



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

Seafood Watch Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting Outcome Summary

Meeting held in Monterey, CA, September 29-30th, 2015

Overview:

The Monterey Bay Aquarium (MBA) Seafood Watch Program (SFW) convened a meeting of its Multi-Stakeholder Group on September 29-30th in its offices in Monterey, California. The primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss and vote on the Seafood Watch Standards for Wild-Capture Fisheries and Aquaculture, with discussion and updates on in-progress work on the Salmonid Fisheries Standard and Greenhouse Gas Emission Criteria.

Prior to the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) meeting, the SFW Standards had been thoroughly vetted; they were revised several times based on consultation with SFW's fisheries and aquaculture Technical Advisory Committees, additional expert groups and two public consultation processes, and were pilot tested to ensure that SFW's scoring is consistent with our conservation ethic.

This summary report provides an overview of the meeting's key outcomes. It is presented in the following sections: (1) Overview; (2) Participants; (3) Meeting Materials and Presentations; (4) Wild Capture Fisheries; (5) Aquaculture; (6) Salmonid Fisheries; (7) Greenhouse Gas Emissions; (8) Next steps. The [meeting agenda](#) and [ground rules](#) are attached as appendices to this document.

Participants:

The MSG is the new decision making body for approving the SFW standards; it was formed in order to move towards compliance with [ISEAL's standard setting code](#). (ISEAL is the member organization for sustainability standards and maintains a widely used set of standards for sustainable production practices for a wide variety of products).

The two-day meeting was attended by the 14 Multi-Stakeholder Group members, with each of the seven stakeholder groups represented by two members. See the table below:

Stakeholder Group	Member	Affiliation
Organizations focused on improving fisheries/aquaculture management	Blake Lee-Harwood	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP)
Organizations focused on improving fisheries/aquaculture management	Momo Kochen	Masyarakat dan Perikanan, Indonesia (MDPI)
International Ratings System Organizations	Jessica Greenstone	WWF South Africa
International Ratings System Organizations	Christine Absil, Ph.D.	Good Fish Foundation
Policy NGOs	Graham Forbes	Greenpeace International
Policy NGOs	Rebecca Goldberg, Ph.D.	Pew Charitable Trusts
Academics	Trevor Ward, Ph.D.	University of Technology Sydney
Academics	Fiorenza Micheli, Ph.D.	Stanford University
Seafood Business	Katy Hladki (representing Bill DiMento)	High Liner Foods
Seafood Business	Guy Dean	Albion Fisheries Ltd.
Seafood Industry	Terry Bradley	Mount Cook Alpine Salmon
Seafood Industry	Tom Kraft	Norpac Fisheries Export
Auditors/On-the-ground operations expert	Cormac O'Sullivan	SAI Global
Auditors/On-the-ground operations expert	Cu Thi Le Thuy	Accreditation Services International (ASI)

In addition to the 14 MSG members, the meeting was hosted by the Seafood Watch Science Team and Seafood Watch Director, who were also in attendance: Jennifer Dianto Kemmerly (SFW Director), Wendy Norden (SFW Science Director), Fisheries Team: Santi Roberts, Sam Wilding, Lisa Max, Sara McDonald, Ph.D., and Iván Martínez Tovar, Aquaculture Team: Corey Peet, Lisa Tucker, Cyrus Ma, Taylor Voorhees. Peter Bridson, Principal with SeaGreen Research, was also in attendance.

The meeting was neutrally facilitated by Scott McCreary, Ph.D. Principal of CONCUR, Inc.

Meeting Materials:

Several documents, available on the [SFW standard revision website](#), were circulated to the MSG members prior to the meeting. These included the [meeting agenda](#) and [ground rules](#)



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

(included as appendices in this document), [MSG terms of reference](#), guiding principles for Fisheries and Aquaculture (included in the [overarching terms of reference for the standard revision process](#)), proposed standards for [Fisheries](#) and [Aquaculture](#), [draft Greenhouse Gas Criteria for Fisheries and Aquaculture](#), [membership lists in the MSG](#), [the Technical Advisory Committees for Fisheries and Aquaculture and expert work groups](#).

Preparatory Webinars:

As preparation for the deliberations, Seafood Watch staff organized and ran webinar presentations. These webinars introduced the group to Seafood Watch and our assessment methodologies; orienting members to the Standards, and the process to be used in the face-to-face meeting. All but one MSG member participated in the webinars.

