



## **Intertek Fisheries Certification (IFC)**

2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Surveillance Report

Prepared for Hokkaido Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations (Hokkaido Gyoren)

Certificate code: F-IFC-151

Authors: Jo Akroyd, Rob Blyth-Skyrme and Kohei Nagano

## Contents

General Information .....	1
Unit/s of assessment .....	1
Background.....	3
Changes since last published report.....	3
Changes to Management systems .....	3
Changes to Relevant Regulations.....	3
Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry .....	3
Changes to scientific base of information - including stock assessments .....	3
Any developments or changes within the fishery which impact traceability or the ability to segregate between fish from the Unit of Certification (UoC) and fish from outside the UoC (non-certified fish) .....	4
TAC Data .....	4
Assessment Process.....	5
Audit Process.....	5
Scope and history of the assessments.....	5
Surveillance activities.....	6
Versions used .....	6
Results .....	7
Conclusion .....	20
Summary of Findings.....	20
References .....	21
Appendix 1. Re-scoring evaluation tables (if necessary).....	22
Appendix 2. Stakeholder submissions (if any) .....	26
Appendix 3. Surveillance audit information (if necessary) .....	27
Appendix 4. Additional detail on conditions/ actions/ results (if necessary) .....	28
Appendix 5. Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary).....	29

## General Information

<b>Name of Fishery</b>	Japanese Scallop ( <i>Patinopecten (Mizuhopecten) yessoensis</i> Jay). Hanging and Seabed Enhanced Fisheries		
<b>Date certified</b>	13 May 2013	<b>Date of expiry</b>	12 May 2018
<b>Date of surveillance audit</b>	February 18 -19 <sup>th</sup> 2015		

## Unit/s of assessment

<b>Species</b>	<i>Patinopecten (Mizuhopecten) yessoensis</i>
<b>Stock Name</b>	Hanging and Seabed Enhanced Fisheries
<b>Geographical Area</b>	UoC 1: All spat areas Hokkaido, Japan. UoC 2: Funka Bay and Lake Saroma, Hokkaido, Japan. UoC 3: Coastal waters adjacent to the Soya and Abashiri Districts and the Nemuro Straits, Hokkaido, Japan
<b>Fishing Method/s</b>	UoC 1: Hanging spat collectors UoC 2: Rope grown cultivation (hanging culture) UoC 3: Seabed ranching and dredge (sowing culture)
<b>Management System/s</b>	Japanese national and regional fisheries regulations
<b>Client Group</b>	Hokkaido Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations (Hokkaido Gyoren)
<b>Other Eligible Fishers</b>	None

Surveillance level and type	Level	6. Annual	Type	Standard
	Any changes in surveillance activity since PCDR / previous surveillance report		No	
Surveillance number (tick one)	1st Surveillance		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2nd Surveillance		X	
	3rd Surveillance		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4th Surveillance		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Other (expedited etc.)		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Surveillance program changed?			<input type="checkbox"/>	
Surveillance team	Lead assessor:		Jo Akroyd	
	Assessor(s):		Rob Blyth- Skyrme	
CAB name	Intertek Fisheries Certification ltd (IFC)			
CAB contact details	Address		10a Victory Park Victory Road Derby	

		United Kingdom DE24 8ZF
	Phone/Fax	01332 275 741
	Email	<a href="mailto:fco@intertek.com">fco@intertek.com</a>
	Contact name(s)	Paul Knapman
Client contact details	Address	Nishi 7 chome, Kita 3-jo Chuo-Ku Sapporo-shi Hokkaido 060-0003 Japan
	Phone/Fax	+ 81 112818586
	Email	<a href="mailto:t_kase@gyoren.or.jp">t_kase@gyoren.or.jp</a>
	Contact name(s)	Mr Takashi Kase

## Background

### Changes since last published report

#### Changes to Management systems

No changes

#### Changes to Relevant Regulations

No changes

#### Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry

##### 1) Retired

-Kiyomichi Massaki, Chief Instructor at Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government

##### 2) Position changes

-Kenta Komiyama, now Manager at Fishing Port & Village Section, Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government (former Manager at Fishery Management Section, Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government)

-Kazuo Imura, now Chief at Fisheries Management Section, Department of Industrial Promotion, Rumoi Subprefectural Bureau, Hokkaido Government (former Leader at Admin Section, Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government)

-Mamoru Kurata, now Director at Wakkanai Fisheries Research Institute (former Director at Resource Enhancement Division, Central Fisheries Research Institute)

-Katsuhisa Baba, now Director at Planning Section of Planning and Coordination Division, Fisheries Research Department (former Chief Coordinator at Hakodate Fisheries Research Institute)

##### 3) New appointments

-Kinori Sakamoto, Chief Instructor at Fisheries Promotion Section, Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government

-Hideto Tsuruga, Manager at Fisheries Management Section, Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government

-Takurou Azumi, Leader at Fisheries Management Section, Department of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Government

-Akira Miyazono, Director at Resource Enhancement Division, Central Fisheries Research Institute

-Hidetsugu Yoshida, Chief Coordinator at Hakodate Fisheries Research Institute

#### Changes to scientific base of information - including stock assessments

No change

### Updates on enhanced fishery's position in relation to scope criteria

No Change

Any developments or changes within the fishery which impact traceability or the ability to segregate between fish from the Unit of Certification (UoC) and fish from outside the UoC (non-certified fish)

No, all Hokkaido scallops are from the client group

### TAC Data

Table 1. TAC and Catch Data

<b>TAC</b>	Year	2014	Amount	456,746mt <sup>1</sup>
<b>UoA share of TAC</b>	Year	2014	Amount	456,746mt
<b>UoC share of TAC</b>	Year	2014	Amount	UoC 1: 0 mt UoC 2: 97,507mt UoC 3: 354,773 mt
<b>Total green weight catch by UoC</b>	Year (most recent)	2014	Amount	452,280 mt
	Year (second most recent)	2013	Amount	448,931 mt

