

**NATIONAL PROCESSED RASPBERRY COUNCIL**  
**Marketing Committee Conference Call**

August 8, 2016; 1:00 p.m.

**Committee Members Participating:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Antonio Dominguez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark Van Mersbergen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Loren Kimura
<input type="checkbox"/> Eric Larson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicki Briggs
<input type="checkbox"/> Hector Lujan	<input type="checkbox"/> Brad Rader	

**Others Participating:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Krugman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meghan Flynn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hakim Fobia
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Skilton		

x = participating      o = absent

**A. Establish Quorum**

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Antonio. Roll call disclosed a quorum to be present.

**B. Real Red Raspberry Seal**

Tom K began by reminding members that the purpose of the call was to review and potentially approve the draft Real Red Raspberries User’s Agreement for submission to the Council for adoption. An initial question raised concerned deleting “100%” from the first “whereas” paragraph. Consumers identifying with fruit product containing 100% fruit was a finding from Consumer Research, not a standard of identity to use the Mark. Discussion and comment from Tom S noted that “100%” did not impact the Agreement one way or the other.

It had been suggested that “quality standards” be removed from paragraph 6(j), to be replaced by “trademark requirements and covered commodities”, also to avoid the appearance of establishing a quality standard. It was agreed that this change also did not impact the Agreement as drafted, as the Agreement being discussed was directed towards processors and importers of processed red raspberry products covered by the Order only.

Antonio asked as to whether the Agreement could be modified in the future if products changed or further clarification was needed. Tom S said that the Agreement was a Council document and could be changed by Board action as necessary. Antonio also asked about use of the Trademark in international markets if approval was granted for its use, and how would the Council ensure that an applicant was a legitimate business. Tom S said that if approval was granted, an applicant could use the Mark in any market. Tom also said that as part of the diligence during an application review, information would be requested to ensure that the applicant was a processor or importer of good standing. In response to discussion on

recordkeeping, he said that a log of all signed Agreements would be maintained which would include sufficient information to track where the Mark was being used, what products, when approval was granted, etc. This log could also be used to trigger Agreement review every 3-5 years, rather than having an open-ended Agreement.

Antonio asked about the process of reviewing and approving applications. Discussion noted it appropriate for the Committee to ask the Council for authorization to review and approve with subsequent reporting.

**C. Committee Action; Adjourn**

With no further discussion or questions on the draft User's Agreement, on a motion by Mark seconded by Jennifer, it was unanimously approved to recommend the Agreement as presented and modified to the Council for approval by e-vote as soon as possible, with the Marketing Committee authorized to review and approve Agreement applications and reporting to the Council on approved Agreements.

There then being no further business, the call concluded and adjourned at 1:50 p.m.