

MSC Variation Request

FPO ICELANDIC CAPELIN

Marine Stewardship Council fisheries assessments

16.06.2021

1 Introduction

This form details the information required from Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) to enable the MSC to consider a CAB application to vary from a clause or requirement in any of the MSC program documents (GCR 4.12).

Please complete all unshaded fields. Where instructions are included in italics, please delete and replace with your specific information. All grey boxes containing instructions may be deleted, e.g. the 'Introduction' section.

Once this variation form is completed, delete guidance, save it as a PDF file and upload to the MSC database. On receipt, the MSC will consider your request and will usually respond within 14 days.

Please note that all variation request forms and MSC responses to the request will be published on the MSC website along with other assessment documents associated with the specific fishery.

2 Marine Stewardship Council variation request

Table 1 – Variation request

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Date submitted to the MSC |
| | 14.06.2021 |
| 2 | CAB |
| | DNV Business Assurance |
| 3 | Fishery name and certificate number |
| | FPO Icelandic capelin. (entering initial assessment) |
| 4 | Lead auditor or program manager |
| | Lucia Revenga |
| 5 | Request prepared by |
| | Lucia Revenga |
| 6 | Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested |
| | FCP v2.2 - 7.16 / G7.16 Site Visit: Team Attendance March 2021 Derogation 3: Covid-19 Fishery and Chain of Custody Remote Auditing – Normative Requirements - 1.3.b. – Submit a variation request (as per GCR 4.12) to the MSC to conduct initial assessments remotely. |
| 7 | How many times has a variation for this requirement been accepted for the same assessment of the same fishery? |
| | None. |

| Table 2 – Variation justification | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Proposed variation |
| | - Please describe how the CAB proposes to vary from the requirement including, where required, any original deadline date, the length of additional time requested and the exact modified deadline date. |
| | The CAB proposes that the site visit for this fishery be conducted remotely for the assessment team, as opposed to conducting a fully onsite visit to Iceland and the Faroe Islands. Note that Principle experts for P1, P2 and P3 have already participated in the assessment of the ISF Icelandic capelin fishery (same fishery, same waters, different client), including the attendance to the relevant site visit. |
| 2 | Additional time requested |
| | Original deadline date |
| | 18 th , 19 th and 20 th August 2021 |
| | Modified deadline date requested |
| | N/A |
| | Length of additional time requested |
| | N/A |
| 3 | Justification |
| | <p>The updated MSC Covid-19 Pandemic Derogation (effective 28th March 2021) states that “initial assessments and audits that are to be completed without an on-site visit will require CABs to submit a variation request and risk assessment for approval” and that “If national or local Covid-19 restrictions prevent Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs), assessors or certificate holders from carrying out on-site audits and assessments of already certified businesses, these may be undertaken remotely.”</p> <p>The justification for conducting a remote site visit for this assessment is as follows:</p> <p>Travel Restrictions: The fishery is carried out by Faroese vessels in Icelandic waters. Site visit should include meetings in Iceland and in Faroe Islands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to restrictions to Iceland, these are specified in https://www.covid.is/categories/travel-to-and-within-iceland Specifically, <i>passengers travelling to Iceland that do not have a certificate of vaccination or a certificate that they have had COVID-19 need to follow different rules when arriving depending on where they travel from (including quarantine). Only Greenland is considered safe area, but all other countries are risk areas. Unnecessary travelling of people without vaccination or previous infection of COVID-19, who do not live in Iceland, from high-risk countries (list II) is prohibited. The level of risk consideration for the different countries varies within weeks.</i> In relation to restrictions in Faroe Islands, restrictions are specified at: https://www.visitfaroeislands.com/about/faroe-islands-reopen-visitors/ <i>PCR tests at the border are a requirement for ALL travellers (also those vaccinated and previously infected travellers) until 30 June 2021 or until further notice. ALL travellers (also those vaccinated and previously infected) should self-isolate until they have received the result. All travellers should be particularly careful during the first four days of their stay until they have received a negative test result.</i> <p>The Team Leader for this assessment has not received vaccination yet nor has passed the COVID 19 infection. Holding on site visits would heavily increase the cost of this, as there will be need to stay longer in both countries in order to isolate until PCR results are received.</p> |
| 4 | Implications for assessment |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Remote audit activities should not have any implications for the assessment, including its timeline. Note that Principle experts have already participated in onsite audits for the same Icelandic capelin fishery (for a different client) and that they are still involved in annual surveillances of the ISF Icelandic capelin fishery. Therefore, they already have good information on the regulations that apply to the fishery and on the potential impacts to expect as well as on stakeholders that should be contacted.</p> <p>Taking into account our CAB's experience with remote fishery assessments within the derogation period during which the active participation of the stakeholders was provided, there is confidence that high level of stakeholder interaction will be provided here as well and the team will be able to collect all required information</p> |
| 5 | Mitigation of the implications for assessment |
| | See Table 1 Risk assessment |
| 6 | How many conditions does the fishery have and will their progress be affected (positive or negative)? |
| | N/A (Initial assessment. No conditions expected at ACDR stage) |
| 7 | What is the status of the current assessment or audit? |
| | ACDR has been published on 15 th June 2021. |
| 8 | Further comments |
| | N/A |
| 9 | If applicable, additional information added after the MSC's request |
| | N/A |

