

**Surveillance Visit Report for
Spencer Gulf Prawn (*Penaeus (Melicertus) latisulcatus*)
Trawl Fishery
MRAG-F-1630**



**MRAG Americas, Inc.
10051 5th St N, Suite 105
St Petersburg, FL 33702, USA**

July 5, 2012

CLIENT DETAILS:

Spencer Gulf and West Coast Prawn Fishermen's Association
Simon Clark
SGWCPFA, PO Box 8 (South Quay Boulevard)
Port Lincoln SA 5606, Australia
Tel: 61 8 8682 4600
Fax: 61 8 8682 6253
Email: eo@prawnassociation.com.au

Document template tracking no.: **MRAG-MS-7e-v1**

MSC reference standards:

MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing Version 1.1
MSC Certification Requirements Version 1.2
MSC Guidance to Certification Requirements Version 1.1

MSC Accreditation Manual Version 5

General Information	
Fishery Name:	Spencer Gulf Prawn Trawl Fishery
Unit(s) of Certification:	<i>Penaeus (Melicertus) latisulcatus</i>
Geographical boundaries	Cape Catastrophe S34° 59.12' E136° 0.18' Cape Spencer S35° 17.99' E 136° 52.84'
Certification Date:	25 th July 2011
Certification Expiry Date:	24 th July 2016
Surveillance Assessment Team:	Principle 1, Principle 2, Principle 3. Richard Banks Dr. Kevin Stokes
On-site Audit Date:	21-23 June 2012
Surveillance Stage:	First surveillance audit
Surveillance Frequency:	Annual

Project Code:	US1630
Issue ref:	First Surveillance Audit
Date of issue:	July 4, 2012
Prepared by:	Richard Banks, Kevin Stokes
Checked/Approved by:	RJT

Contents

Summary	4
1 Introduction	4
2 The Surveillance Process	5
3 Information Sources	5
3.1 Major changes notified by the client	5
3.2 Other information sources	6
4 MSC Certification validation requirements	6
4.1 Public claims made by the client	6
4.2 Review of any personnel changes in science, management or industry	6
4.3 Review of any changes to the scientific base of information, including stock assessments	6
5 Progress in implementing the client action plan	7
6 Conclusions and Recommendations	17
6.1 Progress relative to milestones	17
6.2 Closed-out conditions	17
6.3 Surveillance	17
6.4 Certification Decision	17
6.5 Recommendations	18
APPENDIX 1: Stakeholder Comments	19

Summary

The conclusion of the audit is that the certificate for the Spencer Gulf Prawn Trawl Fishery should be extended for another year. The audit found that the Client Action Plan is being implemented as agreed, but the audit team made a small number of recommendations to the fishery.

1 Introduction

This report outlines the process and outcome of the first annual surveillance audit for the MSC certified fishery 'Spencer Gulf Prawn (*Penaeus (Melicertus) latisulcatus*) Trawl Fishery'. The fishery is conducted by members of the Spencer Gulf and West Coast Prawn Fishermen's Association (SGWCPFA).

There are 39 vessels in the fishery. Fishing takes place during the night. The fishing season lasts from November to June. All these vessels are twin rigged with limits set on vessel horse power (450 hp), and the size and headline of the trawls (a maximum 29.26m in total or 14.63 m per net).

No TAC as such is established in the fishery (CG5.1.1/2/3). The client group takes all commercial catches. The total green weight catches of prawns in the 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 seasons were 2,361 t and 1,979 t respectively (CG5.1.4). The 2009/10 catch was the third highest on record. The catch in 2010/11 was slightly above the average for the last 8 years and higher than the average for the previous 30 years. Commercial catch rates in 2009/10 and 2010/11 are the highest recorded (see p 44, Fig 2.5 of Dixon et al, 2012). Surveys (nominal or standardised) suggest continuing high stock size throughout the year and annually (see p59, Fig 3.4 of Dixon et al, 2012). All indications are such that scoring on PI 1.1.1 would be unaffected.

NOTE TO MRAG: as per CG5.2, CAB to add catch figures to MSC database

The fishery operates deeper than the 10 m isobaths, and is also associated with a series of gazetted and voluntary closed areas, along with real time move on actions at sea, supported through co-management actions.