Table 2. Summary of Assessment Conditions

Condition number	Performance indicator (PI)	Status	PI original score	PI revised score
1 (UoC 1)	2.5.3	On target	70	75
1 (UoC 2)	2.5.3	On target	75	75
1 (UoC 3)	2.5.3	On target	75	75
2 (UoC 1)	2.3.3	On target	65	65
3 (UoC 1)	2.4.3	Closed	70	80
4 ( UoC 3)	2.2.3	On target	70	70
5 (UoC 3)	2.4.3	Closed	70	80

<sup>1</sup> A TAC has not been set for Hokkaido fishery. The weight of the catch of landings from the MSC fishery is specified

## Assessment Process

### Audit Process

- Dec 2014: Client contacted to discuss the upcoming surveillance audit and to arrange logistics for site visit
- Dec 2014: Auditors selected
- 3 Jan 2015: Announcement on MSC website that this surveillance process will be as set out in the MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements v2
- 13 Jan 2015: Announcement on MSC website inviting stakeholders to contribute to the process
- 13 Jan 2015: Announcement on MSC website providing details of site visit
- Translated Client Action Plan sent to Auditors
- Relevant papers and documents sent to Auditors with some translations
- 18-19 Feb 2015. Site visit
- Actively sought the views of the client about:
    - a. Changes to the fishery and its management;
    - b. Performance in relation to any relevant conditions of certification;
    - c. Any developments or changes within the fishery which impact traceability and the ability to segregate MSC from non-MSC products; and
    - d. Any other significant changes in the fishery.
  - Held stakeholder interviews and actively sought the views of stakeholders to ensure that the team is aware of any concerns of stakeholders.
- 23-28 February 2015: Draft Surveillance report prepared by Lead Auditor
- 3 March 2015: Draft surveillance report from Offsite auditor
- 7 March 2015: Final draft Surveillance report written by both auditors sent to Intertek Japan for translation and to client for confirmation
- 9-11 March 2015: Translation completed by Intertek Japan, after which the Japanese translation was sent to the client for their confirmation
- 12 March 2015: Client feedback sent to Auditors via Intertek Japan
- 14 March 2015: Surveillance report sent to Intertek Programme Manager
- Surveillance report sent to MSC within 60 days of completing the audit

### Scope and history of the assessments

Details of the Units of Assessment can be found in the General Information section of this report. In May 2013, the Japanese Scallop (*Patinopecten (Mizuhopecten) yessoensis* Jay) Hanging and Seabed Enhanced Fisheries was MSC certified. There are three Units of Certification, as follows:

Unit of certification 1: Wild spat collection in all spat collecting areas around Hokkaido. The hanging culture ( UoC 2: Suika-shiki) and the Seabed Culture (UoC 3: Keta-Ami) fisheries depend on the collection of wild scallop spat in mesh bags or on sections of gill net either suspended in the water from rope systems or hung from posts driven into the seabed.

Unit of Certification 2: Hanging culture (Suika-shiki) in Funka Bay and Lake Saroma, Hokkaido, Japan. After reaching the 3-5 cm juvenile stage in intermediate culture, scallops in the Suika-shiki fishery are on-grown in rope-culture systems. The lines can be retrieved at intervals to check health, growth, reproductive state, etc. prior to harvest. Although this grow-out phase resembles a conventional cultivation process, the Suika-shiki fishery is considered in-scope for MSC certification.

Unit of Certification 3: Seabed Culture (Keta-Ami) in the coastal waters adjacent to the Soya and Abashiri Districts, and the Nemuro Strait, Hokkaido Japan. The Keta-Ami fishery is a ranching-type system where, after being grown in pearl net systems to the 3-5 cm size, scallop juveniles are released into defined areas of the seabed for on-growing. It is considered that the Keta-Ami fishery is in-scope for MSC certification

The first annual surveillance was carried out in March 2014. All conditions were considered to be on target at that time.

### Surveillance activities

Meetings were held with the Client group, Department of Fisheries and Forestry staff and staff from Fisheries Research Institutes throughout Hokkaido.

Name	Organisation
Toyoki Hirano	Dept. of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Gov.
Hideto Tsuruga	Dept. of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Gov.
Takurou Azumi	Dept. of Fisheries and Forestry, Hokkaido Gov.
Kazuo Imura	Rumoi Subprefectural Bureau, Hokkaido Gov.
Akira Miyazono	Central Fisheries Research Institute
Hidetsugu Yoshida	Hakodate Fisheries Research Institute
Masahide Tada	Abashiri Fisheries Research Institute
Tadashi Kawai	Wakkanai Fisheries Research Institute
Yuji Takahashi	Kaiyo Tansa Co. Ltd. (Ocean Research)
Takashi Kase	Hokkaido Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations
Hisashi Yamada	Hokkaido Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations

The client action report was discussed in detail and research provided to address each of the conditions.