In Person Briefings:

During the first day of meeting in Monterey, the MSG members were introduced to each other and to the Seafood Watch Science Team. They were given overview presentations by Jennifer Dianto-Kemmerly and Wendy Norden covering the program's mission, objectives and theory of change, our Standard Review Process, our Standards and the methodologies we use to carry out our Sustainable Seafood Assessments. Scott McCreary also briefed members on the meeting process and ground rules.

Adoption of Ground Rules and Terms of Reference:

Following a walk-through of the [Ground Rules](#), the group was polled on their support for the Ground Rules and the [Terms of Reference](#). The MSG unanimously adopted both the Ground Rules and Terms of Reference.

Day One Review and Deliberation:

For the remainder of the first day of the meeting, the members focused on the Wild-Capture Fisheries Standard and received an update on progress on the new Salmonid Fisheries Standard.

Outcomes of these discussions, which included testing for consensus on the Fisheries Standard, are described in the sections below. During Day Two of the meeting in Monterey, the members focused on the Aquaculture Standard and received an update on progress made to the new Greenhouse Gas Emissions Criteria for Fisheries and Aquaculture.

Wild Capture Fisheries:

The SFW fisheries team presented the proposed Wild Capture Fisheries Standard, including the guiding principles (or objectives) which underlie the Standard. Each Criterion composing the standard was presented, including updates to each Criterion resulting from the revision process. The [fisheries standard proposed to the MSG](#), as well as a [list of updates](#), is available on the [SFW standard revision website](#), so is not summarized in this document.

Following the presentations and discussions of the individual Criteria, several open issues were addressed. The discussion that ensued included identification of a set of actions that SFW committed to take prior to finalizing the Fisheries Standard (see table below). Unanimous consensus was achieved with the understanding that these actions will be taken.

The following table summarizes actions that SFW is taking to further revise the Fisheries Standard, as well as topics to be addressed in future revisions (as advised by the MSG). The Actions are structured into categories as follows:

- Terminology – How terms in a standard are defined, either within the standard or in a footnote or glossary
- Guidance – Direction given to analysts on how to interpret a factor, assess information or other items which need additional clarification.
- Language – Wording within a factor or sub-factor or other part of a standard
- Scoring – Scoring of factors, sub-factors and overall (note from the [Ground Rules](#): that scoring is under the purview of SFW, not the MSG)
- Future Work – Items that SFW will work on in future iterations of a standard

Relevant Criteria/General revisions	Type of Action	Action
General Revision	Terminology	Ensured that the term “bycatch” is correctly and consistently addressed
General Revision	Terminology	Added a definition of “ghost fishing” to the glossary
General Revision	Terminology	Added a definition of “Fish Aggregating Devices” (FADs) in the glossary.
Criterion 1, Appendix 7 – Data-limited assessment methods	Terminology	Refined the definition of “optimal length” to state that this is generally the length at MSY.
Criterion 1: Impacts on the Species Under Assessment, Criterion 2: Impacts on other Capture Species,	Guidance	Added specific guidance for when to apply the Productivity-Sensitivity Analysis (PSA).
Criterion 1: Impacts on the Species Under Assessment, Criterion 2: Impacts on other Capture Species, Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Terminology/Guidance	Clarified guidance on how to quantify whether a fishery is a substantial contributor to fishing mortality.
Criterion 2: Impacts on other Capture Species	Future Work	In advance of the next revision cycle, we will consult



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

Relevant Criteria/General revisions	Type of Action	Action
		the TAC about whether a stronger disincentive will be created for high discard fisheries.
Criterion 2: Impacts on other Capture Species	Scoring	Clarified that “discards + bait use/landings” factor to explain that the “0.75” scoring multiplier for fisheries with $\geq 100\%$ is a carryover from the 2011 version of the criteria & will be retained to maintain consistency.
Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Terminology	Replaced the term “Illegal, Unreported & Unregulated (IUU)” with “Illegal”
Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Terminology	Refined the definition of “acceptable observer coverage” to include video and electronic monitoring and account for situations where observer safety influences accuracy of reporting
Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Language	Replaced “it is likely” with “there is strong evidence” in regard to shark finning occurrence in a fishery.
Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Language	Changed language in 3.1 Management Strategy for “Moderately Effective” to read “management is in place but effectiveness is unknown”
Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Language/Guidance	Clarified ‘user groups’ and ‘conflict resolution’ in 3.5
Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness	Language/Guidance	We will provide further guidance for each of the bullets under the ‘Critical’ rating.
Criterion 4: Impacts on the Habitat and Ecosystem	Guidance	Added guidance to clarify what is meant by “effective policies in place” for Sub-factor 4.2: Ecosystem Based Management.