The fishery is supported through a series of legal instruments including the Fisheries Management Act 2007 Act which embraces Commonwealth management principles as laid down in Commonwealth Legislation, which acknowledge the precautionary approach, stakeholder participation and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management. The principles of co-management are endorsed through the Fisheries Act 1982, which facilitates the active participation in management decision making by the SGWCPFA Fisheries Management Committee (FMC). The fishery also has a management plan which runs from 2007 to 2012, and is the process of being redrafted.

Principal support organisations include the SGWCPFA and Primary Industries and Resources, South Australia (PIRSA). The principal research organization is South Australia Research and

Development Institute (SARDI). The main stakeholder, additional to the fishermen, is the Conservation Council for South Australia (CCSA).

In preparation for this surveillance audit, stakeholders were contacted by email on 9-10 May and invited to submit comments. The notification of the surveillance audit was also published on the MSC website on the 24 April 2012. The audit was carried out at the offices of DMAW Lawyers, Adelaide, by the surveillance team consisting of Richard Banks and Kevin Stokes, on 21-23 June 2012.

2 The Surveillance Process

The first annual surveillance audit was carried out at the offices of DMAW Lawyers, Adelaide. The surveillance team met with Simon Clark, Executive Officer of the SGWCPFA; Craig Noell, PIRSA Fishery Manager; Dr Cameron Dixon, Principal scientist, SARDI; and Kathryn Warhurst, CCSA.

Discussions covered all issues as laid out in annex CG of the MSC Certification Requirements, including the principal changes occurring to the fishery within the first year of certification and the outcomes as outlined in the Client Action Plan (CAP) against the conditions set.

3 Information Sources

3.1 Major changes notified by the client

The assessors were informed of a number of changes.

These included:

The Pre-Christmas harvest strategy was refined to a finer scale and definitions to include an incremental scale of catch rate to provide a guide for catch levels for the November to December season, including setting of a (hard) Limit Reference Point (53.6 Kgs / hour)¹.

Co-management arrangements were strengthened (Section 79 Notice)² and introduced on a trial basis. This provides delegated powers to the Coordinator at Sea to carry out functions of the Act. This includes the setting of operational boundaries via Fishing Notices³, determined by the 'Committee at Sea'. The coordinator then prepares a report justifying decisions⁴, thereafter gazetted by PIRSA. The intention is to make these arrangements permanent.

¹ Doroudi, M., Pre Xmas harvest strategy, PIRSA, 19 October, 2011

² Fisheries Management Act, 2007, Notice 79, Schedule 3

³ Issued by email to all fishermen, followed by a radio roll call to ensure that members are aware (e.g. Greg Palmer, Coordinator at Sea,

⁴ Greg Palmer, May and April Fishing Reports, SGWCPFA.

Standardised horse power regulations were introduced as part of an amendment to the act⁵: Horse power limits were raised from 365 to 450 hp to reflect actual capacities, but supported by a system of sample checks by Fisheries Compliance (e.g., bollard pull and engine manufacturer verification)⁶.

All of the changes are positive steps and do not compromise the assessment scoring.

3.2 Other information sources

The assessors drew from referenced material (emails, notices, research submissions, published documents and personal communications) to support the findings in the report.

4 MSC Certification validation requirements

4.1 Public claims made by the client

The client uses the MSC logo on a brochure with recipes, standard letterhead, and shirts for fishery participants; all of these were sighted during the surveillance audit. In addition, the client has produced a video⁷ that includes short statements by a chef, SARDI (research provider) scientist, WWF and MSC. The only claim by the client is that the fishery is MSC certified and is a sustainable fishery. Statements by interviewees on the video go no further. No unsupportable claims are made.

4.2 Review of any personnel changes in science, management or industry

There have been some organisational and personnel changes at the management authority, PIRSA, but institutional knowledge has been retained and there are no obvious detrimental implications on management of the fishery. There have been no changes to scientific providers or personnel. The client (SGWCPFA) Executive Officer was replaced soon after the MSC assessment in 2010. The new Executive officer has been intimately involved in ongoing fishery management and MSC-related activities. There have been no detrimental impacts due to the change.

4.3 Review of any changes to the scientific base of information, including stock assessments

A number of projects that will affect future information needs and use are planned or underway (a CRC project (see Condition 1) and FRDC funded projects (see Conditions 3 and 4)). Changes in logbooks and

⁵ South Australia, Fisheries Management (Prawn Fisheries) Regulations 2006 (Version 7/4/2011).

⁶ This required some vessels within the fleet to reduce engine size.

