



**Surveillance Report**  
**New Zealand Southern Blue Whiting Trawl Fisheries**

Certificate No.: **MML-F-121**

**Intertek Moody Marine**  
February 2013

Authors:  
J.M Akroyd, J.P. Pierre

**Intertek Moody Marine**  
Merlin House  
Stanier Way  
Wyvern Business Park  
Derby. DE21 6BF  
UK  
Tel: +44 (0) 1332 544663  
Fax: +44 (0) 1332 675020

## 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

<p><b>Scope against which the surveillance is undertaken:</b> MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing as applied to the New Zealand Southern Blue Whiting Fishery</p> <p><b>Species:</b> Southern blue whiting (<i>Micromesistius australis</i>)</p> <p><b>Area:</b> Unit of Certification 1: Bounty Platform, (SBW 6B)  Unit of Certification 2: Campbell Island Rise (SBW 6I)  Unit of Certification 3: Pukaki Rise (SBW 6R)</p> <p><b>Method of capture:</b> Trawl</p>
---

<b>Date of Surveillance Visit:</b>	29 – 30 January 2013			
<b>Initial Certification</b>	<b>Date:</b> April 2012		<b>Certificate Ref:</b> MML-F-121	
<b>Surveillance stage</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>
<b>Surveillance team:</b>	<b>Lead Assessor:</b> J. Akroyd <b>Assessor(s):</b> J. Pierre			
<b>Company Name:</b> <b>Address:</b>	Deepwater Group Ltd Private Bag 24901 Wellington 6142 New Zealand			
<b>Contact 1</b>	George Clement			
<b>Tel No:</b> <b>Fax No:</b> <b>E-mail address:</b>	Phone: +64 4 802 1844 Fax: +64 4 801 8409 Email: <a href="mailto:dwg@deepwater.co.nz">dwg@deepwater.co.nz</a>			

## 2.0 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report contains the findings of the first surveillance cycle in relation to this fishery.

During the on-site surveillance audit for the trawl southern blue whiting fishery the audit team sought the views of the client and stakeholders about:

- a. The fishery.
- b. Its performance in relation to any relevant conditions of certification.
- c. Issues relevant to the MSC's Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing.

Meetings were held with the client group, representatives of the deepwater fishery, the Ministry of Primary Industries (Compliance, Science and Fisheries Management), research providers (NIWA and Dragonfly) and eNGOs (WWF and Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society).

The fishery was assessed for recent management activity for continued conformity with the MSC's Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing, including

- a. Review any potential or actual changes in management systems.
- b. Review any changes or additions/deletions to regulations.
- c. Review any personnel changes in science, management or industry to evaluate impact on the management of the fishery.
- d. Review any potential changes to the scientific base of information, including stock assessments.

An important change has been a change in the target strength determined for southern blue whiting in New Zealand. The acceptance of this new target strength estimate has led to reductions in the biomass estimates and the new estimates are likely to be about the half the previous estimates.

As a consequence of this the audit team has raised a new recommendation.

**Recommendation 1:** At the next annual surveillance particular attention will be given to the most recent stock estimates and, if there is a sustainability issue (especially with Bounty 6B), the management action that has been taken to address this.

The audit team also evaluated progress against the condition raised during the assessment of this fishery.

The client's response to the Condition of Certification was set out in a Client Action Plan (CAP), which was appended to the Public Certification Report. Progress associated with the actions set forth in the CAP was examined as a part of this surveillance audit. For the one Condition, the report sets out progress to date. This progress has been evaluated by the Intertek Moody Marine (IMM) Audit Team (set out below as 'Observations' and 'Conclusion') against the commitments made in the CAP. This assessment includes a re-evaluation of the scoring allocated to the relevant Performance Indicator (PI) 2.3.2 in the original MSC assessment. As the requirements of a Condition have been met, the PI is re-scored at 85 and the Condition is "closed out". However associated with this PI a new recommendation has been raised

**Recommendation 2:** : At the next annual surveillance the audit team will assess the results of the ongoing monitoring of sea lion captures to ensure captures remain at levels lower than the identified PBR threshold.

