

Intertek Fisheries Certification (IFC)

10A Victory Park Victory Road Derby DE24 8ZF UK

www.intertek.com/food/msc-certification

Surveillance Report Lake Hjälmaren Pikeperch Fish-Trap Fishery Lake Hjälmaren Pikeperch Gill-Net Fishery

Certificate No.: MML-F-154, MML-F-155

Intertek Fisheries Certification Ltd January 2015

Authors: A Hough, S Hansson

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

Scope against which the surveillance is undertaken: MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing as applied to the Lake Hjälmaren Pikeperch Fish-Trap Fishery and Lake Hjälmaren Pikeperch Gill-Net Fishery

Species: Pikeperch/Zander, Sander lucioperca

Area: Lake Hjälmaren, Sweden

Method of capture:

Summer fish-trap fishery

Winter gill net fishery (two Units of Certification)

Date of Surveillance Visit:	28 January 2015	5		
Initial Certification	Date: 12 Nov 20	13	Certificate Ref: M MML-F-155	1ML-F-154,
Surveillance stage	1 st	2 nd	3rd	4th
Surveillance team:	Lead Assessor: Assessor(s):	A He S Ha	ough Insson	
Company Name: Address:	Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund Verktygsgatan 5 SE-73234 Arboga SWEDEN			
Contact 1	Mats Ingemarsson			
Tel No:	+46 70 5594028			
r ax no: E-mail address:	matsilund@ljungby.nu			

2.0 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

This audit was due to be undertaken by 12 November 2014. However, following a variation from MSC, this first audit has been delayed by three months.

The client's response to the Conditions 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 each Condition, the report sets out progress to date. This progress has been evaluated by the Intertek Fisheries Certification (IFC) 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 Indicators (PIs) in the original MSC assessment. Where the requirements of a Condition are met, the PI is re-scored at 80 or more and the Condition is "closed out".

The surveillance audit methodology, as defined in the current version of the MSC Certification Requirements is followed in this audit. According to this requirement, the first surveillance is an on-site audit. However, the next audit will be undertaken according to MSC CR v2.0 in determining the level of surveillance audit that the fishery requires (see Annex 3).

Information Sources:

Meetings

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

28 Jan 2015. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Aquatic Resources, Institute of Freshwater Research, Drottningholm, Sweden
Mats Ingermarson (Client Representative)
Martin Engstrom (County Board of Fisheries)
Johan Nilsson (Secretary, Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund)
Hans Johansson (Chair, Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund)
Ulrika Beier (Environmental Analyst, SUA, Dept of Aquatic Resources)

Reports etc Beier, U. 2015. Presentation of Hjalmaren pikeperch stock information

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
- 4. MSC Certification Requirements v2.0 in determining future audit requirements.

Stock status and Catch Data



	300- Catches		
	Figure 3. Actual catches and model predicted catches based on current fishing intensities and		
	year-class strength (Fig. 2). Data from Ulrika Beijer, Freshwater Laboratory Drottningholm, SLU.		
Total Allowable Catch (TAC) in most recent fishing	The fishery does not operate to a TAC. Following conditions set in the first period of certification, input controls are in place.		
year	In 2015, there are 160 fish-traps (bottengarn) in privately owned waters (5 per fisherman) and 71 fish traps in state controlled water (2.2 per fisherman). There are 60 740m of gill-net (1 900m per fisherman).		
Unit of Certification share of TAC	At present, all fishermen are included in the certified fishery, but see below.		
Client share of TAC	At present, all fishermen are included in the certified fishery.		
Green Weight ¹ of	Most recent calendar year (2013)		
client group	Fish traps: 58 828 t		
	Gill-net: 89 190 t		
	Previous year (2012):		
	Fish traps: 77 350 t		
	Gill-net: 89 493 t		