### Versions used

MSC Sustainable Fishery Standard	v1.1
MSC Certification Requirements	V1.2
MSC Guidance to the Certification Requirements	V1.2

## Results

Table 3: Condition 1

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.5.3	<p>SG 80:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information is adequate to broadly understand the key elements of the ecosystem.</li> <li>Main impacts of the fishery on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, but may not have been investigated in detail.</li> <li>The main functions of the Components (i.e. target, Bycatch, Retained and ETP species and Habitats) in the ecosystem are known.</li> <li>Sufficient information is available on the impacts of the fishery on these Components to allow some of the main consequences for the ecosystem to be inferred.</li> <li>Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</li> </ul>	<p>UoC 1:70</p> <p>UoC 2: 75</p> <p>UoC 3: 75</p>
Condition	<p><b>Condition 1 – Ecosystem Information / Monitoring (PI 2.5.3) (All Units of Certification)</b></p> <p>Procedures for gathering data about the key ecosystem effects of each Unit of Certification should be established. These procedures should enable sufficient qualitative and quantitative information to be gathered to detect any increase in risk posed to the ecosystem by each unit of certification.</p> <p>Proposals for a monitoring programme should be presented at the first surveillance audit within 12 months of certification, and data from the monitoring programme should be presented at the second surveillance audit within 2 years of certification. The monitoring programme should provide information that meets the SG80 requirements within 4 years of certification.</p>		
Milestones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals for a monitoring programme should be presented at the first surveillance audit within 12 months of certification.</li> <li>Data from the monitoring programme should be presented at the second surveillance audit within 2 years of certification.</li> <li>The monitoring programme should provide information that meets the SG80 requirements within 4 years of certification.</li> </ul>		

<b>Client action plan</b>	<p>We will work with related department of Hokkaido Government to develop a continuous monitoring programme for the target sea areas. The programme consists of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The quantitative information of non-target species.</li> <li>- Detect risk of this fishery on benthic habitats.</li> </ul> <p>We will seek agreement to the monitoring programme with related organization within 12 months of certification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The programme will be available for scrutiny at the first annual surveillance audit.</li> <li>2. The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</li> <li>3. Within 4 years of certification we will provide monitoring report, and this will be available for scrutiny at the fourth annual surveillance audit</li> </ol>
<b>Progress on Condition [Year 2]</b>	<p><b>UoC 1 – Spat and Seed Production.</b></p> <p><u>Non target species.</u></p> <p>Research was carried out by the Fisheries Cooperative Associations of Otarushi and Tomamae/kita –rumoi on July 7, 2014 and July 10 2014. The audit team was provided with the “Findings of the Research of fouling organisms on juvenile shells” which was undertaken in the Sea of Japan as required by the condition. This work was discussed during the audit. The numbers of juvenile scallops sampled off the coast of Otaru was 2,989 from one spat collector. The number of juvenile scallops sampled from Tomamae was 10,408 from three spat collectors. Almost all the fouling organisms on the scallops were found to be Mediterranean mussels. The nets used for sampling were 160x70cms.</p> <p>Fisheries Researchers confirmed that the results were typical of all the spat nets in the area, with only mussels being found as fouling organisms.</p> <p><u>ETP species</u></p> <p>All (22) of the Fisheries Associations were notified about the CITES Appendix 1 and the Red list. A procedure has been setup whereby a fisherman who incidentally caught any ETP species must report it as dead or alive. No ETP species have ever been caught in this fishery. However all Fisheries Association members unanimously agreed to report. An example of the report form was seen by the auditor. There was a delay in the planned time to get the information out to Associations because of the large number of CITES (approximately 1,000) and ‘red listed’ (3,597) species. This list was reduced to include only the appropriate (27) ETP species for the area. All Associations are informed and have begun reporting. At the next audit evidence of reporting will need to be evidenced.</p> <p><u>Effect on Habitats.</u></p> <p>Funka Bay: A report was provided for the cultivation areas entitled “Report on scallop enhanced fisheries environmental research in the fiscal year 2013” compiled by three organizations including Hakodate Fisheries Research Institution (HFRI) upon request from Funka Bay Scallop Farming Development Council).</p> <p>Another report for Funka Bay non-cultivation areas “Report on Funka Bay Environment research in the fiscal year 2014” conducted in 2013/2014 by HFRI was also provided.</p>

For both studies sites were selected to be representative of the area. In the cultivated area the four sites are representative of the spat catching areas. In the non-cultivated areas the intention was to get a wide selection of the whole area in Funka Bay. At each sampling location core bottom samples were taken. Latitude, Longitude, distance from the shore, water depth, seabed chemistry and all benthic organisms were identified. There were found to be no significant differences between the data from cultivated and non-cultivated sites. Further details and translations were shown at the site visit. Fisheries Researchers confirmed that there was no significant difference in any of the results.

Lake Saroma: The report presented was from 2009. This survey is carried out every six years and the next report will be available at the next audit. The auditor was shown the data from around 250 stations (using the core sampling methodology) that were taken across the Lake. Fished and unfished areas were included and sites chosen to be geographically representative. Some significant differences between species habitat distribution were found between stations. These were explained by the physical situation. Lake Saroma is a brackish lakean "open/sea" lake (strictly, a "brackish" lake) and species closer to the sea entrance where salinity was higher were different to stations further away from opening where salinity was lower.

Sea of Japan: For the extensive Sea of Japan area, a camera survey was used. Five shots were taken for each square m. Many photographs were available on site for inspection. There appeared to be little difference between sites inside and outside of fishing areas. This interpretation was confirmed by Fisheries Research scientists.

## UoC 2 – Suika-Shiki Fishery

### Non target species

Lake Saroma: A report was provided entitled "Data on research on fouling organisms on scallop shells". This was conducted by the Aquaculture Fisheries Cooperative of Saroma Lake (AFCSL) in 2014. Data was from 10 scallop shells collected from the middle hanging layer. The weight of fouling organisms was recorded. The species identified as fouling were consistently hydrozoans with lesser numbers of *Ascidella aspersa*, *Stela clava* and *Ciona intestinalis*.

Funka Bay: A report was provided on the *Ascidella aspersa* data recording from the Hakodate Fisheries Research Centre. A single site (top, middle and bottom) was sampled in the months of July, August, September, October, November and December, providing 15 samples. Although there appears to be no significant difference between the data collected each month, as only one site was sampled, it is difficult to say that this would be the case between sites.