Relevant Criteria/General revisions	Type of Action	Action
Criterion 4: Impacts on the Habitat and Ecosystem	Terminology/Guidance	We feel the current guidance on ‘trawling footprint’ clearly represents the intent of the standard.

Aquaculture:

The SFW aquaculture team presented the proposed Aquaculture Standard, including the guiding principles (or objectives) which underlie the Standard. Each Criterion composing the standard was presented, including updates to each Criterion resulting from the revision process. The [complete aquaculture standard](#), as well as a [list of updates](#), is available on the [SFW standard revision website](#), so is not summarized in this document.

Following the presentations and discussions of the individual Criteria, unresolved concerns were addressed. Similar to the deliberation on Wild Capture Fisheries, the discussion that ensued produced a set of actions that SFW committed to take prior to finalizing the Aquaculture Standard (see table below).

The following table summarizes the actions that SFW committed to take further revise the Aquaculture Standard, as well as topics to be addressed in future revisions (as advised by the MSG). Refer to the types of Actions as defined in the Fisheries section above.

Relevant Criteria/General revisions	Type of Action	Action
General	Guidance	Define explicit discrete (non-overlapping) ranges for final scores
Criterion 2: Effluent	Guidance	In order to ensure that impacts to ground water are covered in the evidence based assessment, we deleted language specifying nutrient impacts only.
Criterion 2: Effluent	Language	Removed “illegal activities” from the evidence-based assessment.
Criterion 4: Chemical Use	Guidance	A clear explanation for why the use of trend data for this criterion is justified is included in the Guidance.
Criterion 4: Chemical Use	Guidance	Where there are exceptions to timeframes included in the assessment (i.e. in habitat, escapes), these are justified.



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

Relevant Criteria/General revisions	Type of Action	Action
		There is general guidance on timeframes of historic impacts (such as those assessed in this Criterion) included in the scope section of the standard.
Criterion 5: Feed (5.1b – Source fishery sustainability)	Terminology	Added definition for “unacceptable bycatch” in footnote. This will be the same definition as the one in the footnote on pg. 36 of the Standard. No new information required, just consistent specification of guidance.
Criterion 5: Feed (5.1b – Source fishery sustainability)	Guidance	Specified that clear evidence is needed to justify a score of “-10” for sourcing of terrestrial ingredients from agriculture known to destroy high value habitat
Criterion 6: Escapes (6.2 – Invasiveness)	Guidance	Ensured that impacts to wild populations are consistently addressed in the fisheries and aquaculture criteria; the presence of a fisheries management plan informs the degree of potential impact to the wild stock from escaped farmed fish
Criterion 7: Disease	Language	Changed the term “fish” to “wild species” to include impacts on other species
Criterion 8x: Source of Stock	Guidance	Provided guidance on sustainability of sourcing juveniles.
Criterion 9x: Predator and Wildlife Mortalities	Language	Upon further review of how impacts on endangered, threatened and protected (ETP) species are assessed under this Criterion, we concluded that the current language is consistent with the

Relevant Criteria/General revisions	Type of Action	Action
		intent the precautionary approach (i.e. where there is a legal take permit for an ETP species, but no population level impacts, this would not be “Critical” AND where there is a population level impact, this would be “Critical”)
Criterion 10x: Escape of Unintentionally Introduced Species	Language	Replaced “live fish” with “fish” AND remove “principle farmed” to broaden the scope
General	Future Work	Consider applying the aquaculture standard to processing facilities in addition to farms
Criterion 2: Effluent	Future Work	Consider using phosphorous as proxy for waste discharge for freshwater systems (in addition to, or instead of nitrogen)
Criterion 5: Feed	Future Work	Consider redefining “non-edible” and “edible”
Criterion 5: Feed	Future Work	Consider a disclosure for Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)
Criterion 10x: Escape of Unintentionally Introduced Species	Future Work	Consider the biosecurity of processing waste

In addition to the action items in the table above, the MSG provided feedback on other relevant topics outside of the bounded scope of the criteria. One suggestion was that SFW should consider addressing whistleblower options on the website. There was also discussion suggesting that SFW should be wary of developing World Trade Organization (WTO) barriers.

Results of Test for Consensus Support of Standards:

At the conclusion of the deliberations on Wild Capture Fisheries, we took a vote testing for consensus support. The MSG unanimously supported the Wild Seafood Standard with the agreement that the action items described above would be carried out prior to finalization.