⁷ <http://spencergulfkingprawns.com.au/home/>

reporting of bycatch (see Condition 2) will provide additional information to guide mitigation measures and feed in to ecological risk assessments. Survey standardisation has been considered by Dixon et al, 2012⁸) and has been found not to be necessary (see p59, Fig 3.4 of Dixon et al, 2012). Further work to consider standardisation of commercial CPUE (as in Recommendation 2 (SG1.2.3) of the assessment report) is planned and could have implications for decision rule formulation as part of planned work on revised harvest strategy (see Condition 1), strengthening the need for such work to be carried out in advance of evaluation of alternative decision rule and reference points.

5 Progress in implementing the client action plan

Condition 1: Reference Points

PI	1.1.2
Guidepost not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For low trophic level species, the target reference point takes into account the ecological role of the stock. <p>Note that while only the fourth SG80 level Guidepost was not met, the condition set was slightly wider (see below).</p>
Condition	<p>A clear explanation of the use of reference points and triggered actions, clearly linked to the requirements for limits and targets in the FAM P1.1.2, should be prepared and agreed for inclusion in the new Management Plan. Limits and targets adopted in the new Management Plan should explicitly consider the role of prawns in the SG ecosystem.</p> <p>The client is required by the first surveillance to provide a plan for necessary work in support of this condition with a clear outline of the approach to be taken. The plan should be enacted by the second annual surveillance audit. By 3 years after certification is granted, work will be completed sufficient to provide clarity as to the targets and limits set and to provide confidence that they explicitly or implicitly meet PI 1.1.2 requirements at the 80 scoring level or better.</p>
Requirement by Year 1	The client is required by the first surveillance to provide a plan for necessary work in support of this condition with a clear outline of the approach to be taken.
Action Plan by Year 1	<p><i>On behalf of the Fisheries Council of SA, PIRSA will prepare a new management plan for the Spencer Gulf Prawn fishery by 30 June 2013 (Recommendation 4). PIRSA will prepare a project statement in 2011 for preparing the Management Plan. The project statement will provide a work plan and timelines for completing components of the Management Plan, including the harvest strategy for the Fishery.</i></p> <p><i>As part of the new management plan, PIRSA are currently developing a harvest strategy framework to objectively assess current stock status based on Performance Indicators</i></p>

⁸ Dixon, C.D., G.E. Hooper and P. Burch SARDI Research Report series No 603, March 2012 (http://www.sardi.sa.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0010/171577/No_603_Spencer_Gulf_Prawn_Penaeus_Melicertus_latisulcatus_Fishery_2010_11_Fishery_Assessment_Report_to_PIRSA_Fisheries_and_Aquaculture.pdf)

	<p><i>(PIs). The new suite of PIs for the fishery will be written to address the requirements of MSC PI 1.1.2. The primary PIs will involve measures of relative biomass determined from standardised measures of CPUE from fishery-independent surveys. Standardisation will examine key environmental factors as well as differences among survey vessels (addresses Recommendation 1). PIs will have relevant limit reference points and triggers that evoke a management response specified in the Management Plan.</i></p> <p><i>SARDI will also undertake standardisation of commercial fishing CPUE to determine whether it is a useful Performance Indicator for the Management Plan (Recommendation 2).</i></p>
Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation	<p>PIRSA has established a Management Plan Steering Committee which is due to meet in July 2012⁹. That committee will have oversight of development of a new Management Plan which will include a clear harvest strategy and a specification of appropriate, estimable limit and target reference points. Work in support of a revised harvest strategy is already underway.</p> <p>The latest stock assessment report (Dixon et al, 2012¹⁰) includes a discussion (at p 78) on Performance Indicators to be included in a revised Management Plan. It refers directly to the MSC assessment and the need to improve Performance Indicators to provide an assessment of stock status that fits more appropriately with international (and MSC) standards. The need for clear target and limit points using those Performance Indicators is recognised.</p> <p>PIRSA's management planning process includes use of a steering committee, including external advisors¹¹, which has been formed to oversee the development of a new Management Plan and revised harvest strategy, including reference point selection. It is clear from discussion during the surveillance visit that the client, SARDI and PIRSA are aware of the need to consider the ecological role of prawns and, more specifically, whether prawns may need to be considered as a low trophic level species.</p> <p>SARDI has already obtained funding for a Commonwealth Research Centre (CRC) project on bio-economic modelling for the Spencer Gulf and GSV prawn fisheries (\$187K over two years)¹². A position for a fishery modeller is currently being</p>