### ETP species ( as above)

All of (12) Fisheries Associations were notified about the CITES Appendix 1 and the Red list. A procedure has been setup whereby a fisherman who incidentally caught any ETP species must report it as well as if it is dead or alive. No ETP species have ever been caught in this fishery. However all Fisheries Association members have agree to report. The decision to report ETP species was

unanimous. An example of the report form was included. There was a delay in getting the information out to Associations because of the large number of CITES (approximately 1,000) and 'red listed' (3,597) species. This list was reduced to include only the appropriate (27) ETP species for the area. All Associations are informed and have begun reporting. At the next audit evidence of reporting will need to be evidenced.

#### Effects on Habitat.

Studies on the effect on habitats of benthos were conducted in the Lake Saroma and Funka Bay areas. (refer to UoC 1 – Seed and Spat, above)

Funka Bay: A report was provided for the cultivation areas “Report on scallop Enhanced fisheries environmental research in the fiscal year 2013” compiled by three organisations including Hakodate Fisheries Research institute (HFRI) upon request from Funka bay Scallop Farming Development Council .

Another report for Funka Bay non- cultivation areas “Report on Funka Bay Environment research in the fiscal year 2014” conducted in 2013/2014 by HFRI, was also provided.

For both studies sites were selected to be representative of the area. In the cultivated area the four sites are representative of the spat catching areas. In the non-cultivated areas the intention was to get a wide selection of the whole area in Funka Bay. At each sampling location core bottom samples were taken. Latitude, Longitude, distance from the shore, water depth, seabed chemistry and all benthic organisms were identified. Further details and translations were shown at the site visit. Fisheries Researchers confirmed that there was no significant difference between any of the results.

Lake Saroma: The report presented was from 2009. This survey is carried out every six years and the next report will be available at the next audit. The auditor was shown the data from around 250 stations (using the core methodology) that were taken across the Lake. Fished and unfished areas were included and sites geographically representative. Some significant differences between species habitat distribution were found between stations. These were explained by the physical situation. Lake Saroma is brackish lake and species closer to the sea entrance where salinity was higher were different to stations further away from opening where salinity was lower.

### **UoC 3 – Keta-Ami Fishery**

#### Non target species

Sea of Okhotsk: Saruru Fisheries Cooperative Association was asked to collect data. The results will be available soon. This area was chosen as it is in the middle of the main dredging area Sea of Okhotsk.

Nemuro Straits: The Notsuke Fisheries Cooperative was also asked to collect data for Nemuro. This area was chosen as it has the highest scallop catch in the Nemuro area (~66%). These data were provided to the auditors. Areas both inside and outside the fishing areas were sampled. Scallops and starfish are the only species reported to be found in the catch. The estimated weight of the

	<p>standing stock was calculated from the actual numbers of scallops and an “estimated” weight based on the assumed average weight of a scallop at a particular size.</p> <p><u>ETP species (as above)</u></p> <p>All of (20) Fisheries Associations were notified about the CITES Appendix 1 and the Red list. A procedure has been setup whereby a fisherman who incidentally caught an ETP species must report it as well as if it is dead or alive. No ETP species have ever been caught in this fishery. However all Fisheries Association members have agreed to report. The decision to report ETP species was unanimous. An example of the report form was included. There was a delay in getting the information out to Associations because of the large number of of CITES (approximately 1,000) and 'red listed' (3,597) species. This list was reduced to include only the appropriate (27) ETP species for the area. All Associations are informed and have begun reporting. At the next audit evidence of reporting will need to be evidenced.</p> <p><u>Effects on Habitat.</u></p> <p>Underwater cameras were used for field studies conducted in the Sea of Okhotsk and Nemuro waters to collect data both inside and outside the fishing areas.</p> <p>The Sea of Okhotsk: The Saruru Fisheries Coopertive Association led the underwater field survey and tabulated the data with photos collected. The auditor viewed many photos showing gravel, sand bottoms. There appeared to be no significant difference between samples taken inside and outside the fishing area.</p> <p>Nemuro Straits: Notsuke Fisheries cooperation led a similar study in this area. Again, there was no significant difference between inside and outside fishing areas. This area was chosen for the study because it is one of the most heavily fished areas.</p>
<b>Status of condition</b>	<p><u>UoC 1 – Spat and Seed Production (original score for PI 2.5.3 = 70):</u></p> <p>SG 80:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information is adequate to broadly understand the key elements of the ecosystem.</li> <li>• Main impacts of the fishery on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, but may not have been investigated in detail.</li> <li>• The main functions of the Components (i.e. target, Bycatch, Retained and ETP species and Habitats) in the ecosystem are known.</li> <li>• Sufficient information is available on the impacts of the fishery on these Components to allow some of the main consequences for the ecosystem to be inferred.</li> <li>• Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</li> </ul>

The additional work that has been undertaken in the last year has been effective in bringing UoC 1 closer to meeting the SG80 requirements for this PI. With reference to Sla and Slb, the information is sufficient to understand the key elements of the ecosystem, and the impact of this UoC on benthic habitats is now better understood, as is its impact on bycatch species. For both of these ecosystem components, the evidence shows that the fishery is highly unlikely to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function. Slc and Sld were considered to have been met at certification, but with respect to Sle, a reporting programme for ETP species is now in place, but the operational effectiveness of the programme in showing that sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level needs to be demonstrated before this condition can be closed out. UoC 1 is therefore 'on target' to meet this condition, and is rescored from 70 to 75 for PI 2.5.3 at this Year 2 audit on the basis of the additional ecosystem information that is now available (i.e., Sla, Slb, Slc and Sld are met, but Sle is still to be met).