The surveillance audit methodology, as defined in the current version of the MSC Certification Requirements, is followed in this audit. Subsequent to this first audit, the MSC criteria for determining the level of surveillance audit that the fishery requires is included below (see Annex 3).

**Information Sources:****Meetings**

(NB all stakeholders from the full assessment were contacted prior to the surveillance audit taking place)

**Annual surveillance NZ hoki and Southern blue whiting****Site Visit Wellington 29 - 30 January 2013**

Date	Time	Venue	Organisation	Attendees
Tues 29th	10.00am - 1pm	Seafood Industry House	Client group and Ministry for Primary Industries (Fisheries management)	George Clement (DWG) Richard Wells (DWG) Aaron Irving (DWG) Jeremy Helson (MPI) Vicky Reeve (MPI)
Tues 29th	2pm - 3pm	Dragonfly Science	Dragonfly Science (Research Provider)	Edward Abraham
Tues 29th	3pm - 5pm	NIWA	NIWA (Research providers)	Suze Baird David Bowden
Wed 30th	9am - 12noon	MPI (Ministry for Primary Industries)	MPI Compliance  MPI Science (Stock Assessment and Aquatic Environment)  Fisheries Management	Dean Baigent Gary Orr  Pamela Mace Kevin Sullivan Mary Livingston Rohan Currey Rich Ford Geoff Tingley (conference call) Jeremy Helson Vicky Reeve
Wed 30th	2pm - 4pm	WWF	WWF  Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	Katherine short Milena Palka Paul Crozier  Kevin Hackwell
Wed 30th	4.30pm - 5.30pm	Seafood Industry House	Client group  MPI	George Clement Richard Wells Aaron Irving  Jeremy Helson Vicky Reeve

**Reports etc**

*Reports were made available by the client to all interested parties and are available on the website <http://www.deepwater.co.nz/n2292,126.html>.*

Baker, B., Hamilton, S. (2012). Assessment of the impact of incidental fisheries mortality on the Campbell Island New Zealand sea lion *Phocarctos hookeri* population using the Potential Biological Removal technique. Unpublished report held by the Deepwater Group Ltd.

Deepwater Group and Ministry for Primary Industries (2012) Pre-season briefing to SBW Operators.

Gauthier, S., Fu, D., O'Driscoll, R.L., Dunford, A. (2011). Acoustic estimates of southern blue whiting from the Campbell Island Rise, August-September 2009. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2011/09*  
Ministry of Fisheries 2012. Report from the Fisheries Assessment Plenary, May 2012: stock assessments and yield estimates. Ministry of Fisheries, Wellington.

O'Driscoll, R.L., Dunford, A.J., Fu, D. (2012). Acoustic estimates of southern blue whiting from the Campbell Island Rise, August–September 2011 (TAN1112). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/18* 52p.

Wade, P. R. (1998). Calculating limits to the allowable human-caused mortality of Cetaceans and Pinnipeds. *Marine Mammal Science* 14(1):1-37

**Standards and Guidelines used:**

1. MSC Principles and Criteria
2. MSC Certification Requirements v1.3
3. Guidance to the MSC Certification Requirements, v 1.3