	<p>advertised¹³. The project objectives focus on harvest strategy evaluations and the modelling is intended to provide a robust basis for determining Performance Indicators and reference points (limit and target) to be used in the revised harvest strategy consistent with MSC SG requirements.</p> <p>In addition to work planned and underway to support determination of revised reference points, there has already been change to decision rules for pre-Christmas fishing developed jointly by PIRSA, SARDI and industry. The revised decision rules include a hard limit reference point for survey catch below which no pre-Christmas fishing would occur (see section 3.1, above). This was done in response to comments made in the MSC assessment about the current harvest strategy. Also, PIRSA and SARDI are involved in State and National projects to provide objective, data-based assessments of stock status for South Australian fisheries. A description of the national (ABARES) project can be found in the FRDC's FISH magazine¹⁴.</p>
Evidence Provided	<p>PIRSA Project Statement: Development of a new management plan for the Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery, Project No:TBD/2012</p> <p>Dixon, C.D., G.E. Hooper and P. Burch SARDI Research Report series No 603, March 2012 (provided in hard copy and available at http://www.sardi.sa.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0010/171577/No_603_Spencer_Gulf_Prawn_Penaeus_Melicertus_latisulcatus_Fishery_2010_11_Fishery_Assessment_Report_to_PIRSA_Fisheries_and_Aquaculture.pdf)</p> <p>CRC Bio-economic modelling project application to FRDC and signed project agreement documentation (both provided electronically) Job advertisement for bio-economic modeller (already posted, available at http://www.sardi.sa.gov.au/employment/positions_available)</p> <p>Fish (FRDC magazine) Volume 20 number 1 MARCH 2012 (available at http://www.frdc.com.au/documentlibrary/FISH%2020-1.pdf)</p>
Conclusion	<p>Although no single, consolidated document has been prepared that outlines all steps to be taken as part of Condition 1, the various steps being taken and reported during the surveillance visit jointly constitute a clear plan as required in the Condition. The work undertaken follows the components set out in the CAP. The Condition requires at the first annual audit that a plan be provided and at the second audit that the plan should be enacted. Progress to date already goes some way to meeting requirements for the second audit as well as meeting the requirement for the first.</p>
Recommendation	<p>Finalise and sign off the project statement for management planning. By the second annual surveillance audit, as scheduled in the Condition, finalise the fishery Management Plan, and continue work already started to enable Harvest Strategy revision. In line with the CAP (and Recommendation 2) undertake standardisation of commercial CPUE – this needs to be explored in advance of work to define decision rules and reference points.</p>

¹³ http://www.sardi.sa.gov.au/employment/positions_available

¹⁴ <http://www.frdc.com.au/documentlibrary/FISH%2020-1.pdf>

Condition 2: Bycatch information

PI	2.3.3
Guidepost not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information is <u>sufficient</u> to determine whether the fishery may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species, and if so, to measure trends and support a <u>full strategy</u> to manage impacts. <u>Sufficient data</u> are available to allow fishery related mortality and the impact of fishing to be <u>quantitatively</u> estimated for ETP species.
Condition	<p>The strategy to achieve this should be in place by the first annual surveillance audit. The results should be available from the second annual review onwards (and used to assist the development of additional management mitigation measures, if deemed appropriate). The adequacy of information will be evaluated by the fourth surveillance audit.</p> <p>The client could consider the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logbooks can contain explicit reference to Syngnathid species and other ETP species, indicating the state (dead, damaged or released alive); Independent trawl surveys may be conducted to include data on the seasonal distribution and abundance of Syngnathids, or any other ETP in trawled areas The distribution and abundance of ETPs in areas outside the trawl areas can be determined through independent surveys to develop an understanding of the success or otherwise of mitigation measures that are in place.
Requirement by Year 1	<p>The strategy to achieve this should be in place by the first annual surveillance audit. . The results should be incorporated into an annual by-catch report, commencing from the second annual review onwards, which will be made available for public scrutiny, and used to assist the development of additional management mitigation measures, if deemed appropriate. Evidence that this condition has been implemented, will be required by the second annual review.</p>
Action Plan by Year 1	<p><i>The commercial daily logbook, used by the fishery to record catch, has been recently (2011) modified to also identify interactions with Threatened Endangered and Protected Species (TEPS) (including syngnathids) on a shot by shot basis. Additional details on each interaction are then provided in a separate logbook that is specific to TEPS. The TEPS log books record the status of the animal when returned to the marine environment i.e. dead, alive etc. The Association will educate the license holders and skippers on the importance and legal obligation for reporting TEPS interactions.</i></p> <p><i>SARDI Aquatic Sciences will collate and analyse data collected through the TEPS log books (cross referenced to the catch log books) and produce a regular TEPS by-catch report for PIRSA, which will be made available to the public on its website. This first annual by-catch report will be implemented commencing from the second annual review.</i></p> <p><i>Fisheries Independent Surveys (FIS) will collect data on TEPS interactions. The FIS covers areas inside and outside fishing grounds at three different times per year (generally November, February and April). This will be used to report the spatial and temporal distribution and abundance of syngnathids (and other TEPS species) inside and outside trawl areas by the second annual surveillance.</i></p> <p><i>PIRSA will lead an Ecological Sustainable Development risk assessment for the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery (2011-12). Following this, PIRSA will also lead a by-catch risk assessment for</i></p>

