



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

Seafood Watch Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting Outcome Summary

Meeting held in Monterey, CA, February 19-20 2020

Overview:

The Monterey Bay Aquarium (MBA) Seafood Watch Program (SFW) convened a meeting of its Multi-Stakeholder Group on February 19-20 in Monterey, California. The primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss and vote on the Seafood Watch Standards for Wild-Capture Fisheries, Salmon Fisheries and Aquaculture.

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) Agenda; (4) Aquaculture; (5) Fisheries and Salmonid Fisheries; (6) Results of Voting; and (7) Other items. The meeting agenda and ground rules are attached as appendices to this document.

Participants:

The MSG is the decision making body for approving the SFW standards; it was formed in order to be more in line 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 nine of the 14 Multi-Stakeholder Group members. Webinars were held in the two weeks prior to the MSG meeting for the five MSG members who could not be here in person (flagged with * in the table below). Voting was conducted by email for these five. In addition, Kendra Karr, Senior Scientist, Oceans Program attended as an alternate for Tim Fitzgerald. Each of the seven stakeholder groups was represented by two members. See the table below:



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

Name	Affiliation	Stakeholder Group
Fio Micheli*	Stanford University, Center for Ocean Solutions	Academics
Simon Bush	Wageningen University	Academics
Cormac O'Sullivan	SGS Ireland Ltd	Auditors/On-the-ground experts
Hawis Madduppa	Bogor Agricultural University	Auditors/On-the-ground experts
Christine Absil*	Good Fish Foundation	International Ratings Organizations
Tooni Mahto*	Australian Marine Conservation Society	International Ratings Organizations
Carmen Revenga*	The Nature Conservancy	Organizations focused on Improving Fisheries/Aquaculture
Dave Martin	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	Organizations focused on Improving Fisheries/Aquaculture
Rebecca Goldberg	Pew Charitable Trusts	Policy NGOs
Tim Fitzgerald (Kendra Karr attended as an alternate)	Environmental Defense Fund	Policy NGOs
Bill DiMento*	High Liner Foods	Seafood Business
Guy Dean	Organic Ocean	Seafood Business
Darian McBain	Thai Union	Seafood Industry
Tom Kraft	Norpac Fisheries Export	Seafood Industry

In addition to the MSG members, the meeting was hosted by the Seafood Watch Science Team, along with Jennifer Dianto Kemmerly (Vice President, Global Ocean Initiatives). In attendance were Wendy Norden (SFW Science Director), Santi Roberts (SFW Senior Science Manager), the fisheries team (Sam Wilding, Lisa Max, Sara McDonald, Shelley Dearhart, and Tom Wadsworth) and the aquaculture team (Taylor Voorhees, Tyler Isaac, Josh Graybiel). Roxanne Nanninga, Director of Sustainability with Thai Union North America was also in attendance.

The meeting was facilitated by Ryan Bigelow, Seafood Watch Senior Program Manager.



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

Meeting agenda:

Following presentations from Jennifer Dianto-Kemmerly and Wendy Norden on programmatic updates, Santi Roberts provided an overview of the standard revision process to date. For the remainder of the first day of the meeting, the members focused on the Standard for Aquaculture. The Standard for Fisheries and Standard for Salmon Fisheries were discussed on the second day. The full agenda can be found later in this document.

The scope of the standards, and thereby revisions to the standards, is defined by the guiding principles as laid out in each standard. A number of topics came up during discussion that were out of scope, and added to the parking lot for later discussion. Some of these were discussed at the end of the meeting; others will be discussed in future MSG meetings. These are listed later in this document.

Revisions to the Standard for Aquaculture

The SFW aquaculture team presented the revisions to the Standard for Aquaculture, including the guiding principles which underlie the Standard. Each criterion composing the Standard was presented, with a focus on significant proposed updates.

Following the presentations and discussions of the individual criteria, unresolved concerns were addressed. The discussion that ensued produced a set of actions that SFW committed to take prior to finalizing the Standard for Aquaculture:

General

- For a score of 10 out of 10: in the Concern column, change “No Concern” to “Very Low”
- Improve guidance around polyculture to reduce the risk of “red-washing” e.g. low impact species receiving a lower rating based on the performance of other species within the polyculture system or green-washing

Criterion 4 – Chemical Use

- Move to score of Critical: “Evidence indicates antimicrobials critically important for human medicine^[1] are being used in significant^[2] quantities, or unknown quantities.”

^[1] Highly important antimicrobials listed in - <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/312266/9789241515528-eng.pdf?ua=1> have been used in the current or previous production cycle.

