustainability, one indicating that the seafood was caught in California, and the name of the port where the fish was landed. Many liked the idea of a label with these components. People especially liked the idea of

identifying fish by port on the label. Some suggested also including seafood species on the label.

c. Other Panel comments:

- Some panel members noted that California does not land enough fish to feed California.
- Others commented that the California certification program would help to make seafood part of the larger sustainable food system/movement.
- It was noted that 80% of California seafood landings are four species.
- Panel members acknowledged that species populations vary naturally over time and can fluctuate widely. Management of a sustainable fishery has to take these fluctuations into account. A fishery has not necessarily been overfished if biomass levels are low.
- Panel members highlighted other studies for reference. One is a study currently being conducted in Morro Bay, CA, on a new trawling technique. Another is a Hawaii study on the sustainability of Hawaii's longline fishery.

3. YottaMark Presentation on Traceability

YottaMark's Director of Marketing, Jonathan Hawes, gave a presentation on YottaMark's HarvestMark traceability program. Mr. Hawes reviewed applications of their traceability tool specifically within the produce chain of custody and discussed potential applications for the seafood chain of custody. The complete presentation can be found on the OPC website. The following questions were discussed by Mr. Hawes and panel members.

Q: Is there a process for on-demand printing of labels.

A: Yes, YottaMark can provide the infrastructure for that capability.

Q: How do you prevent cheaters?

A: We use third-party auditors. If we find that a traceability system is not being used appropriately, we will shut down the operation.

Q: How much of your business comes from consumer health and welfare?

A: Much of YottaMark's business comes from media influence. The slow food movement and interests in eating locally is having an influence on demand for our services.

Q: Who pays for the traceability service and how much?

A: Supplier and producers are mainly the paying entities. The cost model is on a per unit basis. In most of the markets, the price is fixed by commodity. Infrastructure is a onetime set up fee, and for many products, we charge about a penny per case scanned.

Comment: OPC staff clarified that the anticipated payment structure for the California certification program is to support fisheries to go through certification and eventually pass the maintenance cost of certification to the fishery.

Q: Can the label be customized to provide information about the purpose of tracing?

A: Yes, the label can be customized however you would like.

Comment: A panel member noted that a company called Trace Register uses a computer chip to track products through a supply chain. This company is

convinced that a label is not needed to ensure traceability. This has been used in the seafood industry before.

Q: How long does the data persist in the system?

A: Data is kept live on the system for two years, then it is archived.

Q: Who is the sustainability police in this effort?

A: There are requirements for traceability already existing within the seafood industry. Some are based on ship records.

4. Potential elements of a California Certification Program (preliminary “strawman” example for discussion purposes)

a. OPC staff initial draft concept for discussion

Sam Schuchat and Valerie Termini, OPC staff, presented some preliminary ideas on what might be included in a California Sustainable Seafood Certification program. The purpose was to stimulate additional Advisory Panel discussion on this topic. This preliminary recommendation was based on OPC staff’s own research and the advice of CSSI Advisory Panel members received to date. Core components would include the following:

- Certify fisheries to international standards (i.e., FAO guidelines at a minimum). Use MSC standards and certification or FAO standards with 3rd party verification.
- Include additional criteria that go beyond the international standards. Have an ecolabel that includes the following components: California, which port fish was landed, and a green/sustainable component.
- Create a database of additional information to accompany the ecolabel.
- Establish as a long term goal the certification of all California fisheries that are managed by the state.
- Ensure consistency with existing OPC programs.
- Conduct a study for the state of California based on the UK’s Sussex study model. This would evaluate fisheries against the FAO guidelines and additional certification criteria. This study would essentially flesh out the fisheries matrix information. The finding of the study would prioritize fisheries for certification. The thought is that two or three fisheries will be certified at a time.
- Work with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) on a marketing program
- OPC will pay for capital costs for initial certification, and fisheries will pay for maintenance costs of certification and recertification. Additional funding bodies need to be identified for the long term.
- Include a traceability component
- Long term vision: embarking on a long process to make all California fisheries sustainable.

b. Advisory Panel comments

Advisory Panel members offered the following general comments on OPC staff’s initial concept:

- The criteria for certification should be identified before the study is conducted.
- Federally managed fisheries should be certified in addition to the California fisheries.
- There was a discussion around what entity should shoulder the longer-term costs of (re)certification; the consumer or the industry.
- Albacore is approved through Dolphin Safe and the Seafood Watch program. Seafood already certified through programs like this should be considered for California certification.
- There should be a formal list of criteria that fishermen could easily look at and identify if they qualify for certification.
- The California certification should be viewed as an honors program. Fisheries should be rewarded for putting in the extra effort to be certified.
- Fishermen will be more likely to participate in a voluntary program. OPC staff reiterated that the entire program is voluntary.
- FAO guidelines seem fundamentally inconsistent with MSC's rebuilding plans. California shouldn't be certifying fisheries if the stocks drop below target biomass levels (referencing FAO Guidelines handout, item 2B).
- The fundamental goal of certification is to be a transitional process. The intention is that eventually, all fisheries will be sustainable and certification will no longer be needed.
- Source labels and ecolabels are not the same thing. Hopefully they will come to be known as the same thing, but for now they should be kept separate.
- Performance criteria should vary by fishery and species.
- Let the fishery management plans (FMP) define the sustainable fishing level per fishery.
- The website should include a description of this program and process that is written in easily understood terms, excluding industry jargon. Paul Siri offered to draft this language.

