

Marine Stewardship Council fisheries assessments

DNV GL Business Assurance

# Faroe Islands Queen Scallop MSC Variation Request



## 1 Marine Stewardship Council variation request

1	Date submitted to the MSC
	2 October 2020
2	CAB
	DNV GL Business Assurance
3	Fishery name and certificate number
	Faroe Islands Queen Scallop
4	Lead auditor or program manager
	Jodi Bostrom
5	Request prepared by
	Jodi Bostrom
6	Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested
	FCP v2.2 7.16 and September 2020 Covid-19 Pandemic Derogation 1.2
7	How many times has a variation for this requirement been accepted for the same assessment of the same fishery?
	0

Table 2 – Variation justification		
1	Proposed variation	
	The CAB proposes to vary against the requirement to hold an on-site visit for the initial assessment of this fishery by holding a remote site visit instead.	
2	Additional time requested	
	Original deadline date	NA
	Modified deadline date requested	NA
	Length of additional time requested	NA
3	Justification	
	Given national travel restrictions issued by the Faroe Islands, the team members either cannot enter or will be subject to quarantine upon entry and/or upon return to their country of residence ( <a href="https://www.visitfaroeislands.com/about/faroe-islands-reopen-visitors/">https://www.visitfaroeislands.com/about/faroe-islands-reopen-visitors/</a> ). Jodi Bostrom resides in the United States, and Tristan Southall resides in the UK. Both countries are on the banned list so Jodi and Tristan can only enter the Faroe Islands for a “recognized reason”; however, they would be required to quarantine for 14 days upon entry. Giuseppe Scarcella resides in Cyprus, which is an open country. However, Giuseppe would be required to quarantine for 14 days upon returning to Cyprus. Additionally, Faroese companies prefer that all visitors are tested again on Day 6 before an in-person meeting takes place.	
4	Implications for assessment	
	The CAB recognizes that a remote site visit can be more challenging and could result in additional risk. Therefore, a review of the risks has been completed and included in the Appendix. Overall, the team is confident that we can deliver an effective, robust stakeholder consultation and interview process to gather information necessary to assess this fishery against the MSC Fisheries Standard.	
5	Mitigation of the implications for assessment	
	A review of the risks has been completed and included in the Appendix. The RBF is likely to be the aspect of this site visit with the highest risk. However, the team is confident that we can deliver an effective, robust stakeholder consultation and interview process to gather information necessary to assess this fishery against the MSC Fisheries Standard. As stated in the Appendix, additional time will be built into agenda to ensure sufficient time to interview stakeholders. The team will also distribute RBF materials in advance of the workshop and utilize appropriate participatory tools.	
	As per the September 2020 Covid-19 Pandemic Derogation 1.2, the CAB: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shall request an additional peer reviewer from the Peer Review College when implementing FCP 7.14.</li> <li>• Shall conduct remote audits in alignment with IAF MD 4:2018 (IAF Mandatory Document for the Use of Information and Communication Technology for Auditing/Assessment Purposes, considering security/confidentiality and process requirements).</li> <li>• Will utilize other mechanisms to ensure a successful remote site visit (e.g., ASI’s remote audit procedure, DNV GL’s remote audit procedure, ISO 9001 remote audit guidance).</li> <li>• Will ensure that remote site visit replicates on-site visit as far as practicably possible.</li> </ul>	
6	How many conditions does the fishery have and will their progress be affected (positive or negative)?	
	NA	

7	What is the status of the current assessment or audit?
	Initial assessment to be announced in mid/late September.
8	Further comments
	This fishery underwent full assessment in 2008-2011, and the determination to not certify was published on the MSC website in January 2011. Then in 2012-2013 another full assessment was undertaken, and the fishery was certified in September 2013 with five conditions. Following the third surveillance audit, it was concluded that progress against two conditions was not on target within 12 months of falling behind target, which triggering suspension in January 2017. Corrective action plans to address the causes of suspension were submitted by the client, but no fourth surveillance audit was conducted. The fishery was withdrawn from the MSC programme in March 2018.
9	If applicable, additional information added after the MSC's request