	<p><i>the fishery, where all available data on by-catch is considered for all species of by-catch captured by the fishery. Syngnathids (and other TEPS species if identified through the assessment) will be critically examined during these processes. Mitigation measures will be developed based on the available data and the success of these mitigation measures will be evaluated against 1) data from the long-term by-catch studies, 2) data from fishery-independent surveys and 3) data from TEPs logbook interactions. This will also contribute towards satisfying recommendation 6.</i></p>
<p>Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation</p>	<p>The commercial daily logbook, used by fishing vessels for retained catch was upgraded to include ETP data (SARDI, 2011a). These contain a request to tick a box if there is a 'Wildlife interaction'. If ticked, there is a requirement to fill in a Wildlife Interaction Form (SARDI, 2011b) including fields for common species, number, nature of interaction, status, and fate.</p> <p>The Association initiated a series of 'Information sessions' (SGWCPFAa 2011) for crews. These were preceded with a letter to all vessel owners informing them of the sessions in Port Lincoln and Adelaide/Wallaroo (Clark, 2011). The information pack provided to crews includes an ID card containing details of pipefish, seahorses and sea dragons. The results of the work are published in Knight, <i>et al.</i> (2011) and are publically available. Independent trawl surveys are also undertaken inside and outside the fishing areas. The report shows that information is publically available but there is no indication of participation rates or sample sizes.</p> <p>The Fisheries Independent Survey (FIS) is collecting data on TEPS interactions. The FIS covers areas inside and outside fishing grounds at three different times per year (generally November, February and April). This is also being used to report the spatial and temporal distribution and abundance of Syngnathids (and other TEPS species) inside and outside trawl areas (Cameron Dixon, pers comm, June, 2012).</p> <p>Evidence from collated information is being prepared to input into the ERAEF Level 2 PSA, scheduled for July 2012, at which time stakeholders including the eNGO, CCSA, will be in attendance.</p>
<p>Evidence Provided</p>	<p>SARDI, 2011a, South Australia Western King Prawn Daily Logbook form</p> <p>SARDI, 2011b, South Australia managed fisheries, Wildlife Interaction form</p> <p>SGWCPFA, 2011a, TEP Information sessions, October, 2011</p> <p>Clark, S, 2011, Letter from SGWCPFA. Crew briefings on threatened, endangered and protected species</p> <p>SGWCPFA, 2011b, Report all captures of threatened endangered & protected species.</p> <p>Knight, M., and Vainickis, A., F2009/F0005444-2, SARDI Report Series, 593, December 2011, available at http://www.sardi.sa.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/167240/Interactions_with_Threatened_Endangered_or_Protected_Species_in_South_Australian_Managed_Fisheries_-_2008_09,_2009_10,_and_2010_11pdf.pdf</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>All the elements of the condition have been achieved to date. Significant progress has also been made in respect to reporting, with evidence that actions will be forthcoming through the risk assessment process.</p>

	A concern is that there are no clear indications on TEP reporting rates.
Recommendation	Publications should contain details of reporting rates from logbook reports. Elements of the reporting and risk assessment process should be encompassed in the Management Plan due for completion by mid 2013.