UoC 2 – Suika-Shiki Fishery (original score for PI 2.5.3 = 75):

The evidence presented from recent studies of non-target species catch and habitat distribution from the Suika-shiki fishing areas is useful, and indicates that this UoC is continuing to meet the SG80 level of performance for these ecosystem components. As with UoC 1, there is now a reporting programme in place for ETP species, but the operational effectiveness of the programme needs to be demonstrated over the next period before this condition can be closed out. UoC 2 is therefore 'on target' to meet this condition and continues to score 75 for PI 2.5.3.

UoC 3 – Keta-Ami Fishery (original score for PI 2.5.3 = 75):

The new information that was presented from recent studies of non-target catch and habitat impacts provides good support for the score of 90 that was awarded for the ecosystem outcome PI (2.5.1). The results from the non-target catch study undertaken by the Saruru Fisheries Cooperative Association will be expected at the next audit. As with UoC 1 and 2, there is also now a reporting programme in place for ETP species, but the operational effectiveness of the programme needs to be demonstrated over the next period before this condition can be closed out. UoC 3 is therefore 'on target' to meet this condition and continues to score 75 for PI 2.5.3.

**Table 3: Condition 2**

Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
	2.3.3 UoC 1	SG80: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient information is available to allow fishery related mortality and the impact of fishing to be quantitatively estimated for ETP species.</li> <li>• Information is sufficient to</li> </ul>	65

		<p>determine whether the fishery may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information is sufficient to measure trends and support a full strategy to manage impacts on ETP species.</li> </ul>	
<b>Condition</b>	<p><b>Condition 2 – ETP Species Information / Monitoring (PI 2.3.3) (UoC 1 - Spat Collection)</b></p> <p>Procedures for gathering information about the mortality of ETP species in this Unit of Certification should be established. These procedures should enable sufficient qualitative and quantitative information to be gathered to measure trends in mortality, and to support a full strategy for managing impacts on ETP species..</p> <p>Proposals for a monitoring programme should be presented at the first surveillance audit within 12 months of certification, and data from the monitoring programme should be presented at the second surveillance audit within 2 years of certification. The monitoring programme should provide information that meets the SG80 requirements within 4 years of certification.</p>		
<b>Milestones</b>	<p>The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this</p>		
<b>Client action plan</b>	<p>The fish and shellfish which are listed in the red list of Ministry of the Environment do not exist in seawater but in brackish water or freshwater. However, we will work with related department of Hokkaido Government to announce the 'Red list (Ministry of the Environment)' to the 44 fishery cooperatives and will establish a reporting rule. The rule requests to 44 fishery cooperatives that if they catch the species in the red list, they should release the species immediately and report its amount / life and death to Hokkaido Government.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme will be available for scrutiny at the first annual surveillance audit.</li> <li>The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</li> <li>Within 4 years of certification we will provide monitoring report, and this will be available for scrutiny at the fourth annual surveillance audit."</li> </ol>		
<b>Progress on Condition [Year 2]</b>	<p><u>ETP species</u> (as above)</p> <p>All of (22) Fisheries Associations were notified about the CITES Appendix 1 and the Red list. A procedure has been setup whereby a fisherman who incidentally caught an ETP species must report it as well as if it is dead or alive. No ETP species have ever been caught in this fishery. However all Fisheries Association members have agree to report. The decision to use report ETP species was unanimous. An example of the report form was included. There was a delay in getting the information out to Associations because of the large amount of CITES (approximately 1,000) and 'red listed' (3,597)species. This list was reduced to include only the appropriate (27) ETP species for the area. All Associations are informed and are reporting.</p>		
<b>Status of condition</b>	<p><u>UoC 1 – Spat and Seed Production (original score for PI 2.3.3 = 65):</u></p> <p>A reporting programme is now in place for ETP species, but the operational effectiveness of the programme needs to be demonstrated over the next period before this condition can be closed out. UoC 1 is 'on target' to meet this</p>		

condition.

Table 3: Condition 3

Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
	2.4.3 UoC 1	<p>SG 80</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail arelevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.</li> <li>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, timing and location of use of the fishing gear.</li> <li>Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitat (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</li> </ul>	70
Condition	<p><b>Condition 3 – Habitats Information / Monitoring (PI 2.4.3) (UoC 1 – Spat Collection)</b></p> <p>Procedures should be established for gathering information about the nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in fishery areas at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.</p> <p>Data should be gathered to allow the nature of the impacts of the fishery on habitat types to be identified.</p> <p>Proposals for a monitoring programme should be presented at the first surveillance audit within 12 months of certification, and data from the monitoring programme should be presented at the second surveillance audit within 2 years of certification. The monitoring programme should provide information that meets the SG80 requirements within 4 years of certification</p>		
Milestones	<p>The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</p>		
Client action plan	<p>Refer UoC 1 Spat and seed ETP</p> <p>We will work with related department of Hokkaido Government to develop a monitoring programme of detect risk of benthic habitats for the target sea areas. The programme will demonstrate the impacts of this fishery on benthic habitats. We will seek agreement to the monitoring programme with related organization within 12 months of certification.</p> <p>1. The programme will be available for scrutiny at the first annual surveillance</p>		

