



2016-02-04

Faroe Islands Queen Scallop Fishery

Marine Stewardship Council Fishery Standards
Conformity Assessment Body: Vottunarstofan Tún ehf.

Client Corrective Action Plan to Address Causes of Suspension

The suspension of the certificate and its cause were announced on the MSC website on the 1st of October 2015. At its 2nd Annual Surveillance of this fishery, the assessment team concluded that progress against condition 1 and condition 3 remained behind target, 12 months after initially falling behind target, thus triggering suspension as required by clause 7.23.13.2 of MSC's Fisheries Certification Requirements (FCR) v2.0.

The fishery client provided a corrective action plan for addressing the causes of the suspension within the timeframe set by MSC's FCR, see appendix.

Information on this fishery, including notification on the re-instatement of its MSC certification, are available on MSC's website:

http://www.msc.org/track-a-fishery/fisheries-in-the-program/certified/north-eastatlantic/faroe_islands_queen_scallop/assessment-downloads.

Vottunarstofan Tún ehf.
Fisheries Program Manager
Email: tun@tun.is
Tel.: +354 511 1330

Appendix:

Faroe Islands Queen Scallop fishery:

Client Corrective Action Plan to Address Causes of Suspension

Table 1: Condition 1

| Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s) | Insert relevant PI number(s) | Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text | Score |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| | 1.2.2 | There are well defined and effective harvest control rules in place | 60 |
| Rationale | | | <p><u>SG80a:</u> “Well defined harvest control rules are in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached.”</p> <p><u>SG80b:</u> “The selection of the harvest control rules takes into account the main uncertainties.”</p> <p><u>SG80c:</u> “Available evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.”</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u> In order for the fishery to score 80, a limit reference point (LRP) or proxy thereof must be set for the stock and actions for reducing exploitation rate as the LRP is approached. Since a LRP cannot be analytically determined, measures should be introduced to respond to changes in the fishery, e.g. by reducing susceptibility of the stock when the fishery is not heading in the direction of its objectives.</p> <p><u>Previous conditions raised:</u> The fishery failed a previous assessment and this PI scored 60. For a failed fishery, no mandatory conditions or defined actions are specified (CR 27.21.3.1). The Public Certification Report (PCR) is required to outline draft and non-binding conditions for relevant PI’s. However, no conditions are found in the PCR, only in the Public Comment Draft Report. However, PCRs of failed fisheries are not to include any agreement from the client to address conditions (CR27.21.3.4).</p> |
| Condition | | | <p><u>SG80a:</u> A limit reference point or proxy thereof and actions as the LRP is approached shall be implemented for the fishery.</p> <p>Since a LRP cannot be analytically determined, measures should be introduced to respond to changes in the fishery, e.g. by reducing susceptibility of the stock when the fishery is not heading in the direction of its objectives.</p> <p><u>SG80b&c:</u> Evidence must be provided that the harvest control rule is set at an appropriate level to allow for recovery of local scallop beds. Uncertainties regarding the set level of the limit reference point and the appropriateness of the tools used to control exploitation rate must be addressed as well.</p> |
| Milestones | | | <p><u>Milestone 1:</u> At the first annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence that a program/project to evaluate the effectiveness of the harvest control rule, including uncertainties, has been initiated and that funding and/or resources have been made available for the evaluation. Evidence shall also be provided of a draft LRP and resulting actions. Resulting score: 60</p> <p><u>Milestone 2:</u> At the second annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence of progress in evaluating the effectiveness of the harvest control rule, including identification of uncertainties. A limit reference point shall be set for the fishery and resulting actions in case the LRP is approached. Resulting score: 60</p> <p><u>Milestone 3:</u> At the third annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence that the set level of the harvest control rule is effective for the sustainable management of all</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | <p>relevant scallop beds, that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules and that uncertainties have been taken into account regarding the set level. Resulting score: 80 The effectiveness of the set level shall be monitored throughout the period of certification. The LRP and associated actions shall be implemented throughout the period of certification.</p> |
| Corrective action plan | <p><i>The best evidence that the harvest control rules, used in the fishery, are set at an appropriate level to allow for recovery of local scallop beds is the relative stable fishery in the specific areas around Faroes the last 30-40 years. The fishery is strictly limited to one vessel, to breadth of the dredge and to the winter period. Uncertainties regarding the Limit Reference Point is especially the weather condition. Uncertainties regarding the appropriateness of the tools used to control exploitation rate are addressed in the yearly evaluation of the fishery.</i></p> <p>Corrective action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present practice formalized by guidelines and including minimum catch limit (kg/hour) <p><i>See Appendix 1: Harvest Control Rules for the scallop fishery around Faroe Islands</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluate “move on” rule by analysing the available data on the geographical positions <p><i>See Appendix 2: Table, indicating Good area, Awareness areas and Closed areas for the past 4 years.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contact the Faroe Marine Research Institute (FAMRI) regarding the limit reference point and ensure a verification of the used reference points, especially the Limit Reference points. <p><i>See Appendix 3: Review from FAMRI on CPUE. FAMRI has been reviewing the scallop fishery in the period 2003 – 2015. The company will continuing to supply FAMRI with date to support their research and to look closer at the ability to work on a scientific review of the eastern areas.</i></p> <p><i>FAMRI is invited to participate in the evaluation of the data from the 2015/16 fishing season. This evaluation will also include a newly written Fishery Manual as a whole. The evaluation will be in May/June 2016.</i></p> |
| Revised status | <p>The assessors focussed on the milestone requirement for “progress in evaluating the effectiveness of the harvest control rule”. Since the time of the 2nd annual surveillance and the suspension of the fishery in October 2015 the client have taken a number of steps and have contracted FAMRI to undertake further dedicated research on the stock. This assessors conclude that these steps represent “progress in evaluating the effectiveness of the harvest control rule”. As a result, it is now concluded that the fishery is now “on target” at the 2nd annual milestone.</p> <p>No comment is given at this time on the preparations for the 3rd annual milestone, however it should be noted that this requires evidence that “the set level of the harvest control rule is effective for the sustainable management of all relevant scallop bed”. This implies that it is clearly demonstrated that the rules applied to the fishery are effective at stock-level management. This is likely to require further analysis and an increased evidence base.</p> |