The MSG also reached consensus on the Aquaculture Standard with the agreement that the action items described above would be carried out prior to finalization. In this case,



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

consensus was reached based on the decision rule laid out in the [Ground Rules](#) stating that, “If unanimity cannot be achieved, we will use an alternate decision rule to define a functional consensus as two-thirds of the members with at least one member from each stakeholder group voting in favor of a standard.” One member of the MSG did not consent.

Salmonid Fisheries:

SFW presented an update to the MSG on the [Salmonid Fisheries Standard](#), a draft of which was posted during the second public consultation process. As this Standard is still in development, the MSG is expected to vote on a finalized version in 2016.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

SFW presented an update to the MSG on the [Greenhouse Gas Emissions Criteria for Fisheries and Aquaculture](#), proposed informational criteria which will not be included in the overall scoring of recommendations in the short term.

The MSG did not vote on these criteria but expected to vote on a finalized version in 2016.

Next Steps:

Seafood Watch and Facilitator Scott McCreary agreed to generate a Meeting Summary (this document) within one month of the conclusion of the meeting.

Seafood Watch staff will make revisions to the Fisheries and Aquaculture standards based on feedback from the MSG (described in the tables in this document) by October 30 2015 and post them on the [SFW standard revision website](#). Fisheries and aquaculture reports starting on or after January 1st 2016 will be based on the new standards.

The intention is that the Seafood Watch program will reconvene the MSG midyear 2016. Agenda items will likely include discussion and testing for consensus on the Salmonids Fisheries Standard, the Greenhouse Gas Emission Criteria for Fisheries and Aquaculture, and additional items as needed.

Appendix 1: Seafood Watch Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting Agenda

29 – 30 September 2015
Seafood Watch Offices
 100A Heritage Harbor
 99 Pacific Street, Monterey, CA

Meeting Objectives

1. To review and test for consensus on the terms of reference for the Seafood Watch Multi-Stakeholder Group
2. To discuss, test for, and seek consensus on the Seafood Watch Standards for Aquaculture and Wild Capture Fisheries and the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Criteria using a structured voting process; these draft standards were vetted through the Seafood Watch Technical Advisory Committees and two public consultation processes. Additionally, to review and discuss progress on the Salmonid Standard.

NOTE: timing on this agenda is fluid – if more or less time is needed for a section, we will adjust as needed.

Day 1 (29 September 2015)

07:45 – 08:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet in Lobby of Portola Hotel (07:45 Sharp) • Walk over to the Seafood Watch Heritage Harbor Offices • Breakfast at Seafood Watch Office
08:30 – 8:40	<p>Welcome and Meeting Objectives (setting the stage for the next two days), Introduction to SFW Staff and the Facilitator</p> <p><i>Jennifer Kemmerly – SFW Director</i> <i>Scott McCreary – CONCUR, Inc.</i></p>
08:40 – 08:55	<p>Brief Introduction of Multi-Stakeholder Group members, highlighting each member’s area of expertise and how their stakeholder group interacts with SFW recommendations (1 minute each)</p>
08:55 – 09:05	<p>The State of the Seafood Watch Program</p> <p><i>Jennifer Kemmerly – SFW Director</i></p>
09:05 – 09:20	<p>The Seafood Watch Science Research Process and the Standard Revision Process</p> <p><i>Wendy Norden – SFW Science Director</i></p>
09:20 – 9:45	<p>Meeting Ground Rules (including voting process), Terms of Reference, Guiding Principles for Fisheries and Aquaculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly Review Ground Rules and Terms of Reference • Confirm Agreement with the Guiding Principles and Ground Rules by MSG Members <p><i>Scott McCreary – CONCUR, Inc. and Lisa Max – SFW Senior Fisheries Scientist</i></p>



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

09:45 – 09:55	Opening to the Wild Capture Fisheries Standard <i>Santi Roberts – SFW Science Manager</i>
09:55-10:10	<i>Group Photo and Coffee Break</i>
10:10 – 11:20	Criterion #1 – Impacts on the Species Under Assessment
11:20 – 12:15	Criterion # 2 – Impacts on Other Capture Species (including the Unknown Bycatch Matrix)
12:15-13:15	<i>Lunch</i>
13:15 – 14:45	Criterion # 3 – Management Effectiveness
14:45 – 15:00	<i>Break</i>
15:00 – 16:15	Criterion # 4 – Impacts on the Habitat and Ecosystem AND Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management
16:15 – 16:45	Additional Discussion and Voting on the overall Fisheries Standard
16:45-17:05	Overview of the Salmonid Hatchery Standard
17:05 – 17:15	Recap of Day 1, Preview of Day 2
18:30	<i>Dinner at the Aquarium with Julie Packard, Open Seas Exhibit</i>