Stock status and Catch Data	Southern Blue Whiting
Update on Stock Status	<p>Management of southern blue whiting in New Zealand is based on the best available information. Wide-area acoustic biomass surveys of the major stock at Campbell Islands (SBW 6I) are typically undertaken every two or three years, providing good estimates of the absolute biomass of the spawning aggregations and the pre-recruits. In addition aggregation-based acoustic surveys are completed annually in the SBW 6B (Bounty) stock to provide minimum estimates of the spawning biomass. Similar surveys have been attempted on the Pukaki Rise stock but to date have not been considered adequate for use in stock assessment or management of the stock.</p> <p>Survey results, in conjunction with biological sampling data from Ministry at-sea observers, are used to assess the status of the stocks and this process is public, transparent and subject to peer review. The Ministry for Primary Industries publishes the outcomes of stock assessments and catch limits are reviewed based on this information.</p> <p>There have been no new stock assessments for southern blue whiting since the fishery was certified in April 2012. However, there has been another acoustic survey at Bounty (SBW 6B). There has also been a change in the target strength determined for southern blue whiting in New Zealand.</p> <p>The acceptance of this new target strength estimate has led to reductions in the biomass estimates and the new estimates are likely to be about the half the previous estimates.</p> <p>The most recent information is as follows:</p> <p><b><i>Campbell Island stock</i></b></p> <p>The stock in 2009 was considered likely to be at or above the target level (40-60% of <math>B_0</math> compared to the target of 40%), and very unlikely to be below the limit reference point (20% <math>B_0</math>). An incoming strong year class should enter the fishery over the next few years. The TACC was increased to 29 400 t for 2011 and 2012, but remains consistent with the precautionary level tested through the projections. At this level of catch, the biomass is projected to increase over the next few years, and the probability that the biomass will drop below <math>B_{20\%}</math> 2010-2015 is projected to be less than 1% for the base model.</p> <p><b><i>Bounty Platform stock</i></b></p> <p>Industry-operated aggregation acoustic surveys carried out in 2007 and 2008 suggested that 2002 was an extremely strong year class, and suggested a biomass of 140-160 000 t. However, all four annual surveys since 2008 have suggested much lower biomass. The observed decline is too great to be explained solely by fishing and average levels of natural mortality of the 2002 year class and it is only possible to speculate on the causes of this decline. Suggested causes may include unusually high natural mortality. The lower estimates resulted in the TACC being reduced to 6860 t from 1 April 2011.</p> <p>The use of the new target strength estimate resulted in the 2012 biomass estimate for Bounty being only 13,000 t. Management action is now under consideration to reduce the catches to the appropriate level.</p> <p><b><i>Pukaki Rise stock</i></b></p> <p>The stock assessment of this stock has not been updated since 2002. Catch levels from 2002-2007 (average 380 t) are unlikely to have made much impact on stock size. Recently catches have increased, but this is at the same time as the available</p>

	<p>indicators show the stock is increasing in size. This stock has been only lightly exploited since 1993, and the available, but limited, evidence indicates that it is likely to be above the level that will support the MSY.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> At the next annual surveillance particular attention will be given to the most recent stock estimates and, if there is a sustainability issue (especially for the Bounty stock), the management action that has been taken to address this.</p>		
<b>Total Allowable Catch (TAC) in most recent fishing year</b>	UoC 1: Bounty 6B : 2012 TACC 6,860t UoC 2: Campbell 6I : 2012 TACC 29,400t UoC 3: Pukaki 6R: 2012 TACC 5,500t		
<b>Unit of Certification share of TAC</b>	UoC 1: Bounty 6B : 100% UoC 2: Campbell 6I : 100% UoC 3: Pukaki 6R: 100%		
<b>Client share of TAC</b>	UoC 1: Bounty 6B : 94-96% UoC 2: Campbell 6I : 94-96% UoC 3: Pukaki 6R: 94-96%		
<b>Green Weight<sup>1</sup> of catch</b>			
	UoC 1: Bounty 6B	Reported catch (tonnes)	TACC (tonnes)
	2010	15,467	14,700
	2011	13,912	14,700
	2012	6,590	6,860
	UoC 2: Campbell 6I	Reported catch (tonnes)	TACC (tonnes)
	2010	19,039	20,000
	2011	20,223	23,000
	2012	30,840	29,400
	UoC 3: Pukaki 6R	Reported catch (tonnes)	TACC (tonnes)
	2010	4,853	5,500
	2011	4,432	5,500
	2012	677	5,500

<sup>1</sup>The weight of a catch prior to processing taken from the May 2012 Plenary table 2.Ministry of Primary Industries