	<p>audit.</p> <p>2. The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</p> <p>3. Within 4 years of certification we will provide monitoring report, and this will be available for scrutiny at the fourth annual surveillance audit."</p>
<p><b>Progress on Condition [Year 2]</b></p>	<p><u>Effect on Habitats.</u></p> <p>Funka Bay: A report was provided for the cultivation areas entitled "Report on scallop enhanced fisheries environmental research in the fiscal year 2013" compiled by three organisations including Hakodate Fisheries research Institute (HFRI) upon request from Funka Bay Scallop Farming Development Council.</p> <p>Another report for Funka Bay non-cultivation areas "Report on Funka Bay Environment research in the fiscal year 2014" conducted in 2013/2014 by HFRI was also provided.</p> <p>For both studies sites were selected to be representative of the area. In the cultivated area the four sites are representative of the spat catching areas. In the non-cultivated areas the intention was to get a wide selection of the whole area in Funka Bay. At each sampling location core bottom samples were taken. Latitude, Longitude, distance from the shore, water depth, seabed chemistry and all benthic organisms were identified. There were found to be no significant differences between the data from cultivated and non-cultivated sites. Further details and translations were shown at the site visit. Fisheries Researchers confirmed that there was no significant difference in any of the results.</p> <p>Lake Saroma: The report presented was from 2009. This survey is carried out every six years and the next report will be available at the next audit. The auditor was shown the data from around 250 stations (using the core sampling methodology) that were taken across the Lake. Fished and unfished areas were included and sites geographically representative. Some significant differences between species habitat distribution were found between stations. These were explained by the physical situation. Lake Saroma is brackish lake and species closer to the sea entrance where salinity was higher were different to stations further away from opening where salinity was lower.</p> <p>Sea of Japan: For the extensive Sea of Japan work cameras were used. Five shots were taken for each square m. Many photographs were available on site for inspection. There seemed to be little difference between sites inside and outside of fishing areas. This interpretation was confirmed by Fisheries Research scientists.</p>
<p><b>Status of condition</b></p>	<p><u>UoC 1 – Spat and Seed Production (original score for PI 2.4.3 = 70):</u></p> <p>SG 80</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.</li> <li>• 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, timing and location of use of the fishing gear.</li> <li>• Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitat</li> </ul>

	<p>(e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</p> <p>The additional work that has been undertaken in the last year has been effective in bringing UoC 1 up to the SG80 level of performance. With reference to SIa, the nature, distribution and vulnerability of the main habitat types are now known at a level of detail relevant to the scale of the fishery. With reference to SIc, the information on the fishery's extent and intensity are available and continue to be collected such that any increase in risk to habitats would be detected. SIb was considered to have been met by the fishery at certification.</p> <p>UoC 1 is therefore rescored at 80 for PI 2.4.3, and Condition 3 is closed out.</p>
--	---

Table 3: Condition 4

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.2.3 UoC 3	<p>SG 80</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualitative information and some quantitative information are available on the amount of main bycatch species affected by the fishery.</li> <li>Information is sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.</li> <li>Information is adequate to support a partial strategy to manage main bycatch species.</li> <li>Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk to main bycatch species (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the strategy).</li> </ul>	70
Condition	<p><b>Condition 4 – Discards (bycatch) monitoring (PI 2.2.3) (UoC 3 – Keta-Ami Fishery)</b></p> <p>Procedures for gathering data about the non-target species that are discarded from each Unit of Certification should be established. These procedures should enable sufficient qualitative and quantitative information to be gathered to support a management strategy for these species.</p> <p>Proposals for a monitoring programme should be presented at the first surveillance audit within 12 months of certification, and data from the monitoring programme should be presented at the second surveillance audit within 2 years of certification. The monitoring programme should provide information that meets the SG80 requirements within 4 years of certification.</p>		

<b>Milestones</b>	The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.
<b>Client action plan</b>	<p>We will work with related department of Hokkaido Government to develop a monitoring programme for the target sea areas.</p> <p>With regard to non-target species, we keep monitoring the ""Fishery Production Statistics"" by Hokkaido Government, which reports all the species caught in Hokkaido, so that we can figure out information of all the non-target species.</p> <p>For discards, we will develop a new monitoring programme to gather quantitative information of them, though we deem there is no effect on environment at the moment as discards are released alive.</p> <p>We will seek agreement to the new monitoring programme with related organization within 12 months of certification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The programme will be available for scrutiny at the first annual surveillance audit.</li> <li>2. The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</li> <li>3. Within 4 years of certification we will provide monitoring report, and this will be available for scrutiny at the fourth annual surveillance audit.</li> </ol>
<b>Progress on Condition [Year 2]</b>	<p><u>Non target species</u></p> <p>Sea of Okhotsk: Saruru Fisheries Cooperative Association was asked to collect data. The results will be available soon. This area was chosen as it is in the middle of the main dredging area Sea of Okhotsk.</p> <p>Nemuro Straits: The Notsuke Fisheries Cooperative was also asked to collect data for Nemuro. This area was chosen as it has the highest scallop catch in the Nemuro area (~66%). These data were provided to the auditors. Areas both inside and outside the fishing areas were sampled. Scallops and starfish are the only species reported in the catch. The estimated weight of the standing stock was calculated from the actual numbers of scallops and an "estimated" weight based on the assumed average weight of a scallop at a particular size.</p> <p>All bycatch and retained species is recorded by all fishers and collated by the Fisheries Research Institutes. The auditor was shown examples</p>
<b>Status of condition</b>	<p><u>UoC 3 – Keta-Ami Fishey (original score for PI 2.2.3 = 70):</u></p> <p>Results from the non-target catch study undertaken by the Saruru Fisheries Cooperative Association are expected at the next audit. It is noted that the key issue is bycatch in the fishery, not a comparison between bycatch rates inside and outside the fished areas.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the information coming forward from the Notsuke Fisheries Cooperative is useful and confirms the existing score for this PI. More information on non-target catches in UoC 3 is expected to be collected this year and UoC 3 is 'on target' to meet this condition.</p>

Table 3: Condition 5

Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
	2.4.3 UoC 3	<p>SG80:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat</li> </ul>	70