Day 2 (30 September 2015)

08:00 – 08:30	<i>Breakfast</i>
08:30 – 08:40	Recap from Day 1
08:40 – 08:50	Opening to the Aquaculture Standard <i>Corey Peet</i> – SFW Aquaculture Program Manager
08:50 – 9:25	Criterion # 1 – Data¹
09:25 – 10:00	Criterion # 2 – Effluent
10:00 – 10:10	<i>Break</i>
10:10 – 10:55	Criterion # 3 – Habitat
10:55 – 11:20	Criterion # 4 – Chemical Use
11:40 – 12:30	Criterion #5 – Feed
12:30 – 13:25	<i>Lunch</i>
13:25 – 14:00	Criterion # 6 – Escapes
14:00 – 14:25	Criterion # 7 – Disease, Pathogens and Parasite Interaction
14:25 – 15:00	Criterion # 8 – Source of Stock – Independence from Wild Stocks
15:00 – 15:10	<i>Break</i>
15:10– 15:50	Criterion # 9 and 10 – Predator and wildlife mortalities AND Escape of unintentionally introduced species
15:50 – 16:35	Additional Discussion and Voting on the overall Aquaculture Standard
16:35 – 17:15	Greenhouse Gases Criteria for Fisheries and Aquaculture <i>Lisa Max</i>
17:15 – 17:30	Meeting Wrap Up
17:30	Adjourn
18:30	<i>Optional Dinner at Cannery Row Brewing Company</i>

¹ SFW may present the Aquaculture Criteria non-sequentially



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

Appendix 2 - Ground Rules & Decision Process

Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Program Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting September 29-30, 2015

The following document outlines the operating ground rules for the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Program Standards revision process, including an overview of the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) objectives and decision-making process. These ground rules are intended to foster and reinforce constructive interaction and deliberation among MSG members; they emphasize clear communication, trust building, respect for divergent views, creative thinking, collaborative problem solving, and the pursuit of mutual gains. The MSG reserves the right to revise these ground rules at their discretion.

Goals, Tasks and Responsibilities of the MSG

The primary charge to the MSG in 2015 is to thoughtfully review and approve the Seafood Watch Standards to support compliance with the ISEAL Standard Setting Code. Participation in the MSG must be conducted in a manner that is consistent with this document, the overarching Terms of Reference, the MSG Terms of Reference and the Process Procedures.

The MSG will conduct an informed vote on the content of the proposed Standards. It is not the intent that the MSG will vote on the overall scoring guidelines of the proposed Standards.

Members of the MSG must abide by and make decisions that adhere to the Seafood Watch Guiding Principles for Fisheries and Aquaculture (defined as “Objectives” in the overarching Terms of Reference document).

Furthermore, the MSG members shall:

- Serve as a liaison to their respective stakeholders
- Review and approve revisions to the standards proposed by the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) for Fisheries and Aquaculture
- Request further input from the TACs as necessary
- Approve the final revised standards

GROUND RULES

Participation and Collaboration

- **Active, focused participation.** Every participant is responsible for communicating his/her perspectives and interests on the issues under consideration. Voicing these perspectives is essential to enable meaningful dialogue. Everyone will participate; no one will dominate. Only one person will speak at a time. Everyone will come to the meetings prepared, and help keep the meetings on track.
- **Respectful interaction.** Participants will respect each other's personal integrity, divergent viewpoints, values and legitimacy of interests.
- **Satisfy Mutual Interests.** Participants will work to satisfy not only their own interests but also those of other MSG members. Participants are encouraged to be clear about their own interests and to recognize the important distinction between underlying interests and fixed positions.
- **Chatham House Rule.** The MSG operates according to the Chatham House Rule (see Definition in the MSG Terms of Reference). So, while members of the MSG have full authority to share the non-confidential substance of discussions and papers, they shall not report or attribute either the comments of individuals or their affiliations outside of meetings, whether conducted face to face or virtually. The default approach of the MSG is that the non-attributable content of discussions and papers is not confidential, unless so specified.
- **Commitment to ground rules.** MSG members commit to adhere to these ground rules, as a set of mutual obligations, once they are ratified. MSG members are encouraged to help uphold and enforce these ground rules. If an MSG member consistently deviates from these ground rules, that member may be replaced by another person upon confirmation by the director of the Seafood Watch Program. Flagrant personal attacks or repeated violations of the ground rules may be cause for immediate removal.