## 2 Appendix

**Table 3 – Areas considered in risk assessment**

Risk Areas	Key Risks	Risk Mitigation
Sufficient information to enable an effective and robust fishery assessment process and comprehensive assessment against the MSC Fisheries Standard	Ability to verify information remotely.	Fishery reports, government documents, and other relevant reports required for the assessment against the MSC Fisheries Standard are available publicly and/or can be transmitted electronically. There are ample opportunities and mechanisms to engage with clients and stakeholders including electronic forms of communication (videoconferencing, phone conferencing, email). These mechanisms are effective in this fishery so the team is confident that information can be verified remotely.
	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.	Electronic forms of communication and other mechanisms to engage with clients and stakeholders (such as video conferencing, phone conferencing, email, phone) will be efficient and effective in providing the information required for a site visit for this fishery. Again, there are ample opportunities and mechanisms to engage with clients and stakeholders remotely so the team is confident that we can deliver a robust stakeholder consultation and interview processes.
	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	There are ample opportunities and mechanisms to engage with clients and stakeholders remotely. As with any RBF workshop, materials will be shared with the stakeholders in advance, and extra time will be scheduled within the agenda for the workshop to ensure sufficient interviewing and information gathering can occur. Additionally, the team will determine which participatory tools will be most effective in a remote site visit situation (e.g., screen sharing of diagrams) and use what is appropriate to increase the effectiveness of the consultation. The team is confident that we can engage with stakeholders to deliver a robust RBF process.
	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.  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	Fishery reports, government documents, and other relevant reports required for the assessment against the MSC Fisheries Standard are available publicly and/or can be transmitted electronically. Specifically, information necessary to assess the Principles 1 and 2 information requirements (e.g., VMS data, observer data, logbooks) are available electronically. Additional information can be gathered from the client and stakeholders via videoconferencing or phone during the site visit or via email following the site visit.  For Principle 3, there is a sufficient level of transparency in management, such that information on the fishery is publicly available or known to the wider group of stakeholders. Any information provided on the fishery can be easily verified.

	<p>that the ACDR provides indicative scoring and rationales, and identifies where more information is needed. One 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 &lt;60 reported in the ACDR.</p>	<p>The team is confident that the current information gaps highlighted in the ACDR can be addressed via a remote site visit during client and stakeholder interviews.</p>
	<p>Ability to understand the context, scale, and intensity of the fishery operations.</p>	<p>The team concluded that the assessment does not require investigation of physical aspects of the fishery, but if questions arise, there are reliable mechanisms to enable verification of these aspects from a remote location. Additionally, one of the team members was on the previous assessment team so is already familiar with the context, scale, and intensity of the fishery’s operations.</p>
<p>Sufficient communication capability to effectively plan, conduct interviews and facilitate information sharing as per IAF ID 4: 2018.</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>The client, all team members, and all identified stakeholders can easily access ICT and are competent in doing so. Team leader experience with some of these individuals and the client representative’s knowledge of them confirm this statement.</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>The client, all team members, and all identified stakeholders can communicate effectively in English. Team leader experience with some of these individuals and the client representative’s knowledge of them confirm this statement.</p>
	<p>Ability to schedule remote site visit activities at reasonable mutually convenient times when parties are located across different time zones.</p>	<p>At the time of the remote site visit, the Cyprus-based team member will be two hours ahead the UK-based team member and the client and stakeholders in the Faroe Islands. The US-based team leader will be eight hours behind the Faroe Islands. The team is confident that mutually convenient times can be found to accommodate all parties (e.g., early morning for the team leader).</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](http://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](mailto:standards@msc.org)

SAFER, SMARTER, GREENER

#### **About DNV GL**

DNV GL is one of the world's leading certification bodies. We help businesses manage risk and assure the performance of their organizations, products, people, facilities and supply chains through certification, verification, assessment and training services across a wide range of industries.

In the food and beverage industry, we help customers worldwide to achieve excellence in food safety and quality, environmental management, supply chain management and product sustainability. We combine technical, digital and industry expertise to empower companies' decisions and actions.

Partnering with our customers, we build sustainable business performance and create stakeholder trust.

[dnvgl.com/assurance](https://dnvgl.com/assurance)