Table 2. Condition 3.

| Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s) | Insert relevant PI number(s) | Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text | Score |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------|
| Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s) | 2.4.3 | Information is adequate to determine the risk posed to habitat types by the fishery and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage impacts on habitat types | 75 |
| Rationale | <p>SG80b: "Sufficient data are available to allow the nature of the impacts of the fishery on habitat types to be identified and there is reliable information on the spatial extent of interaction, and the timing and location of use of the fishing gear."</p> <p>Rationale: There is reliable information on the spatial interaction of the gear and habitat and studies on the impact of dredging have been conducted in the northern area (Matras 2001). However, no data is available for the impact of the dredge in use in the main eastern fishing area.</p> <p>Previous conditions raised: No previous conditions raised.</p> | | |
| Condition | <p>Sufficient data must be provided to assess the impact of the dredge in use on the habitat for the main eastern fishing area.</p> | | |
| Milestones | <p>Milestone 1: At the first annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence that a program is being planned to assess the impact of the dredge in use on the main eastern habitat. Resulting score: 75</p> <p>Milestone 2: At the second annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence that a program has been initiated to assess the impact of the dredge in use on the main eastern habitat. Resulting score: 75</p> <p>Milestone 3: At the third annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence of progress/completion of the program to assess the impact of the dredge in use on the main eastern habitat. Resulting score: 75-80</p> | | |
| Corrective plan action | <p><i>OC Joensen is able to ensure a good field registration. To determine the risks posed to habitat types by the fishery the company OC Joensen, together with FAMRI, will start a program with underwater video camera to evaluate and assess the effects of dredging on the main eastern waters of the Faroes. Contacts are to be established with clients which can provide the guidance and expertise in this field. The first trials will expand the last months of the current fishing season (February to April 2016) and by the time the fishing activities resume in September 2016 an operational monitoring of the sea beds will be in place with underwater cameras attached to the fishing gear.</i></p> <p><i>Elements of the dredge has been improved in years but the breadth gap has not been changed. The aim of the last improvements on the dredge has been to reduce the wasted dredge tow, to give fish better possibilities to swim away and to get a better sea flow through the dredge.</i></p> <p><i>Differences between the former and new dredge will be evaluated, based on differences in trash and bycatch. We do not expect other differences in scallop catch than less wasted tow, due to the dredge ability to tow on both sides and in more rough weather condition. The evaluation will be done each year as a part of the general review in the end of the fishing season.</i></p> | | |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <p><i>In December 2016 we can deliver a review on the impact of dredging on bottom habitats based on underwater video camera assessments, former studies and company experience on bottom habitat impact. The differences between areas will be further evaluated in 2016 and this will be part of the review on impact on bottom habitats, including bycatch and trash (rusk). An evaluation on the differences between dredges will be part of this review as well.</i></p> <p><i>See Appendix 4: Procedure for registration and evaluation, which also contain the methods of bycatch and trash registration.</i></p> |
| Revised status | <p>The assessors focussed on the milestone requirement for a “program (to be) initiated to assess the impact of the dredge”. Since the time of the 2nd annual surveillance and the suspension of the fishery in October 2015 the client have taken a number of steps (as outlined above) and have contracted FAMRI to undertake further dedicated research on habitats impacts. This assessors conclude that though this field research is yet to begin, planning is underway, clear timelines exist and a letter from FAMRI confirms their intent to begin this research therefore it can be concluded that the program has been “initiated”. As a result, it is now concluded that the fishery is now “on target” at the 2nd annual milestone.</p> <p>No comment is given at this time on the preparations for the 3rd annual milestone, however it should be noted that evidence must be provided “of progress/completion of the program to assess the impact of the heavier dredge”. This implies that it is clearly demonstrated that the research is underway and / or nearing completion.</p> |

End of document