Commitment to process

- **Good faith effort.** Participants will make a good faith effort to achieving the goals of the project on the schedule proposed.
- **Come Prepared.** Participants will review meeting materials in advance of the meetings and come prepared to address the meeting objectives. Seafood Watch science staff and the facilitator will convene preparatory webinars to confirm preparation.
- **Meeting Attendance.** Meetings will start on time. Participants who know that they will be absent, late, or have to leave early will inform project staff in advance.
- **Cell phones on silent.** Cell phones, pagers and other electronic devices will be turned off or set to "silent" mode.



MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM

Media Contact

- **Seafood Watch Media Contacts.** Media contacts regarding the project will be handled by Seafood Watch program staff.
- **Representation to Media.** MSG members agree to avoid: a) making any statements to the media about the MSG meeting or process, b) representing another group's point of view or characterizing their motives, or c) stating positions on preliminary proposals while they are still in development or refinement by the MSG.
- **Use of Key Outcomes Memoranda.** In briefing constituents, MSG members are encouraged to rely primarily on key outcomes memoranda.

MSG DECISION PROCESSES

Decision Rules and Voting Process

- **Strive for Broad Based Support for Proposals.**
 - MSG members will strive to achieve consensus in developing and advancing the vetted proposals for Seafood Watch standards (previously vetted through the Technical Advisory Committees and two public consultation processes).
 - The objection of a few MSG members will not be grounds to impede progress. Any objection raised must be justified by valid reasoning and a solution must be proposed.
 - If unanimity cannot be achieved, we will use an alternate decision rule to define a functional consensus as two-thirds of the members with at least one member from each stakeholder group voting in favor of a standard.
- **We will test for consensus after the presentation of the full set of components for each standard (wild fisheries and aquaculture).** Discussions on the components of each standard will occur prior to testing for consensus on an overall standard.

Voting will be conducted with a quorum. A quorum must be present to conduct a vote. A quorum is two-thirds of the MSG members and at least one member from each stakeholder group.

If Consensus is not achieved. If consensus (unanimous consensus or the alternate decision rule defining consensus) cannot be reached at the meeting, Seafood Watch may choose to convene additional webinars or other virtual communication to complete the voting process and strive for consensus shortly after the meeting. If consensus is not reached by the MSG, Seafood Watch reserves the right to

implement the proposed standards as presented, recognizing that this may forfeit compliance with the ISEAL Alliance standard setting code.

Role of Facilitation Team

- **Neutral Facilitators.** For the September 2015 MSG meeting, the facilitation team is non-partisan. The team will not advocate for particular outcomes. The facilitator will strive to ensure that all MSG members clearly articulate their respective interests and will assist members to complete their work in a well-informed, efficient and timely fashion. SFW reserves the right to determine alternative facilitation schemes for future MSG meetings.
- **Foster Alternatives with Mutual Benefit.** The facilitation team will seek to foster approaches to meeting management, and to identify and consider alternative Standards proposals, which maximize joint gains and mutual benefit.
- **Efficient Use of Time.** The facilitators will strive to structure meetings and discussion so as to make efficient use of members' time. This includes providing materials in advance of meetings, assisting with keeping the discussion focused and monitoring discussions so that no individual or idea dominates.
- **Facilitators' Discretion.** The facilitation team will use its discretion in guiding meetings and may propose agenda adjustments. The facilitation team may also use straw voting to track a range of preferences on emerging issues and gauge the level of support for alternative options.
- **Key outcomes memoranda.** The MSG facilitation team will work with staff of the Monterey Bay Aquarium to prepare a key outcomes memorandum to summarize the main results of the MSG meeting. This key outcomes memorandum will summarize key decisions made, issues discussed, and the next steps identified for moving the project forward. The memorandum is not intended to represent a formal meeting transcript.

Role of Seafood Watch Science Team

- **Information Providers.** Seafood Watch science staff will present the content of the proposed standards to the MSG. If MSG members voice concern with aspects of the proposed standards, Seafood Watch science staff will summarize insights based on experience developing the standards, the expertise provided by of the Technical Advisory Committees, and feedback received during the two public consultation processes.