The panel suggested the following specific *criteria* for inclusion into a California certification program:

- Bycatch criteria particularly for endangered and protected species.
- Food safety/contamination criteria, specifically for mercury, DDT, and other toxics. Panel members pointed out that most surveillance of domestic seafood for toxicity is conducted by independent studies. Some panel members thought that the safety of the seafood should be included on the label as well. These members expressed that it would be irresponsible to not include a safety criteria, and irresponsible to promote a product that could pose a health risk. Some thought that swordfish and tuna should not be certified because of health issues. Others suggested that safety should be addressed as a label warning component instead of a criteria for certification.
- Gear type criteria, specifically a ranking system for sustainability. Some panel members expressed interested in not allowing longline fishing and trawling gear. Others thought that specific gear types should not be excluded from certification because it would create a disincentive to improve the gear to fit within sustainable practices. Certification should promote improvement of a resource extraction industry such as commercial fishing.
- Carbon footprint/locality criteria. Some members suggested that the Seawatch criteria be use for this. Others thought that carbon footprint could

be addressed by labeling the seafood by port; this would serve as a proxy to measure food miles.

- MPA criteria (i.e., the extent to which fisheries management is supported by MPAs).
- Incentives for quality of seafood over quantity.
- Molecular identification requirement. This could be used as a spot check to disclose inaccurate labeling.

5. Process suggestions

Advisory Panel members requested that they have additional opportunities to weigh in on OPC staff's initial thinking prior to the next meeting. In particular, they requested the opportunity to each be able to respond to a "strawman" proposal from OPC staff. This would enable OPC staff to better understand the level of support for particular components of the proposed certification program.

Some Advisory Panel members also recommended that the Panel create a mission statement of the desired outcome of the California Sustainable Seafood Certification program.

Others recommended that the Panel create a working definition of "sustainable fishing." OPC staff responded that the Panel was using the FAO's definition of sustainable fishing as a minimum definition and cautioned against spending significant time trying to come to agreement on a definition of this term. The Panel discussed the FAO's definition of sustainable fishing at its first meeting in May. Other Advisory Panel members agreed that this would not be the best use of the Panel's time.

6. Comments from the Public

The following members of the public shared their thoughts:

- Lia Protopapadakis, Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission, shared that she is excited that California passed AB 1217. She believes that a strong certification program will have strong management as well as verifiably strong fish stocks. She stated that MSC has not always verified fish stocks. She also recommended that seafood contamination issues be addressed in the certification program and that it would be irresponsible not to do so.
- Natasha Benjamin, independent consultant, shared that socioeconomics need to be addressed in the certification program. She suggested that it would be helpful for the panel to view socioeconomic models. She suggested that the panel look at the EcoTrust Life Cycle Analysis by Astrid Scholz. She suggested that the certification be built off of the FAO code of conduct. She also expressed interest in the OPC conducting a broader outreach program so this process is more public and visible. She expressed that soliciting input at the beginning of the process will make for a more publicly accepted and embraced California sustainable seafood certification program once it is completed and implemented. She noted that the LEED tiered certification model could be problematic and too complicated, causing more confusion unnecessarily. She suggested using a tiered approach behind the scenes and within the certification process, but not publicly (i.e., within the label). Tiers could be useful in the internal certification program to promote improvement and advancement within the industry. She

stated that traceability is a critical component of a certification program. She likes the label that Diane Pleschner-Steele proposed and would like to see the port, species, and gear type added to the label.

C. Action Items and Next Steps (from both days)

OPC staff thanked the group for a productive first meeting and encouraged everyone to contact staff with thoughts and suggestions at any time. OPC staff will follow up on the list of action items below.

1. Staff committed to provide Advisory Panel members with an outline of the emerging framework prior to the October Advisory Panel meeting so that Panel members can each weigh in on the individual components.
2. Marketing, logo, outreach, and long term funding of certification will be discussed at the October meeting.
3. Staff committed to work on fleshing out the Fisheries Matrix.
4. OPC staff will confirm whether the ASMI program is based on FAO guidelines alone, or something more.
5. The next CSSI Advisory Panel meeting is on October 13 & 14, 2010; location to be determined.