<b>Condition</b>	<p><b>1</b></p> <p>Within three years of certification: i) Identify the level of ETP species interactions that would lead to adverse effects on population levels for sea lions, and ii) where a problem is identified, develop and implement appropriate management approaches to achieve those national requirements and objectives.</p> <p>Milestone 1: By the first annual surveillance, identify the level of ETP species interactions that would lead to adverse effects on population levels for sea lions,</p> <p>Milestone 2: By the second annual surveillance, where a problem is identified, develop and implement appropriate management approaches to achieve those national requirements and objectives.</p> <p>Milestone 3: Provide evidence that the strategy is being implemented successfully</p>
<b>PI</b>	<p><b>2.3.2 (6I only) Endangered, threatened and protected (ETP) species</b></p> <p><b><i>Management strategy</i></b></p> <p>The fishery has in place precautionary management strategies designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- meet national and international requirements;</li> <li>- ensure the fishery does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to ETP species;</li> <li>- ensure the fishery does not hinder recovery of ETP species; and</li> <li>- minimise mortality of ETP species.</li> </ul>
<b>SG 60</b>	<p>There are <u>measures</u> in place that minimise mortality, and are expected to be highly likely to achieve national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species.</p> <p>The measures are <u>considered likely</u> to work, based on <u>plausible argument</u> (eg general experience, theory or comparison with similar fisheries/species).</p>
<b>SG 80</b>	<p>There is a <u>strategy</u> in place for managing the fishery's impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality that is designed to be highly likely to achieve national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species.</p> <p>There is an <u>objective basis for confidence</u> that the strategy will work, based on <u>some information</u> directly about the fishery and/or the species involved.</p> <p>There is <u>evidence</u> that the strategy is being implemented successfully.</p>
<b>SG 100</b>	<p>There is a <u>comprehensive strategy</u> in place for managing the fishery's impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality, that is designed to achieve <u>above</u> national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species.</p> <p>The strategy is mainly based on information directly about the fishery and/or species involved, and a <u>quantitative analysis</u> supports <u>high confidence</u> that the strategy will work.</p> <p>There is <u>clear evidence</u> that the strategy is being implemented successfully, and intended changes are occurring. There is evidence that the strategy is achieving its objective.</p>
<b>Score</b>	75 (6I only)
<b>Scoring Rationale</b>	<p>Based on the analytical information available, while operational strategies appear effective at reducing seabird, fur seal and coral interactions, they appear less effective for sea lions. While the fishery impact appears highly unlikely to create unacceptable impacts on sea lion populations (2.2.1), there is no formal mitigation strategy to ensure this remains so, and analytical evidence to provide an objective basis for confidence that the operational strategies in place will work is limited.</p>



<b>Client Action Plan</b>	<p>The client fishery, in conjunction with the Ministry of Fisheries, will continue to conduct ongoing monitoring of both levels of New Zealand sea lion interactions and adherence to the agreed mitigation measures. Monitoring will be driven through Operational Objective 2.2 in the Southern Blue Whiting National Fisheries Plan chapter and will be undertaken through the Ministry's Observer Programme. Observers will achieve not less than 20% coverage onboard client fishery vessels in the SBW 61 fishery each year, with coverage being progressively scaled up over the period of certification. Additional analyses of the nature and extent of interactions will further enable trends in incidental interactions and mortality data for the species to be assessed.</p> <p>At present, the monitoring, mitigation and assessment measures in place are considered to be demonstrably effective, such that the southern blue whiting fishery does not adversely affect the New Zealand sea lion sub-population at the Campbell Islands. However, to ensure current interactions are within biologically based limits for sea lions, the client fishery will undertake an updated PBR analysis of the Campbell Islands' sea lion population by 2013. Population research already, or being, undertaken by Department of Conservation will help to inform these analyses. This process is achievable because good data are available on the levels of fishery interactions (relatively little fishing effort coupled with high levels of observer coverage) and on the recent <i>Phocarctos hookeri</i> population size at the Campbell Islands (from Department of Conservation research).</p> <p>Should the PBR analysis demonstrate that further mitigation measures are required, DWG will, in conjunction with the Ministry, develop, implement and monitor these.</p>
<b>Client Progress</b>	<p>The Client reported progress against each of the three Milestones above.</p> <p>Milestone 1:</p> <p>An analysis using the Potential Biological Removal (PBR, Wade 1998) approach was undertaken. The process of conducting this analysis involved compiling the information available on sea lion pup production on Campbell Island (and relevant information from other areas when unavailable from Campbell), considering the skewed sex ratio in reported sea lion captures in that area, identifying appropriate values (and ranges of values) to complete the PBR formula, and comparing outputs from this formula with past recorded sea lion catches and catch estimates. This work concluded that the New Zealand sea lion population on Campbell Island is able to sustain low levels of fishery-induced mortalities (<math>\leq 8</math> or <math>\leq 16</math> animals per year, depending on the values used in the PBR formula) (Baker and Hamilton 2012).</p> <p>Milestone 2:</p> <p>The national management objectives for the New Zealand sea lion are described by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) and the Department of Conservation. The species is classified as critically endangered. The Client and MPI have committed to reducing captures of this animal to the greatest extent practicable, which requires interactions in SBW6I to be minimised (Operational Objective 2.2 of the Southern Blue Whiting Fisheries Plan). To ensure that the level of captures remains below the PBR, a series of management and monitoring measures were developed and implemented. These are described in the Client's progress report. In brief, measures were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To identify areas where, and vessels for which, there may be higher risks of sea lion captures</li> <li>• To brief all operators on issues relating to sea lion captures, and follow up</li> </ul>