¹ The weight of a catch prior to processing

Condition	1. Stock Status
PI	1.1.1. The stock is at a level which maintains high productivity and has a low probability of recruitment overfishing
SG 60	It is likely that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired.
SG 80	It is highly likely that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired.
	The stock is at or fluctuating around its target reference point.
SG 100	There is a high degree of certainty that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired.
	There is a high degree of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around its target reference point, or has been above its target reference point, over recent years.
Score	90
Scoring Rationale	The RBF was used to score this PI. The PSA score for the stock was 90, and this score was used in determining the overall Principle 1 average score. However, the fishery scored 60-80 for the SICA analysis and so the RBF cannot be used at a future reassessment. The following condition is therefore required.
	Little specific study has been carried out on the effects of the fishery on ecosystem function in Lake Hjalmaren, hence the RBF is used for this PI.
	The greatest risk-causing activity is considered to be the removal of top predators from the lake system through direct capture.
	On the basis of the current level of fishing, there are around 200 fish traps distributed around the lake, and 20 gill-netters, each using around 1000 m of net. If all gear were deployed at a given time, the total area covered by fishing gear would be less than a few km2; the lake is 485 km2, The Spatial scale of the fishery for both gear types is therefore taken to be 1-15% of the total area (2).
	Some fishing activity takes place on most days; the temporal scale was therefore taken as 300-365 days per year (6).
	Where fishing takes place, fishing activity (intensity) will be obvious, but localised; there will be large areas of the lake with no detectable fishing or fishing-related effects. Intensity is therefore moderate (3).
	The 'subcomponent' of the lake ecosystem considered most likely to be affected by the fishery is trophic size/structure – due to the removal of top predators, principally pikeperch, from the lake system.
	The stakeholders and assessment team, having identified the subcomponent representing the 'worst-case' situation, discussed the likely consequence in relation to the relevant consequence categories until a consequence score was unanimously agreed. The agreed consequence score was $2 -$ change in mean trophic level/biomass/number in each size class up to 5% and time to recover from impact typically up to 5 years.
	The average percentage distribution of catches between gill-net and fish-trap between 1996-2011 was approximately 43% in traps and 57% in gill nets, However, the PSA score is the same for both gears and so the weighted average score remains 90.

Condition	There must be information collected and analysed providing a direct measure of stock status (e.g. biomass) that can be compared with biologically-based reference points by the time of the re-assessment.
Milestones	Within the first year of certification, a plan to address the requirements of this condition should be in place.
	Within the second year of certification, work should have begun to determine stock status.
	Within the third year of certification, work on the above should continue.
	Within the fourth year of certification, there should be a direct measure of stock status and appropriate reference points in place. (Score 80)
Client Action Plan	Client action plan regarding condition 1.1.1
	Within the first year of certification
	Client should coordinate relevant authorities and stakeholders to produce and set in place a Biomass data collection plan for the here called "limited reference points for SSB" including a plan on how to collect and analyse information providing a direct measure of stock status (e.g. biomass) that may be compared with biologically-based reference points by the time of the re-assessment.
	Client and relevant authorities will ensure that desired management data, here called "limit and target reference points for SSB" and their content definition is reviewed by the CAB to ensure the condition is on target for satisfactory completion.
	Within year 2
	Client coordinates and secures that government authorities work on determining stock status "limited reference points for SSB" as defined in Biomass data collection plan, has begun.
	Within year three
	Client should coordinate and secure that work within the Biomass data collection plan continues.
	Within year four
	Client should be able to harvest the result of work under Biomass data collection plan and relevant authorities should be able to present the direct measures of stock status and appropriate reference points, here called "limited reference points for SSB" and present that said points are set in place in management of the fishery.
Observations	Catch, effort and recruitment data have been collected. A program for assessing the biomass by means of a VPA modelling approach has been developed by the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) and data collection for this purpose is planned to be initiated in 2015. According to this plan, fishery independent data will be collected by means of gill net test fishing every third year.
	There were some uncertainties about the future for the annual collection of recruitment data from fisheries with small meshed fyke nets, but given the importance of these data as an early indicator of expected future population/catch changes, efforts are likely to be taken to maintain this monitoring.
	No biologically-based reference points were presented at this stage, but work is progressing satisfactorily at present.

specified timescale.