D. Attendees

Advisory Panel Members:

David Anderson, Aquarium of the Pacific
Sean Anderson, CSU Channel Island
Sarah Glaser, Scripps Institute of Oceanography
Mark Gold, Heal the Bay
Marcela Gutierrez, Wildcoast
Jonathan Hardy, Office of Senator Ducheny
Wayne Heikkila, Western Fishboat Owner's Association
Mark Helvey, NOAA/NMFS
Paul Johnson, Monterey Fish Company
Sam King, King Seafood
Logan Kock, Santa Monica Seafoods
Stephanie Mutz, Commercial Fisherman of Santa Barbara
Timothy O'Shea, Cleanfish
Matthew Owens, Fishwise
Pietro Parravano, Institute for Fisheries Resources
Richard Parrish, National Marine Fisheries Service (retired)
Diane Pleschner-Steele, CA Wetfish Producers
Teri Shore, Turtle Island Restoration Network
Paul Siri, Consultant
Patricia Unterman, Hayes Street Grill

Presenters:

Dan Averill, Marine Stewardship Council
Bill Fox, World Wildlife Fund
Jonathan Hawes, YottaMark
Allison Jordon, Wine Institute & California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance (via webinar)
Dr. Malcolm Lewis, United States Green Building Council

Ray Riutta, Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute
Casson Trenor, Greenpeace

OPC Staff:

Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer State Coastal Conservancy/OPC Secretary
Valerie Termini, OPC Project Manager
Erinn McKell, Natural Resources Agency Sea Grant Fellow

Members of the Public:

Natasha Benjamin
Laura Engeman
Jenna Friesa
Brook George
Huff McGonigal
Lia Protopapadakis
Craig Shuman
Steve Weisberg

Facilitators:

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

APPENDIX 1

AGENDA

California Sustainable Seafood Initiative

Advisory Panel Meeting #2

August 2, 2010 (10 AM – 6 PM)

August 3, 2010 (9 AM – 3 PM)

SCCWRP Offices

3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110

Costa Mesa, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Present and discuss different certification models: discuss results and impacts
2. Discuss and outline core elements of CA a sustainable seafood certification program

Day 1: August 2, 2010

| Time | Topic |
|-------------|--|
| 9:30 AM | Arrivals and refreshments |
| 10:00 AM | Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review |
| 10:15 AM | Present framework questions and intended outcomes |
| 10:30 AM | Presentations and discussion on different certification and marketing models: discuss results to date and effectiveness <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. World Wildlife Fund (WWF) – overview of certification programs and key assessment findings (Bill Fox, Vice President & Managing Director for Fisheries, WWF) 2. Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) (Dan Averill, Fisheries Manager, MSC) |
| 12:15 PM | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 1:15 PM | Continue Presentations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (Ray Riutta, Executive Director) 4. Greenpeace Sustainable Seafood Program (Casson Trenor, Senior Markets Campaigner) |
| 2:45 PM | <i>Break</i> |
| 3:00 PM | Public Comment |
| 3:30 PM | Continue Presentations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Sustainable wine growers (Allison Jordon, Director, Environmental Affairs, Wine Institute, Executive Director, California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance) 6. LEED style tiers (Dr. Malcolm Lewis, CEO of CTG Energetics/chair of the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) Technical Committee) |
| 5:00 PM | <i>Break</i> |
| 5:15 PM | Discuss Fisheries Matrix <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which criteria are most important to determine whether a fishery is sustainable? 2. To what seafood does this certification apply? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Caught in CA-managed fishery? Caught in a CA-U.S. co-managed fishery? Landed in CA ports? Sold within CA? Combination? |
| 6:00 PM | <i>Adjourn for day. Dinner at 7:15 PM</i> |

Day 2: August 3, 2010

| | |
|---------|---|
| 9:00 AM | Agenda review and questions/comments from Day 1 |
| 9:15 AM | Discuss and outline core elements of CA certification program: framework question #1: |

| | |
|----------|---|
| | 1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the different certification models presented on Day 1? |
| 10:15 AM | <i>Break</i> |
| 10:30 AM | Discuss and outline core elements of CA certification program: framework question #2: 2. Which of the certification models presented would you recommend as the foundation for a CA sustainable seafood certification program? |
| 11:30 AM | Presentation on Traceability: Yotta Mark, Elliot Grant |
| 12:00 PM | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 1:00 PM | Public Comment |
| 1:30 PM | Discuss and outline core elements of CA certification program: framework question #3: 3. What elements need to be included or modified to make the program appropriate for California? |
| 2:45 PM | Recap and Next Steps |
| 3:00 PM | <i>Adjourn</i> |

Meeting materials

1. Framework questions
2. Overviews of various certification/marketing programs
3. Guest speaker PPT presentations
4. Fisheries matrix
5. FAO guidelines