	<p>with in-person briefings for higher risk vessels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To brief government fisheries observers on the management focus on sea lion captures and mitigation of those captures</li> <li>• Increased monitoring of vessels in-season, including greater coverage of fishing effort (compared to previous years) by government fisheries observers, and the use of VMS.</li> </ul> <p>The Marine Mammal Operating Procedure (and briefings given to vessel operators) described measures that managers considered would reduce sea lion captures. Particular emphasis was placed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks associated with sea lion captures (e.g., fishing area)</li> <li>• Minimising the time trawl nets are on the sea surface during shooting and hauling, and,</li> <li>• Managing offal and whole fish discards and eliminating discharge during shooting and hauling</li> </ul> <p>Milestone 3:</p> <p>In the fishing year preceding the audit, the catch of sea lions in the Campbell southern blue whiting fishery was zero. Monitoring through the season by MPI (both fishery managers and observers at sea) confirmed that the management strategy to address sea lion bycatch was implemented in the majority of cases. ~76% of fishing effort was monitored by government observers in this (6I) fishery. While no animals were reported caught, sea lions were reported by observers to be present around vessels. MPI and the Client have committed to continuing to support the more intensive management approach described here on an ongoing basis through the Certification period and after that time.</p>
<b>Observations</b>	<p>Milestone 1:</p> <p>The analysis completed for Milestone 1 concluded that the New Zealand sea lion population closest to SBW6I is able to sustain low levels of fishery-induced mortalities (<math>\leq 8</math> or <math>\leq 16</math> animals per year, depending on the values used in the PBR formula) (Baker and Hamilton 2012).</p> <p>This analysis addresses Milestone 1, in that it identified, using the information available, the level of ETP species interactions that would lead to adverse effects on population levels for sea lions.</p> <p>Milestone 2:</p> <p>The mean annual level of estimated sea lion bycatch over the previous five fishing years in SBW6I (2008 – 2012) is 9 animals. This is close to the precautionary PBR threshold identified (8 animals). Further, in the 2012 year, no captures were reported. If captures continue to be zero, there is obviously no problem with sea lion bycatch. (However, additional years of low – no bycatch are needed to have confidence in the efficacy of management measures).</p> <p>Meantime, the Client and MPI have committed to continuing to apply the intensive management approach used in the 2012 year. This includes operator briefings, increased levels of observer coverage and detailed in-season monitoring.</p> <p>The fishery (SBW6I) meets national requirements and objectives for 2012.</p> <p>Milestone 3:</p> <p>Evidence that the strategy is being implemented successfully includes at-sea monitoring (VMS, government observers). The reduced catch of sea lions may also be evidence of the efficacy of the strategy. Given the inherent variation in bycatch levels generally, additional years of low to zero sea lion catches will increase</p>