^[2] Significant definition: the average frequency of use of the farms being assessed is more than once per production cycle, or if data on the total volume of antimicrobial use (if this is the only data available) imply the same (estimated).



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

- Move to score of 0: “Evidence indicates antimicrobials highly important for human medicine are being used in unknown quantities”; leave use of these products in “significant” quantities in score of 2.
- In a score of 10 out of 10:
 - Change “...over 3 or more...” to “...for three consecutive production cycles, or three consecutive years for cycles longer than one year”
 - Add: “...and the species or production systems have a demonstrably low need for chemical use”
- In footnote regarding antimicrobial resistance: Clarify that the focus of concern for resistance is in veterinary applications, not in human health.

In addition to the action items above, the MSG provided feedback on other items that are within scope for future standard revisions given the bounds of the current guiding principles.

- Consider Fisheries and Aquaculture’s role in global food security and role as requisite source of nutrition (i.e. rather than solely as a protein/calorie source.)
- Consider what ‘resilience’ means for aquaculture, within the context of ecosystem resilience as an adaptation strategy to better cope with climate change.

Revisions to the Standard for Fisheries and Standard for Salmon Fisheries

The SFW fisheries team presented the revisions to the Standard for Fisheries and Standard for Salmon, including the guiding principles which underlie each Standard. Each criterion composing the Standard was presented, with a focus on significant proposed updates.

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:

- Add this sentence to the beginning of the definition for forage species:

Forage species are small schooling fish and/or invertebrate species that serve as prey for larger and often commercially and recreationally important fish and/or invertebrates, as well as for marine mammals, sea birds and other predators.

- Provide additional guidance on how to use alternative methods to understand changes in species productivity in Appendix 1 (relevant to all species, may be particularly useful for forage species, so will refer to this additional guidance in Appendix 8). This is different from alternative methods to determine stock status. Ex. Froese, Cope methods.



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

- Ensure that “resilience” is used consistently throughout the document.

Results of Test for Consensus Support of Standards:

At the conclusion of the deliberations on each standard, we took a vote testing for consensus support. The attending MSG members unanimously supported the revisions to all three standards with the agreement that the action items described above would be carried out prior to finalization. MSG members had already unanimously supported the revisions ahead of these in-person votes, but were consulted after the meeting to ensure the above changes would not change their support. All voted to approve.

Out of Scope Items and Discussions:

- Recognizing better performers: This discussion centered on clarification to our Unit of Assessment/scope of ratings, how we recognize credible eco-certifications and improvement efforts, and verification tools we are developing (limited to farmed shrimp and farmed salmon in the current phase).
- Standard revision process: Suggestions to improve the process include quarterly webinars (even outside of the standard review process), to tack on this meeting with other events that most participants would already be at, reduce or eliminate paper materials, and see if there’s a way to improve efficiency by analyzing the influence of each component of the process (e.g. public comment, TACs) on the final revisions. There was also interest in reviewing a gap analysis we have commissioned with ISEAL for our standards-setting and assessment processes.
- The following issues were defined at the outset of the meeting as being out of scope, and no further discussion was had on them (though there was a suggestion during one of the leadup webinars that we look at energy use more closely in the coming years).
 - Energy Use
 - Animal Welfare
 - Social Issues
 - Subsidies



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

Appendix 1: Seafood Watch Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting Agenda

Seafood Watch Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting

19-20 February 2020

Bechtel Education Center Forum, Monterey

625 Cannery Row, Monterey, CA 93940

Agenda

Meeting Objectives

1. To discuss and approve revisions to the Seafood Watch Standard for Aquaculture, Standard for Fisheries and Standard for Salmonid Fisheries

Wednesday, 19 February 2020

Meet SFW staff at Clement lobby at 7:45

08:00-08:30	<i>Breakfast</i> - In Bechtel Ed Center
08:30-08:45	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Round of names, affiliations - Meeting logistics - Agenda <p><i>Ryan Bigelow</i> – Facilitator</p>
08:45-09:00	<p>Seafood Watch Programmatic and Global Engagement Updates</p> <p><i>Jennifer Kemmerly</i> – Vice President of Global Fisheries and Aquaculture</p> <p><i>Wendy Norden</i> – Science Director</p>