Condition 3: Habitat information

PI	2.4.3
Guidepost not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Condition	<p>A detailed plan to achieve this should be in place at the first annual surveillance audit. The results on benthic interactions should be available from the second annual review onwards (and used to assist the development of additional management mitigation measures, if deemed appropriate). The adequacy of information will be evaluated by the fourth surveillance audit.</p> <p>The Condition is to strengthen the information available to allow any detection of an increase in risk to habitat as a result of fishing or other exogenous environmental variables, within the Gulf.</p>
Requirement by Year 1	A detailed plan to achieve this should be in place at the first annual surveillance audit.
Action Plan by Year 1	<p><i>As per condition 2, PIRSA will lead an Ecological Sustainable Development risk assessment, as a step in developing the new management plan, which will identify the components, including habitats and species, at risk from interactions from prawn trawling.</i></p> <p><i>The ESD risk assessment will be used to develop an Environmental Evaluation Plan by the first annual audit. The "Environmental Evaluation" plan will include:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) Assessments of the available data on environmental impacts of the prawn fishery in Spencer Gulf;</i> <i>2) Recommendations for appropriate on-going measures and timescales for environmental assessment;</i> <i>3) Recommendations for potential performance indicators for environmental assessment.</i> <p><i>This plan will assess the on-going measures and time scales for environmental assessment. Data from the FIS and fishing log books will also be incorporated in the model. This plan will provide a basis for on-going reporting of by-catch on a short term and long term scale. It will inform the annual by-catch report, commencing from the second annual review, which will subsequently be made publicly available. The report will be used to assist the development of additional management mitigation measures, if needed.</i></p>
Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation	FRDC funding has been obtained for a project led by SARDI (SARDI, 2011c), with PIRSA support and involvement. The project has support from the SGWCPFA Research Subcommittee, as outlined in the funding application. Funding was requested from 2011/12 but has only recently been obtained; nevertheless,

	SARDI has already committed 3 months of work on the project. The project aims to collate existing data and information from various research projects previously conducted for the Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery. This will include analysis of two existing data sources: 1) GPS data gathered for 30% of all trawl shots conducted in the Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery since 2003 will be analysed by PIRSA (SA Govt) spatial analysis experts. GPS data are provided by fishers as the centre point of a trawl shot, and with assumptions regarding the direction and distance of trawls based on catch and effort data and fisher knowledge, the area trawled and percentage overlap of trawl shots will be calculated using GIS software. This knowledge will be used to examine the historic trawl footprint and to determine reference points for performance indicators to manage the footprint. 2) There are 120 core sediment samples in storage that were taken from throughout Spencer Gulf. Either all or a representative selection of these samples will be analysed for substrate structure which can be used in the future for a habitat risk assessment. Sediment samples will be analysed by technical staff at SARDI Aquatic Sciences.
Evidence Provided	<i>SARDI 2011c</i> , A reporting framework for ecosystem based assessment of Australian trawl fisheries
Conclusion	As outlined for Condition 1, the Management Plan is under development and will contain elements as outlined in the CAP, including attention to risk assessment and treatment of habitat impacts. The work already underway, as described above, and now funded, should provide a sound basis for development of an Environmental Evaluation Plan (for habitats) as specified in the CAP to be developed by the first annual audit. While no such Environmental Evaluation Plan currently exists Work is in any case underway and on target to enable the Condition to be met.
Recommendation	That a formal Environmental Evaluation Plan, as specified in Condition 3, be developed by the next audit, building on work already underway.

Condition 4: Ecosystem information

PI	2.5.3
Guidepost not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main functions of the Components (i.e. target, Bycatch, Retained and ETP species and Habitats) in the ecosystem are <u>known</u>.
Condition	Based on the outputs from Condition 2 and 3, and Recommendation 3, continuous information should be collected in order to detect the ecosystem outcomes of management measures implemented under the management strategy, once in full operation.
Requirement by Year 1	A detailed plan to achieve this should be in place at the first annual surveillance audit.
Action Plan by Year 1	<i>The Environmental Evaluation Plan described under Condition 3 will examine available data to inform potential risks to trophic level impacts of the fishery, and will recommend data requirements to report on these risks annually, to be completed by the second annual audit. Data considered will include: long-term data from independent by-catch surveys conducted every 7 years; fishery-independent</i>