Condition	2. Harvest Control Rules
PI	1.2.2 There are well defined and effective harvest control rules in place
SG 60	Generally understood harvest rules are in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and which act to reduce the exploitation rate as limit reference points are approached. There is some evidence that tools used to implement harvest control rules are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation.
SG 80	Well defined harvest control rules are in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached.The selection of the harvest control rules takes into account the main uncertainties.Available evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
SG 100	The design of the harvest control rules takes into account a wide range of uncertainties. Evidence clearly shows that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
Score	75
Scoring Rationale	There are a number of clearly understood management measures that can be taken in the event that there is a perceived risk of overfishing the stock. These are entirely consistent with the overall harvest strategy and will act to reduce the exploitation rate. The management rules are well understood, but do not clearly define the sequencing of actions that would be undertaken should the risk of overfishing arise. The rules are therefore not considered to be well defined.
Condition	Well defined harvest control rules shall be put in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached. Reference points shall be as determined under Condition 1.
Milestones	Actions within the first year of certification will be under Condition 1. (Score 75) Within the second year of certification, a plan for producing harvest control rules shall be produced. (75) Within the third year of certification, work on the above should continue. (75) Within the fourth year of certification, there should be harvest control rules in place which ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached. (Score 80)
Client Action Plan	Client Action plan regarding condition 1.2.2 Within the first year of certification Client is required to coordinate relevant government authorities and stakeholders to create an agreement (MoA) on securing the desired management data in a long term perspective. The agreement should include responsibility of relevant stakeholders to continue to manage fisheries in a sustainable manner.

	The desired management data, here called "well-defined harvest control regulations" (with respect to the reference points) and their content definition will be reviewed by the CAB to ensure the condition is on target for satisfactory completion.	
	Within year 2	
	Client is required to coordinate a plan for producing harvest control rules including relevant stakeholders and authorities in the process.	
	Within year 3	
	Client is required to secure that work on the plan for producing harvest control rules continue by coordinating relevant authorities and stakeholder input.	
	Within year four	
	Client, relevant authorities and stakeholders should, with the force of the MoA from year one, secure and present that said harvest control rules ("well-defined harvest control regulations") are implemented in the fishery, ensuring the exploitation rate is reduced if limit reference points are approached.	
	Before year five	
	The implemented management data, here called "well-defined harvest control regulations", provide background to the process of re-certification in year five, when next recertification cycle starts.	
Observations	As completing Condition 2 is dependent on progress with Condition 1, the milestone for the first year of certification is addressed under Condition 1 above, which is currently 'ahead of target'.	
	The administrative and legal tools available to rapidly change the fishing is case of substantial and quick population decreases are not currently in place but it is noted that fishermen and managers have begun to consider options for implementing such harvest control rules. Of the 35 fishermen operating in the lake, 32 are currently members of the Clients organisation.	
Conclusion	As Condition 1 is 'ahead of target', then Condition 2 is currently 'on-target' for completion within the specified timescale.	

Any complaints against the certified operation; recorded, reviewed and actioned.

Concerns were raised at the re-assessment by BirdLife Sweden (formerly Swedish Ornithological Society) over the culling of cormorants at the lake. It is understood that BirdLife Sweden continues to express concerns over this during consultations prior to the annual licensing of the cull. There is no indication, however, that any characteristics of the cull have altered since the re-assessment was concluded and so no changes in scoring of the fishery are considered necessary.

Any relevant changes to legislation or regulation.

In response to an EU Directive, the licensing of commercial fishermen by the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SWAM) has been modified: previously licenses were only issued to fishermen for whom fishing was their main source of income. The amendment means that licenses may be issued for fishermen who wish to undertake commercial fishing. SWAM consult local County Board managers to evaluate implications of further licenses in light of available resources.

However, while the SWAM-issued license allows fishers to undertake commercial fishing, a separate permit is also required from the County Board allowing the deployment of gear (in this case in Lake Hjalmaren). This permitting is directly evaluated by the County Board in light of the available resource.

There are not expected to be any significant changes in the industry as a result of this change in licensing for the foreseeable (5-10 years) future. No change in scoring of the fishery is therefore considered necessary.

Any relevant changes to management regime.

No other changes have been reported to the assessment team.

Traceability and Chain of Custody

The fishery client, Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund, wishes to investigate options for fishermen to sell product more widely in the local area, potentially including sales to local retailers/restaurants and even retail sales by fishers (although of course the latter would require that such fishermen have their own separate Chain of Custody certification).

The traceability section in the original reassessment report considered traceability of product to collection from the fishermen, by CoC certified processors, at the point of landing at the lakeshore; this being the route by which most fish (around 90%) enter future Chain of Custody.