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

09:15-9:40	Seafood Standard Revision Process and Groundrules <i>Santi Roberts</i> – Senior Science Manager <i>Ryan Bigelow</i> – Facilitator
9:40-9:45	Introduction to the Aquaculture Standard Revisions <i>Taylor Voorhees</i> – Senior Aquaculture Scientist
9:45-10:30	Review of revisions to the Standard for Aquaculture Feed: Factor 5.1 Wild Fish Use <i>Tyler Isaac</i> – Senior Aquaculture Scientist
10:30-10:45	<i>Break</i>
10:45-11:30	Review of revisions to the Standard for Aquaculture Feed: Factor 5.2 Net Protein Gain/Loss Factor 5.3 Feed Footprint <i>Tyler Isaac</i> – Senior Aquaculture Scientist
11:30-12:30	<i>Lunch - In Bechtel Ed Center</i>
12:30-14:00	Review of revisions to the Standard for Aquaculture Polyculture, Data, Effluent, Habitat <i>Josh Graybiel</i> – Aquaculture Scientist
14:00-14:10	<i>Mini-Break</i>
14:10-16:00	Review of revisions to the Standard for Aquaculture Chemical Use, Escapes, Source of Stock, Wildlife Mortalities <i>Taylor Voorhees</i> – Senior Aquaculture Scientist
16:00-16:10	<i>Mini-Break</i>
16:10-16:30	Voting on revised Standard for Aquaculture <i>Ryan Bigelow</i> – Facilitator
16:30-17:00	Wrap-up for Day 1



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

	<i>Ryan Bigelow – Facilitator</i>
18:30	<i>Dinner - MBA Aquarium 6:30 – 8:30</i>

Thursday, 20 February 2020

08:00-08:30	<i>Breakfast - In Bechtel Ed Center</i>
08:30-08:45	Recap from yesterday, overview of agenda for today <i>Ryan Bigelow – Facilitator</i>
08:45-10:10	Review of revisions to the Standard for Fisheries <i>Sam Wilding – Fisheries Program Manager</i> <i>Lisa Max – Senior Fisheries Scientist</i> <i>Sara McDonald – Senior Fisheries Scientist</i> <i>Shelley Dearhart – Senior Fisheries Scientist</i> <i>Tom Wadsworth – Fisheries Scientist</i>
10:10-10:30	<i>Group photo</i>
10:30-11:30	Continue...
11:30-12:30	<i>Lunch - In Bechtel Ed Center</i>
12:30-13:30	Continue...
13:30-14:00	Voting on Standard for Fisheries <i>Ryan Bigelow</i>
14:00-14:10	<i>Mini-Break</i>
14:10-16:00	Review of revisions to the Standard for Salmonid Fisheries <i>Sam Wilding – Fisheries Program Manager</i>



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

	<i>Tom Wadsworth – Fisheries Scientist</i>
16:00-16:10	<i>Mini-Break</i>
16:10-16:30	Voting on Standard for Salmonid Fisheries <i>Ryan Bigelow – Facilitator</i>
16:30-17:00	Wrap-up <i>Ryan Bigelow – Facilitator</i>
18:30	<i>Dinner - 6:00 p.m. Hula's – Tiki Room 6:00/6:30 – 8:00/8:30</i>



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

Appendix 2 - Ground Rules & Decision Process

Ground Rules & Decision Process

Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Program

Multi-Stakeholder Group Meeting

February 19-20th, 2020

The following document outlines the operating ground rules for the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Program Standards review process, including an overview of the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) objectives and decision-making process. These are the same as used in the 2015-2016 standard review. They 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 2019-2020 is to thoughtfully review and approve the Seafood Watch Standards in keeping with the ISEAL Standard Setting Code. Participation in the MSG must be conducted in a manner that is consistent with this document, the [Terms of Reference](#) and the [Process Procedures](#).

The MSG will conduct an informed vote on the content of the proposed Standards at the 2020 meeting. 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



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

- Review and approve revisions to the standards
- 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.



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

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.

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



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

- **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 (vetted in 2019 through the Technical Advisory Committees and 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. MSG members unable to make the meeting will vote ahead of the meeting.
 - 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 consistency with the ISEAL Alliance standard setting code.

Role of the Facilitator

- **Strive for Clear Input from all MSG members.** 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.



Monterey Bay Aquarium®

- **Foster Alternatives with Mutual Benefit.** The facilitator 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 facilitator 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 facilitator will use his discretion in guiding meetings and may propose agenda adjustments. The facilitator may also use straw voting to track a range of preferences on emerging issues and gauge the level of support for alternative options.

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 the Technical Advisory Committees, and feedback received during public consultation processes.
- **Key outcomes summary.** Science staff of the Monterey Bay Aquarium to prepare and post a document summarizing the key decisions and discussion points of the MSG meeting.