	<p>types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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, timing and location of use of the fishing gear.</li> <li>• Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitat (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</li> </ul>	
<b>Condition</b>	<p><b>Condition 5 – Discards (bycatch) monitoring (PI 2.2.3) (UoC 3 – Keta-Ami Fishery)</b></p> <p>Procedures should be established for gathering information about the nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in fishery areas at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.</p> <p>Data should be gathered to allow the nature of the impacts of the fishery on habitat types to be identified.</p> <p>Proposals for a monitoring programme should be presented at the first surveillance audit within 12 months of certification, and data from the monitoring programme should be presented at the second surveillance audit within 2 years of certification. The monitoring programme should provide information that meets the SG80 requirements within 4 years of certification.</p>	
<b>Milestones</b>	<p>The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</p>	
<b>Client action plan</b>	<p>We will work with related department of Hokkaido Government to develop a monitoring programme of detect risk of benthic habitats for the target sea areas. The programme will demonstrate the impacts of this fishery on benthic habitats. We will seek agreement to the monitoring programme with related organization within 12 months of certification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The programme will be available for scrutiny at the first annual surveillance audit.</li> <li>2. The programme will be implemented by the time of 2nd surveillance audit and will provide evidence of this.</li> <li>3. Within 4 years of certification we will provide monitoring report, and this will be available for scrutiny at the fourth annual surveillance audit."</li> </ol>	
<b>Progress on Condition [Year 2]</b>	<p><u>Effects on Habitat.</u></p> <p>Underwater cameras were used for field studies conducted in the Sea of Okhotsk and Nemuro waters to collect data both inside and outside the fishing areas.</p> <p>The Sea of Okhotsk: The Saruru Fisheries Cooperative Association led the underwater field survey and tabulated the data with photos collected. The</p>	

	<p>auditor viewed many photos showing gravel, sand bottoms. There appeared to be no significant difference between samples taken inside and outside the fishing area.</p> <p>Nemuro Straits: Notsuke Fisheries cooperation led a similar study in this area. Again, no significant differences were apparent between sites inside and outside the fishing areas. This area was chosen as it is one of the most heavily fished areas.</p>
<b>Status of condition</b>	<p><u>UoC 3 – Keta-Ami Fishey (original score for PI 2.4.3 = 70):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.</li> <li>• 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, timing and location of use of the fishing gear.</li> <li>• Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitat (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</li> </ul> <p>The new information that was presented from the Sea of Ohotsk and Nemuro areas is sufficient that it can be said that the nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery. As such, UoC 3 meets the SG80 level of performance for SIa. UoC 3 was considered to have met the SG80 requirements for SIb and SIc at certification, and so this UoC is rescored at 80 and the Condition is closed out.</p>

## **Conclusion**

### **Summary of Findings**

IFC confirm that this fishery is certified.

## References

The client provided various documents and presentations as listed below.

Parts of these documents were translated to English on request.

1. Findings of the research on fouling organisms on juvenile scallops. Sea of Japan Reported by OFCA and KRFA. 2014
2. Prior Notification of report on ETP species
3. List of ETP species relevant to the Scallop enhanced fisheries in Hokkaido
4. Format for ETP catch report
5. Report on scallop enhanced fisheries environment research in the 2013 fiscal year. Cultivation areas. Funka Bay Scallop Farming Development Council with cooperation from HFRI and 2 other organisations.
6. Report on Funka Bay (non-cultivation areas) in the fiscal year 2014. HFRI
7. Research paper on macrobenthos in Lake Saroma. AFRI 2009
8. Findings of underwater field study off the coast of Otaru and Rumoi. Hokkaido Scallop Fisheries Promotion Association. 2014
9. Data on the research on fouling organisms on scallop shells, Lake Saroma. AFCSL 2014
10. Ascidilla aspersa data recording format. HFRI 2014
11. Data on dredge fishing test. NFCA 2014
12. Data on fisheries resources camera study in the Sea of Okhotsk. SFCA 2014
13. Data on a fishery resources camera study in the Nemuro area, NFCA 2014

## Appendix 1. Re-scoring evaluation tables

Changes made to original rationales are in blue.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
<p><b>2.5.3 Information monitoring</b></p> <p>There is adequate knowledge of the impacts of the fishery on the ecosystem.</p>	<p>Information is adequate to <u>identify</u> the key elements of the ecosystem (e.g. trophic structure and function, community composition, productivity pattern and biodiversity).</p> <p>Main impacts of the fishery on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, but <u>have not been investigated in detail</u>.</p>	<p>Information is adequate to <u>broadly understand</u> the key elements of the ecosystem.</p> <p>Main impacts of the fishery on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, but <u>may not have been investigated in detail</u>.</p> <p>The main functions of the Components (i.e. target, Bycatch, Retained and ETP species and Habitats) in the ecosystem are <u>known</u>.</p> <p>Sufficient information is available on the impacts of the fishery on these Components to allow some of the main consequences for the ecosystem to be inferred.</p>	<p>Main <u>interactions</u> between the fishery and these ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, and <u>have been investigated in detail</u>.</p> <p>The impacts of the fishery on target, Bycatch, Retained and ETP species and Habitats are identified and the main functions of these Components in the ecosystem are <u>understood</u>.</p> <p>Sufficient information is available on the impacts of the fishery on the Components <u>and elements</u> to allow the main consequences for the ecosystem to be inferred.</p>

		<p>Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).</p>	<p>Information is sufficient to support the development of strategies to manage ecosystem impacts.</p>
--	--	--	--

#### UoC1: Spat collection & ongrowing - Scoring Comments

There is sufficient information available to broadly understand the key elements of the ecosystem in the fishery area in Lake Saroma and Funka Bay. This information is available in Government reports and scientific publications describing interactions between scallops and their food sources; and the potential effect of the fishery on non-target species, benthic habitats and the spread of non-native species and diseases. These reports demonstrate that the main interactions of the fishery with marine ecosystems have been investigated in these areas. There is, however relatively limited and patchy information outside these two areas

The main functions of the components of the ecosystem that are likely to be affected by this unit of certification are known. There is sufficient information available to conclude that there is very little interaction with non-target species and ETP species, a limited interaction with benthic habitats, and the unit of certification appears to be affected by, rather than have an effect upon, phytoplankton abundance (which is determined by climatic factors).