	confidence in this conclusion.
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The team concludes that there is now a strategy in place for managing the fishery's impact on the ETP species that was the subject of the Condition (New Zealand sea lions in SBW6I). This strategy includes measures designed to minimise mortality, and is designed to be highly likely to achieve the national requirements for the protection of this species.</p> <p>There is an objective basis for confidence that the strategy will work, based on information about the fishery and sea lion bycatch patterns, and including data collected prior to the introduction of the strategy and during its roll-out.</p> <p>In its first year of implementation, there is evidence that the strategy is being implemented successfully, both based on reported information from Observers at sea, and given the zero catch of sea lions recorded. However, bycatch levels are inherently variable between years, and additional seasons of zero or low catch are required to increase confidence in the link between the management measures applied and bycatch reductions, and develop quantitative analyses to that effect.</p> <p>The audit team rescored PI 2.3.2</p> <p>SG 60 is met as there are measures, considered likely to work, based on plausible argument in place that minimise mortality, and are expected to be highly likely to achieve national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species.</p> <p>SG 80 is met as There is a strategy in place for managing the fishery's impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality that is designed to be highly likely to achieve national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species.</p> <p>There is an objective basis for confidence that the strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or the species involved.</p> <p>There is evidence that the strategy is being implemented successfully.</p> <p>A score of 85 is given as one of the SG 100 is met. There is a <u>comprehensive strategy</u> in place for managing the fishery's impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality, that is designed to achieve <u>above</u> national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species.</p> <p>However there needs to be evidence beyond the first year of implementation to provide high confidence and clear evidence that the strategy is achieving its objective for SG100 to be fully met</p> <p>The Condition is closed, and a recommendation is made as follows:</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> At the next annual surveillance the audit team will assess the results of the ongoing monitoring of sea lion captures to ensure captures remain at levels lower than the identified PBR threshold.</p>

<b>Any complaints against the certified operation; recorded, reviewed and actioned.</b>
No

<b>Any relevant changes to legislation or regulation.</b>
No

<b>Any relevant changes to management regime.</b>
<p>The southern blue whiting fishery includes some non-New Zealand vessels fishing on a charter basis. A Ministerial Inquiry into the use and operation of foreign charter vessels fishing in New Zealand waters was conducted in 2011/12, concluding in February 2012. The principal objective of the Inquiry was to ensure that the operation of foreign owned and flagged vessels chartered by New Zealand fishing companies supported the government's objectives in the following areas (<a href="http://www.fish.govt.nz/en-nz/Consultations/Ministerial+Inquiry+into+Foreign+Charter+Vessels/default.htm">http://www.fish.govt.nz/en-nz/Consultations/Ministerial+Inquiry+into+Foreign+Charter+Vessels/default.htm</a>):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To protect New Zealand's international reputation and trade access.</li> <li>2. To maximise the economic return to New Zealand from our fisheries resources.</li> <li>3. To ensure acceptable and equitable New Zealand labour standards (including safe working environments) on all fishing vessels operating in New Zealand's fisheries waters within the Exclusive Economic Zone.</li> </ol> <p>One outcome from this enquiry relevant to the southern blue whiting fishery is the implementation of increased levels of fisheries observer coverage on foreign charter vessels. Amongst other outcomes, this increased coverage has provided increased opportunities for data collection on target catch, bycatch, ETP, etc.</p>

<b>Overall Conclusions.</b>
<p>The first annual surveillance was carried out 29 -30<sup>th</sup> January, 2013. The team assessed changes in the fishery and evaluated progress against the Condition.</p> <p>To verify that the Condition has been met and outcomes have achieved, the assessment team:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Examined relevant objective evidence, and following that examination,</li> <li>b) Re-scored the relevant PSIGs relating to that Condition.</li> </ol> <p>The score was raised above 80 and consequently the Condition is now closed with no remaining Conditions. The rationale for the re-scoring and closing out of the Condition is documented in this Surveillance Report.</p> <p>Two recommendations have been made.</p> <p>No changes in management have taken place that would detrimentally affect the performance of this fishery against the MSC standard and the fishery continues to meet the requirements of the MSC Standard.</p> <p>MSC Certification should continue with annual audits (see Annex 3 below).</p>

## Annex 1

### Written stakeholder submissions to the surveillance audit and IMM responses to points raised.

None received.

Minutes of eNGO meeting attached

## Annex 2

### Notification of surveillance audit posted on the MSC website on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2013:.

