

Control Union Pesca Ltd.

Namibia hake fishery

MSC Variation Request

Control Union Pesca Ltd.

56 High Street, Lymington, Hampshire,
SO41 9AH, United Kingdom

Tel: 01590 613007 Fax: 01590 671573

Email: infopesca@controlunion.com

Website: cupesca.com

1 Marine Stewardship Council variation request

Table 1 – Variation request

| | |
|----------|---|
| 1 | Date submitted to MSC |
| | 3 rd July 2019 |
| 2 | CAB |
| | Control Union Pesca Ltd. |
| 3 | Fishery name and certificate number or CoC certificate number |
| | Namibia hake fishery |
| 4 | Lead auditor or programme manager |
| | Kat Collinson |
| 5 | Request prepared by |
| | Kat Collinson |
| 6 | Scheme requirement for which variation requested |
| | FCR 7.3.2 - If the period from the full assessment announcement to the receipt of the Final Report by the MSC is more than 18 months, the CAB shall withdraw the fishery from the MSC assessment process. |
| 7 | How many times has a variation for this requirement been accepted for the same assessment of the same fishery? |
| | Zero. |

Table 2 – Variation justification

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Proposed variation | |
| | The 18 month deadline for the publication of the Final Report (FCR 7.3.2) is the 1 st August 2019. The CAB is requesting a further nine months to complete to the Final Report stage. | |
| 2 | Additional time requested | |
| | Original deadline date | 1 st August 2019 |
| | Modified deadline date requested | 1 st May 2020 |
| | Length of additional time requested | Nine months |
| 3 | Justification | |
| | <p>The fishery has been subject to multiple delays. The fishery was announced on 1st February 2018 and the site visit took place between the 5th and 9th March 2018. Information gathering and discussions with stakeholders during the site visit highlighted the complexities of the fishery to the assessment team, specifically in regards to Principle 1, and a lesser extent Principle 3. Questions and uncertainties remained following the site visit relating to population dynamics and stock mixing, including the extent to which sharing of the stocks occurs with the South African hake (<i>paradoxus</i> and <i>capensis</i>) populations, although both countries are agreed that at least <i>paradoxus</i> is shared to some level between the two countries. This required further input from the client and consultation with the Namibian research organisation, NatMIRC post site visit. Whilst the publication of the Client Draft Report commenced following the site visit, scoring of all Performance Indicators (PIs) for the fishery remained in draft format until November 2018, due to information gaps in the fishery in relation to Principle 1. The assessment team were still gathering/receiving information for the Client Draft Report up to February 2019. Furthermore, for Principle 2, information was collected at the site visit from a NGO, but the team was informed in November 2018 that the data were not complete. These data were only received in March 2019, necessitating a re-score of PIs 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3 (and PI 3.2.3). With the ongoing delays assessment team availability became an issue and after several rounds of email exchanges, and reviewing of scores to reach a common consensus the Client Draft Report was ready for client review at the beginning of April 2019.</p> <p>Further to this, the fishery overlaps with the South African hake fishery, impacting Principles 1 and 3. A MoU between the Namibia and South Africa was signed in January 2019, to formalise the framework for cooperation at the highest level. Further, through the Benguela Current Commission, there is an already established demersal working group comprising Namibian, South African and Angolan scientists and managers that have been reviewing and considering the hake shared stocks issue and how best to address this moving forward. This process has been somewhat slow, but has nevertheless been in process and was given more impetus in June of this year with a formal stakeholder engagement in Cape Town, facilitated by the joint BCC and FAO NORAD transboundary programme. This meeting was to be followed by a similar Namibian stakeholder meeting to address the same issue. Harmonisation discussions between the CABs (CU Pesca and Lloyds Register) began during this fishery’s site visit in March 2018. The South African hake fishery is now in re-assessment, following the Fisheries Certification Process. As this fishery is using the Fisheries Certification Requirements, the assessment timelines and reporting stages are not aligned, compounded by the delay in the South African fishery’s reassessment site visit (scheduled for later this year), which initially complicated combined team dialogue surrounding scoring.</p> | |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>Further discussions were held in March 2019, whilst the Client Draft Report was being compiled, and again in April 2019. A consensus on Principle 3, lead to a shared condition on PI 3.1.1. The most recent harmonisation call was on the 19th June 2019, which resulted in further sharing of reports and rationales. The condition and its milestones are harmonised with the South African assessment. The formation of this plan is on-going and not yet finalised with the client, and one of the conditions requires consultation and harmonisation on client action plan tasks with newly restructured South African Department of Environment Affairs, Forestry and Fisheries (DEFF) and the MSC South Africa hake fishery. The process of this consultation process between the fisheries may need more than one round of discussion to implement what is required. The team also requires time to review the suitability of the plan, ensuring that FCR 7.11.2 (the CAB shall require the client to prepare a “client action plan” ...) is met.</p> <p>The assessment is requesting the variation to allow harmonisation talks to continue between CABs and more importantly for the fisheries certification process.</p> |
| 4 | If a fishery assessment, implications for assessment |
| | <p>None anticipated. This is the last MSC deadline for a fishery assessment. As the fishery is still in assessment, there are no further timeline or certificate requirements that may be affected. The MSC Peer Review College has been kept updated on the progress of this assessment.</p> <p>Given that the report is yet to reach public comment stage, there is clear and structured opportunity for stakeholders to make comment on the report or bring new information pertinent to the scoring of the fishery in the assessment for the assessment team’s consideration. Stakeholders would be informed directly regarding the assessment timeline, should this Variation Request be accepted.</p> |
| 5 | If a fishery assessment, mitigation of the implication for assessment |
| | <p>N/A, as no assessment implications are perceived. As mentioned above, stakeholders will be directly notified if the assessment timeline is extended.</p> |
| 6 | If a fishery assessment, how many conditions does the fishery have and will their progress be affected (positive or negative)? |
| | <p>Zero. The fishery is currently in assessment.</p> |
| 7 | What is the status of the current assessment? |
| | <p>The fishery is currently in assessment. The client draft report has been drafted, and is waiting for further harmonisation discussions with another CAB prior to sending to the Peer Review College.</p> |
| 8 | Further comments |
| | <p>- Please include any further relevant information.</p> |
| | |
| 9 | If applicable, additional information added after MSC’s request |
| | |