Data about ecosystem effects is continually gathered for some potential risks (such as the incidence of capture of retained species, the productivity of the fishery, and the incidence of non-native species) but is not continually gathered for other potential risks (such as the incidence of discarding, interactions with ETP species, and impacts on benthic habitats). Nevertheless, there is sufficient information available to allow some of the main consequences of the fishery on the components of the ecosystem to be inferred.

The additional work that has been undertaken in the last year has been effective in bringing UoC 1 closer to meeting the SG80 requirements for this PI. With reference to SIa and SIb, the information is sufficient to understand the key elements of the ecosystem, and the impact of this UoC on benthic habitats is now better understood, as is its impact on bycatch species. For both of these ecosystem components, the evidence shows that the fishery is highly unlikely to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function. SIc and SId were considered to have been met at certification, but with respect to SIe, a reporting programme for ETP species is now in place, but the operational effectiveness of the programme in showing that sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level needs to be demonstrated before this condition can be closed out. UoC 1 is therefore 'on target' to meet this condition, and is rescored from 70 to 75 for PI 2.5.3 at this Year 2 audit on the basis of the additional ecosystem information that is now available (i.e., SIa, SIb, SIc and SId are met, but SIe is still to be met).

**Score: 75. All of the requirements at SG 60 are met and four out of the five at SG80**

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
2.4.3	<b>Information / monitoring</b>  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.	There is a basic understanding of the types and distribution of main habitats in the area of the fishery.	The nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery.	The distribution of habitat types is known over their range, with particular attention to the occurrence of vulnerable habitat types.
		Information is adequate to broadly understand the main impacts of gear use on the main habitats, including spatial extent of interaction.	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, timing and location of use of the fishing gear.  Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitat (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the measures).	The physical impacts of the gear on the habitat types have been quantified fully.  Changes in habitat distributions over time are measured.

#### UoC 1: Spat collection & ongrowing - Scoring Comments

Good information is available about the nature and distribution of the main habitats in the vicinity of the spat collection and ongrowing areas in Funka Bay and Lake Saroma, and the effects of scallop cultivation activity on these habitats is known from regular surveys within and around the cultivation areas that are carried out at a scale and level of detail that is appropriate to the fishing activity. Much less information is available for the other spat collection areas, where the available survey information shows only a basic understanding of habitat types and distributions.

The information gathered for Lake Saroma and Funka Bay is of sufficient detail to quantify the impacts of this fishery on habitats, and to detect changes in

habitat distributions over time. This information is not matched for other areas; however it provides the basis of a basic understanding of the effects of this fishery on benthic habitats in Hokkaido.

Excellent information is available on the scale location of the cultivation activity throughout Hokkaido, and any changes to fishing operations (such as their scale, location or nature of activity) would be detected immediately, enabling any increase in risks to habitats to be evaluated.

The additional work that has been undertaken in the last year has been effective in bringing UoC 1 up to the SG80 level of performance. With reference to Sla, the nature, distribution and vulnerability of the main habitat types are now known at a level of detail relevant to the scale of the fishery. With reference to Slc, the information on the fishery's extent and intensity are available and continue to be collected such that any increase in risk to habitats would be detected. Slb was considered to have been met by the fishery at certification.

UoC 1 is therefore rescored at 80 for PI 2.4.3, and Condition 3 is closed out

**Score: 80**

**All of the SG60 and SG 80 requirements are met**

## UoC3: Keta-Ami fishery - Scoring Comments

The nature and distribution of the main habitats within each Keta-Ami fishery area are known, and the effects of scallop cultivation activity on these habitats is known from regular surveys within and around the cultivation areas in the Sea of Okhotsk and the Nemuro Strait that have been carried out at a scale and level of detail that is appropriate to the fishing activity. Little information has been presented about the vulnerability of these habitats to the impacts of the fishery, and there is limited detail in the available information.

The nature of the impacts of the fishery on habitat types can be determined from the available data and from generic studies of the impacts of scallop dredges on seabed habitats. For this fishery there is excellent information available on the location of the cultivation and harvesting activity. The fishery is closely monitored, and any changes to fishing operations (such as their scale, location or nature of activity) would be detected instantly, enabling any increase in risks to habitats to be evaluated.

The new information that was presented from the Sea of Ohotsk and Nemuro areas is sufficient that it can be said that the nature, distribution and vulnerability of all main habitat types in the fishery area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the fishery. As such, UoC 3 meets the SG80 level of performance for Sla. UoC 3 was considered to have met the SG80 requirements for Slb and Slc at certification, and so this UoC is rescored at 80 and the Condition is closed out.

**Score: 80. All of the SG60 and SG 80 requirements are met.**

## Appendix 2. Stakeholder submissions

None received

**Appendix 3. Surveillance audit information (if necessary)**

**Appendix 4. Additional detail on conditions/ actions/ results (if necessary)**

## Appendix 5. Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary)

Table 5.1 : Surveillance level rationale

Year	Surveillance activity	Number of auditors	Rationale
2016	On-site audit	1 auditor on-site with remote support from 1 auditor	From client action plan it can be deduced that information needed to verify progress towards conditions 1, 2 and 4 can be provided with 1 auditor on-site with remote support – this to ensure that all information is collected

Table 5.2: Timing of surveillance audit

Year	Anniversary date of certificate	Proposed date of surveillance audit	Rationale
3	May 2013	February 2016	Anniversary date suitable to client fishery and scientific advice

Table 5.3: Fishery Surveillance Program

Surveillance Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Level 6	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit & re-certification site visit.