	<p><i>survey data collected 3 times every year.</i></p> <p><i>A joint research proposal has recently been developed between SARDI, Adelaide University and Flinders University. This project aims to develop an ecosystem model for Spencer Gulf. Collaboration on this project (if the grant application is successful) could enable further examination of the ecosystem effects of prawn trawling in Spencer Gulf.</i></p>
Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation	FRDC funding has been obtained for a project led by the University of Adelaide, with PIRSA and SARDI support (University of Adelaide 2011) aims to develop a system model for the spencer Gulf, building on work already completed for the GAB (Goldsworthy et al, in prep.). Data to populate the model will be drawn for prawn stock assessment surveys and the commercial fishery. The project may provide a useful basis for broad understanding of features of the Spencer Gulf ecosystem but it is unclear that the proposed modelling will provide any predictive capability or the ability to test management measures that might be implemented under the Management Plan (as called for in condition 4).
Evidence Provided	<p>University of Adelaide 2011, Spencer Gulf Research Initiative: development of an ecosystem model for fisheries and aquaculture Goldsworthy, S.D. B. Page, P. J. Rogers, C. Bulman, A. Wiebkin, L. McLeay, L. Einoder, A.M.M. Baylis, M. Braley, R. Caines, K. Daly, C. Huveneers, K. Peters, A.D. Lowther, T.M. Ward (in prep.)</p> <p>Trophodynamics of the eastern Great Australian Bight ecosystem: ecological change associated with the growth of Australia's largest fishery (supplied during meeting)</p>
Conclusion	The CAP states that an Environmental Evaluation Plan will be developed by the first annual audit. As noted above for Condition 3, no formal Environmental Evaluation Plan currently exists but work is in any case underway and on target to enable the Condition to be met. More relevant to this Condition is the requirement to use the Plan to inform potential risks and recommend data requirements by the second annual audit.
Recommendation	That a formal Environmental Evaluation Plan be developed by the next audit and that as per the Condition, by the second audit, data requirements for annual reporting on risks to ecosystem function should be recommended.

Condition 5: Consultation

PI	3.1.2
Guidepost not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation process <u>provides opportunity</u> for all interested and affected parties to be involved.
Condition	<p>Evidence that the consultation process is taking place should be introduced by the first surveillance audit, and enacted at the first subsequent meeting.</p> <p>In particular, PIRSA should improve participation of external stakeholders (i.e. an</p>

	environmental eNGO) in the formulation of management decisions affecting ecosystem based management, consistent with the strategies outlined in the Hollamby report. Examples of improved participation may relate to eNGO participation in risk assessments and input into the formulation of bycatch mitigation strategies.
Requirement by Year 1	Evidence that consultation is taking place and eNGOs are actively engaged in the formulation of decisions relating to management actions, including participation in risk assessments.
Action Plan by Year 1	<p><i>PIRSA will continue to seek to improve participation of eNGOs in formulation of management plans by following the recommendations in the Hollamby report. This proposes the participation of environmental eNGOs (CCSA and WWF) in fishery risk assessments, which will lead to the development of management mitigation measures for at-risk species. These measures will be place by the first surveillance audit.</i></p> <p><i>SGWCPFA will amend its charter for the Research Sub-committee to include membership of an environmental eNGO by 2012.</i></p>
Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation	<p>SGWCPFA has amended its charter for the Research Sub-committee to include membership of an environmental eNGO.</p> <p>PIRSA is improving participation of eNGOs (specifically CCSA) in formulation of management plans, especially in the context of risk assessment and formulation of mitigation measures. CCSA has to date participated in a Level 1 SICA assessment, and will be attending the ERAEF level 2 workshop in July, 2012. CCSA has also participated in discussions through the SGWCPFA on the application of T90 square mesh trawl gear, which may provide an acceptable bycatch mitigation tool (Kathryn Warhurst, CCSA, pers. Comm., June 2012).</p> <p>To date the SGWCPFA has fully funded the presence of CCSA to attend Research Subcommittee meetings, which provides for an attendance allowance and travel costs. However, the position of CCSA member requires for regular interaction which is not funded. A submission has been made to the Fisheries Council, supported by SGWCPFA, for support funding for a CCSA fishery officer. If supported, this will achieve the effective engagement of a critically important stakeholder in the process.</p>
Evidence Provided	SGWCPFA, 2011c, Charter – Research Sub-Committee, 2011
Conclusion	<p>The evidence is that all elements of the Condition have been met, and stakeholders are very supportive of the process. However, there are concerns that lack of funding may cause some problems. Every attempt must be made to facilitate continuation of active engagement of CCSA in the process.</p> <p>This Condition is now closed. However, CCSA participation will be monitored.</p>
Recommendation	Means are found to encourage and facilitate effective engagement from affected parties (the eNGO).