[http://www.msc.org/track-a-fishery/fisheries-in-the-program/certified/pacific/new\\_zealand\\_eez\\_southern\\_blue\\_whiting\\_pelagic\\_trawl\\_fishery%20/assessment-downloads-1/82089\\_85\\_Surveillance\\_audit\\_notification\\_NZ\\_hoki\\_and\\_SBW.pdf](http://www.msc.org/track-a-fishery/fisheries-in-the-program/certified/pacific/new_zealand_eez_southern_blue_whiting_pelagic_trawl_fishery%20/assessment-downloads-1/82089_85_Surveillance_audit_notification_NZ_hoki_and_SBW.pdf)

## Annex 3

### Determination of surveillance level

A surveillance audit may be conducted as either an “on-site” or “offsite audit”. This is determined by using criteria set out by the MSC requirements V1.3, January 2013, Table C3 Criteria to determine surveillance score and Table C4 Surveillance level:

Criteria	Surveillance Score	SBW Fishery
1. Default Assessment Tree		
Yes	0	0
No	2	-
2. Number of Conditions		
Zero Conditions	0	0
1-5 Conditions	1	-
>5 Conditions	2	-
3. Principle Level Scores		
≥ 85	0	
<85	2	2
4. Conditions on outcome PIs?		
Yes	2	-
No	0	0
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>2</b>

The score for the fishery is used to determine the surveillance level appropriate to the fishery using the table below:

Surveillance score	Surveillance level		Years after certification or re-certification			
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
2 or more	Normal surveillance		On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit & recertification visit
1	Remote surveillance	Option 1	Off-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	Off-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit & recertification visit
		Option 2	On-site surveillance audit	Off-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	
0	Reduced surveillance		Review new information	On-site surveillance audit	Review new information	On-site surveillance audit & recertification visit

The New Zealand Southern Blue Whiting Trawl Fisheries scores 2 and so will be subject to a normal surveillance level, requiring an on-site surveillance audit next year.

## MSC Interview Record

### *Southern Blue Whiting*

#### 1. Introduction.

##### IMM Lead Assessor to introduce MSC assessment to Stakeholders, including:

- Purpose of meeting – information collection and identification of issues relevant to fishery surveillance audit.

Assessment Team	Names
Lead Assessor	Jo Akroyd
P1 Team Member	
P2 Team Member	Johanna Pierre
P3 Team Member	

Meeting Location	WWF offices, Boulcott Street, Wellington	
Date	30 January 2013	
Stakeholders Name	Affiliation	
Kevin Hackwell	Forest and Bird	
Katherine Short	WWF	
Paul Crozier	WWF	
Melina Palka	WWF	

Comments:  
Apologies from Barry Weeber ECO

#### 2. Status

What is the nature of the organizations interest in the fishery (e.g. client / science / management / industry / eNGO etc)

eNGOs

#### 3. Stakeholder Key Issues

What, if any, specific substantive issues or concerns are identified regarding the fishery? (P1 – P2 – P3) and what information is available to allow us to determine the status of the fishery in relation to each issue?

- The lack of reported sea lion bycatch from government fisheries observers in the past (fishing) year in this fishery is not considered as indicative of a lack of potential population impacts on this species.
- The link between zero observed catch of sea lions and management action is not clear. Understanding more about what management has actually changed and documentation showing explicit linkages between actions and outcomes is needed.
- The ‘value’ of male and female sea lions is acknowledged as most likely different within the population. Care needs to be undertaken to consider this appropriately in modeling/analytical work (on an ongoing basis).
- Additional years (e.g., 5 years) of zero catch are necessary before the management approach can confidently be deemed as successful.
- Need to keep abreast of new work on sea lions (e.g., done by Jim Roberts at NIWA)
- Appreciated the quality and quantity of information provided by the client, including the progress report for this fishery.

#### 4. IMM Assessment Team Questions

Assessment team questions for stakeholders

--

#### 5. Other issues

(e.g. any other stakeholders we should contact, any written submissions to follow?)

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Timing of future audits: Discussion focused on timeframes between audits, and emphasized the need for regular audits rather than protracted gaps between them.</li></ul> |
|--|

#### 7. Confirmation of record of meeting:

IMM Lead Assessor Signature:  
JM Akroyd

Stakeholder Signature:  
By email 7<sup>th</sup> February 2013