To ensure that traceability systems are sufficiently secure to allow this local sale of product, the assessment team have updated the traceability section below.

Traceability within the Fishery

Fishermen land at their own docks on the lakeshore; all fish landed are from Lake Hjalmaren. Catches are reported by area and gear and may be subject to inspection by fishery officers from the County Boards. Some fishermen may also fish in adjacent lakes, but catches are separately labelled and pikeperch from Lake Hjälmaren are distinguishable (by fishery officers, other fishermen and knowledgeable buyers) from fish from other lakes; this is considered sufficient disincentive to prevent mixing.

All fish are sold whole and pikeperch are readily distinguished from other commercial species (pike and perch).

As detailed above, most fish entering future Chain of Custody continue to be collected from the fishermen by CoC certified processors at the point of landing.

There is no processing on the lake and no trans-shipping – landings are directly to the shore, presenting little opportunity for substitution/addition of fish from other lakes.

The decision of Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund, to restrict access to the fishery certificate to those licensed fishers who are members of the association, or which have entered into a cost-sharing arrangement with the association, is not expected to compromise traceability of MSC fish – county board inspections and peer scrutiny is expected to identify any inappropriate use of the MSC label.

Traceability within the fishery is therefore considered to be adequate to provide traceability of product to fishers within the certified fishery.

Eligibility to Enter Further Chains of Custody

The tracking and traceability information is considered sufficient for certified pikeperch to enter further certified chains of custody.

All licensed fishermen who are members of, or who have a cost-sharing arrangement with, Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund may supply product into further certified chains of custody. Details of fishermen included within the fishery certificate are available at the Sic website <u>http://www.insjofiskare.se</u>.

Eligible points of landing are all landing points on the shores of Lake Hjalmaren.

Change of ownership, and the point from which Chain of Custody (CoC) certification is required, is the first point of sale of pike perch from identified fishermen. All processors/retailers/restaurants/fishermen etc wishing to sell Lake Hjälmaren pikeperch as 'MSC certified' will require their own separate Chain of Custody certification.

Eligibility of Inseparable or Practically Inseparable (IPI) stock(s) to Enter Further Chains of Custody

No IPI stock(s) are involved in this certification.

Definition of Unit of Certification re Client Group

The client for the certification, Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund, expressed a wish that access to the fishery certificate be restricted to those licensed fishers who are members of the association, or which have entered into a cost-sharing arrangement with the association (originally all fishers licensed to fish on the lake had access to the fishery certificate).

As this is a (minor) change of the UoC, a variation has been sought from the MSC. This variation has been approved by the MSC and details included as Annex 4.

Hjälmarens Fiskareförbund hereby state their willingness to enter into reasonable certificate sharing arrangements, and to inform other eligible fishers of these arrangements as follows:

1. Hjälmarens Fiskareförbund will inform all licensed fishermen (i.e. all eligible fishers) of arrangements for using the MSC certificate at the annual meeting in late February 2015.

2. Application forms to join the Unit of Certification will be available on-line, including rules of the MSC fishery.

3. Each participant will be identified (including their member number) in a list available on-line at the Sic website http://www.insjofiskare.se.

Overall Conclusions.

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. No destructive fishing practices or controversial unilateral exemptions to an international agreement have been introduced.

Two conditions apply:

Condition 1: ahead of target

Condition 2: on target

No Performance Indicators are rescored at this time.

MSC Certification should therefore continue.

The next surveillance audit will be carried out under MSC Certification Requirements v2.0 (effective from April 2015). The basis for ongoing surveillance requirements is described in Annex 3 below. Accordingly, the next annual surveillance audit will be an Off-site Audit in Sep/Oct 2015.

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

No written submissions were received.

Notification of surveillance audit

Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fishery Certification Assessment

Lake Hjälmaren Pikeperch Trap Fishery Lake Hjälmaren Pikeperch Gill Net Fishery

Certification Body: Intertek Fisheries Certification

Surveillance Audit

Following certification of this fishery, we are now continuing the process of annual surveillance audits of the fishery. These audits have two principal functions:

- 1. To review any changes in the management of the fishery, including regulations, key management or scientific staff, or stock evaluation
- 2. To evaluate the progress of the fishery against any Conditions of Certification raised during the Full Assessment

During the audit, or at separate meetings, we shall be speaking with representatives of the fishery and fishery management organisations. We expect to carry out meetings on 28/29 January 2015

Meetings will be held at Drottningholm, Sweden and attended by Audit Team members

Dr Andrew Hough	Coordinator	On site
Sture Hanson	Specialist Team Member	On site

(see details of the team membership below).