Table 1: Areas of risk to be included in risk assessment

| Risks areas | Key risks | Fishery risk |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Sufficient information to enable an effective and robust fishery assessment process and comprehensive assessment against the MSC Fisheries Standard.</p> | <p>Ability to verify information remotely</p> <p>– please refer to Table G1 for more information</p> | <p>Low risk:</p> <p>The team will use different mechanisms to engage with the clients remotely and stakeholders, such as Skype/Zoom calls, email and phone (where appropriate). The mechanisms are determined to be sufficient and effective in the circumstances of this fishery. Fishery reports and other documents are fully available to the team as they have been requested during the ACDR preparation.</p> |
| | <p>Ability to engage with stakeholders, deliver a robust stakeholder consultation process and conduct interviews with stakeholder. Please refer to FCP 4.2, GFCP 4.2, and 7.16.</p> | <p>Low risk: DNV will organize the consultation process according to FCP v.2.2 4.2. Essential stakeholders such as the client, management authorities and research institutes have already confirmed their availability to meet remotely. The assessment team is open to set more meetings with other interested stakeholders.</p> |
| | <p>Ability to gather information and carry out stakeholder consultations if the Risk Based Framework (annex PF) is being used to assess data-deficient PIs. Please refer to PF2.3, PF3.2, PF3.3.2, PF4.1.5.b.ii, PF4.2, PF7.2, PF8.2, PF8.4.1, PF8.5.1, PF8.6.1 and PF8.7.1. Other relevant references: FCP 7.10.2.m.</p> | <p>Low risk, N/A: The use of RBF is not expected since the vast majority of the catch is the targeted capelin.</p> |
| | <p>Availability of information - FCP 7.10.2.h requires CABs to indicate the availability of information used to score each PI and to highlight potential information gaps. If the CAB identifies a large number of information gaps in the ACDR the CAB should consider if a remote site visit will be sufficient to obtain the necessary information.</p> <p>Please refer to the interpretation ‘Clarifications relating to the Announcement Comment Draft’ which provides the MSC’s intent behind draft scoring ranges, identification of information gaps to inform site visits and stakeholders consultation: “The MSC’s intent is that the ACDR provides indicative scoring and rationales and identifies where more information is needed. One</p> | <p>Low risk: The limited number of information gaps (all of which refer to update information rather than to search for new information) favours the collection of this information via remote means.</p> <p>Moreover, no PI scored <60 nor <80.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>of the objectives of the ACDR is to assist the site visit by facilitating stakeholder input to the assessment prior to the site visit, and to ensure the CAB, the client and stakeholders are better informed and prepared for the site visit...”</p> <p>CABs should consider the risk of an off-site initial fishery assessment if any Performance Indicator has a draft scoring range of <60 reported in the ACDR.</p> | |
| | <p>Ability to understand the context, scale, and intensity of the fishery operations.</p> | <p>Low risk: the team has a good understanding of the specified aspects of the fishery under assessment. P1, P2 and P3 experts have participated in the full assessment and annual surveillances of the ISF Icelandic capelin fishery (for the ISF Icelandic client).</p> |
| <p>Sufficient communication capability to effectively plan, conduct interviews and facilitate information sharing as per IAF MD 4: 20181.</p> | <p>Availability of information and communication technology (ICT). Competency of assessment teams, auditees, and stakeholders in using ICT. Please refer to IAF MD 4:2018</p> | <p>Low risk: the team has available a wide range of ICT such as their PCs with required software, teleconference facilities allowing audio, video and data (ICT). sharing.</p> <p>Video and audio during the opening and closing meetings can be recorded if agreed by all parties, taking into account security and confidentiality issues.</p> |
| | <p>Ability to clearly exchange information between the assessment team, prospective fishery client and stakeholders and to be understood by all parties when parties speak different languages.</p> | <p>Low risk: the team, representatives of the CAB and the client have used Microsoft Teams and other ITC communication means previously, including during remote assessments. No problems with using them have been identified in the past.</p> <p>The CAB and the assessors understand the risks and opportunities of ICT used and its possible impact on the assessment duration.</p> <p>The language to be used during the assessment will be English.</p> <p>The client is Faroese and fishery takes place in Icelandic waters. Among team members there are Norwegian and Danish natives with sufficient understanding of Danish and Icelandic languages if needed (as Scandinavian languages are similar).</p> |
| | <p>Ability to schedule remote site visit activities at reasonable mutually convenient times when parties are located across different time zones</p> | <p>Low risk:</p> <p>Assessors and CAB follow CET while client, Faroese and Icelandic stakeholders follow Greenwich time.</p> <p>Meetings will be scheduled at reasonable times for all stakeholders.</p> |

3 Template information and copyright

This document was drafted using the 'MSC Variation Request Form – Fisheries v1.0'.

The Marine Stewardship Council's 'MSC Variation Request Form – Fisheries v1.0' and its content is copyright of "Marine Stewardship Council" - © "Marine Stewardship Council" 2020. All rights reserved.

Template version control

| Version | Date of publication | Description of amendment |
|---------|---------------------|--|
| 1.0 | 25 March 2020 | Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.2 |

A controlled document list of MSC program documents is available on the MSC website (msc.org).

Marine Stewardship Council
Marine House
1 Snow Hill
London EC1A 2DH
United Kingdom

Phone: + 44 (0) 20 7246 8900
Fax: + 44 (0) 20 7246 8901
Email: standards@msc.org

ABOUT DNV

DNV is the independent expert in assurance and risk management, operating in more than 100 countries. Through its broad experience and deep expertise DNV advances safety and sustainable performance, sets industry benchmarks, and inspires and invents solutions.

DNV is one of the world's leading certification, assurance and risk management providers. Whether certifying a company's management system or products, providing training, or assessing supply chains, and digital assets, we enable customers and stakeholders to make critical decisions with confidence. We are committed to support our customers to transition and realize their long-term strategic goals sustainably, collectively contributing to the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

www.dnv.com

© DNV 2021