Condition 6: Research Plan

PI	3.2.4
Guidepost not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A <u>research plan</u> provides the management system with a strategic approach to research and <u>reliable and timely information</u> sufficient to achieve the objectives consistent with MSC's Principles 1 and 2.
Condition	A Research Plan is required to clearly outline the strategically important activities as appropriate to achieving fishery-specific and ecosystem-orientated research outputs consistent with the management plan. A strategic research plan should be formulated in agreement with all significant stakeholders.
Requirement by Year 1	The condition is required to be implemented by year 4. No specific actions are required in Year 1.
Action Plan by Year 1	<p><i>SARDI will draft a "plan" as mentioned in the CAP at condition 3 to take into consideration trophodynamics; benthic habitats; by-catch and by-product, and TEPS, collating existing data. This will inform the research plan.</i></p> <p><i>A research plan will be developed with the new Management Plan. The Research Sub-committee will develop a strategy to implement and prioritise research projects, which will support ecosystem-orientated research outputs and fisheries specific programs which will be reviewed biannually from the implementation of the new Management Plan (2013).</i></p>
Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation	As outlined at Condition1, PIRSA has established a Management Plan Steering Committee which is due to meet in July 2012. That committee will have oversight of development of a new Management Plan which will include a Research Plan. As part of the management planning process, the Research Plan is due to be provided by 2013. The Research Plan is expected to identify research needs and priorities for a ten year period. As part of the management planning process, the Research Plan will be developed by the Management Committee, Research Subcommittee.
Evidence Provided	PIRSA, 2012, Management Plan project statement (sighted)
Conclusion	The condition requires that SG80 Guideposts be met within four years of certification. The intentions for development of a Research Plan fit within this timeframe.
Recommendation	None.

Condition 7: Performance evaluation

PI	3.2.5
Guidepost not met	The fishery has in place mechanisms to evaluate <u>key</u> parts of the management system and is subject to <u>regular internal</u> and <u>occasional external</u> review.
Condition	SARDI and the SGWCPFA Research Plans and their outputs are subject to independent external review once formulated. In addition, the performance of the Management Plan should be subject to regular internal review and occasional external review. A plan for reviews will be evaluated during the first annual surveillance audit, and reviews appraised at each annual surveillance audit as appropriate. The external review will have been completed by the fourth surveillance audit (2015).
Requirement by	The condition is required to be implemented by year 4

Year 1	
Action Plan by Year 1	<i>There is no specified requirement for this PI to be met within the first surveillance audit</i>
Actions by SGWCPFA and management organisation	It is noteworthy that PIRSA is in the process of formulating a revised Management Plan. The plan allows for the design of outcomes, activities and means of verification. This plan, when active, will be regularly reviewed (Craig Noell, PIRSA, pers comm, June, 2012. PIRSA indicate that it is normal to have the management plan externally evaluated. PIRSA also indicate that the Plan will draw heavily from the Conditions and recommendations laid out on the Fishery Assessment.
Evidence Provided	PIRSA Project Statement: Development of a new management plan for the Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery, Project No:TBD/2012
Conclusion	
Recommendation	Performance Monitoring and evaluation are explicitly highlighted as part of the Management Plan.

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Progress relative to milestones

Milestones in each condition have been met, or are expected to be so by the second surveillance audit. While there appears to be a delay in the process of formulating a formal Management Plan, this is still reasonably on track, with the project statement recently agreed and work already underway that would in any case form part of the plan. Overall, progress towards achieving milestones and Conditions is on target.

6.2 Closed-out conditions

Condition 5 (Consultation, SG 3.1.2) is closed. However, the evaluation team stresses the need to continue monitoring support for eNGO engagement and participation.

6.3 Surveillance

Based on the guidelines as set out in Annex CG 27.22 (Table C3), the Surveillance score is 2 or more. Table C4 indicates that the Year 2 annual surveillance audit should be normal and on site.

6.4 Certification Decision

The MRAG Americas Certification Committee concurs that the certification of the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery against the MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing be continued for a further year.

6.5 Recommendations

1. PIRSA should give priority to completing the Management Plan project statement immediately, and have in place a completed Management Plan by the second surveillance audit. The Management Plan should include objectives, outcomes and activities that relate to the Environmental Evaluation Plan, Research Plan and performance monitoring. Elements of the reporting and risk assessment process should also be encompassed as an activity with the Management Plan.
2. In line with the CAP (and assessment Recommendation 2) undertake standardisation of commercial CPUE. This needs to be explored in advance of work to define decision rules and reference points as part of a revised harvest strategy.
3. ETP publications should contain details of reporting rates from logbook reports and the FIS.

APPENDIX 1: Stakeholder Comments

There were no written stakeholder submissions