

# Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request

<b>Date submitted to MSC</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> February 2018
<b>Name of CAB</b>	Acoura Marine
<b>Fishery Name/CoC Certificate Number</b>	Chile Purse Seine jack mackerel jurel
<b>Lead Auditor/Programme Manager</b>	Billy Hynes/Paul Knapman
<b>Variation prepared by:</b>	Billy Hynes w/ Paul Knapman
<b>Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested</b>	7.5.1 The CAB shall announce a team for a fisheries assessment comprising a team leader and a minimum of one additional team member who meets the qualifications and competency requirements specified in Tables PC1, PC2 and PC3 in Annex PC and in line with the requirements in the General Certification Requirements (GCR).
<b>Is this variation sought in order to fulfil IPI requirements (FCR 7.4.14)?</b>	No

<b>1. Proposed variation</b>	
Acoura would like to use a team that does not strictly conform with section five of Table PC3: Fishery Team Qualification and Competency Criteria	
<b>2. Rationale/Justification</b>	
<p>Acoura are undertaking a full assessment of the Chile Purse Seine jack mackerel fishery in Santiago, Valparaiso and Concepción in Chile week commencing 19<sup>th</sup> March 2018. Due to scheduling conflicts, Andy Hough has had to withdraw from the assessment. Andy represented the local context for the team having undertaken projects in the region in the last 15 years.</p> <p>Acoura have a planned replacement who is an appropriate technical fit with many years of experience of MSC assessments on similar species as well as, equally importantly, experience applying the RBF which is required for four P2 performance indicators. He does not have any regional experience.</p> <p>Our rationale to vary against 7.5.1 is that the plan was always to use a Chilean interpreter for stakeholder meetings. Paul Knapman has 3 years' experience with responsibility for MSC assessments in Chile when working for Intertek. Additionally, the client has contracted a native English, Spanish speaking MSC assessor based in Chile to work as their facilitator. He will be on site for the site visit as well as responding to the team.</p> <p>In summary, the team have been selected for their technical skills in assessing the fishery, using RBF as well as an understanding of local context though not in conformance with Table PC3.</p>	
<b>3. Implications for assessment (required for fisheries assessment variations only)</b>	
No implication	
<b>4. Have the stakeholders of this fishery assessment been informed of this request? (required for fisheries assessment variations only)</b>	No