Should you have any information on this fishery that you feel should be considered in the assessment, please advise us by 5 p.m. GMT on 20 January 2015. We may be available to meet with stakeholders as appropriate. If you would like to arrange a meeting, please advise us of:

- a) your name and contact details
- b) your association with the fishery
- c) the issues you would like to discuss (in order for us to arrange appropriate representation)
- d) where and when you would like to meet

Lead Assessor : Andrew Hough E-mail: andy@houghassociates.co.uk

23 December 2014

Determination of surveillance level

The next (second) surveillance audit will be conducted according to MSC CR v2.0, which has different criteria for auditor attendance at site visits.

Relevant aspects of this fishery are:

- 1. The fishery has been reassessed
- 2. There are two conditions at present, but both relate to Principle 1
- 3. Information on meeting Conditions may be reviewed remotely, this being scientific reports on stock assessment, implementation of reference points and development of harvest Control Rules
- 4. Engagement with stakeholders through electronic media is widely available and used.
- 5. The next audit is due in Sep/Oct 2015 i.e. in 8/9 months time.
- 6. The client proposed to amend the rules on access to the certificate (change to UoC) and to extend the opportunities for sale of fish from the fishery (change to traceability).

Accordingly, it is proposed that the ongoing surveillance be undertaken accordance with Level 5, with the surveillance plan as follows:

Year	Surveillance	No.	Rationale
	Activity	Auditors	
1	On-site Audit	2	Current audit, undertaken according to CR v1.3
2	Off-site Audit	1	Report on progress against Conditions (1 and 2) to be presented
	Sep 2015		remotely.
			Next audit follows in 8/9 months, so changes to traceability and
			CoC not expected to have taken effect.
3	On-site Audit	2	Review progress against Conditions and status of fishery generally
	Sep 2016		(2 auditors).
			Review traceability arrangements within fishery and operation of
			UoC (1 auditor).
4	On-site Audit	2	Review information sufficient to close conditions.
	Sep 2017		Confirm traceability arrangements within fishery and operation of
			UoC.
			Assumed final surveillance audit to coincide with Re-Assessment
			audit.

Variation request

Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request Form V1.3

Date submitted to MSC	9 February 2015
Conformity Assessment	Intertek Fisheries Certification
Body	
Fishery Name/CoC	Lake Hjalmaren Pikeperch Gill-Net and Fish-Trap Fisheries
Certificate Number	
Lead Auditor/Programme	Andrew Hough
Manager	
Scheme requirement(s) to	CR v1.3 s 27.4.3
vary from	
Is this variation sought in	No
order to undertake an	
expedited P1 assessment	
(CR annex CL)?	

1. Proposed variation

IFC, following request and discussions with the fishery client, proposes to amend the previously defined Unit of Certification.

2. Rationale/Justification

The original definition of the Unit of Certification included all fishermen on the lake. This situation was largely a result of earlier assessments being financed by third parties (notably WWF).

The client now wished to confirm that the client for the certification is the fishermen's organisation Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund only.

As Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund are now responsible for the certification, they also wish for use of the certificate to be restricted to members of Hjälmarens Fiskarförbund or fishers willing to enter into an agreement to share costs and comply with the rules of the association relating to certification requirements.

It is noted that the reassessment included all fishers on the lake as 'eligible fishers'.

This is in accordance with MSC guidance on equitable cost-sharing arrangements.

This request does not alter the conformity of the certificate holder with the MSC standard.

3. Implications for assessment (required for fisheries assessment variations only)

There are no other impacts on the certification.

This fishery has recently completed its first surveillance audit following reassessment. If granted, the outcome of this variation request will be included in the surveillance report.

4. Have the stakeholders of this fishery	No. Information will be provided to eligible
assessment been informed of this	fishers.
request? (required for fisheries	
assessment variations only	

The variation was granted by MSC 13/2/15