

Global Trust Certification

Canada Scotia-Fundy Haddock

MSC Use of the Risk-Based Framework (RBF) in a Fishery Assessment

1 Introduction

This form details the information Global Trust is required to provide for publication on the MSC website when proposing to use the Risk-Based Framework (RBF) in a fishery assessment or reassessment. The criteria by which a component may be identified as data-deficient and thereby eligible for the RBF are given in MSC Fisheries Certification Process (FCP) v2.2 §7.7.3 and its associated Table 3.

This form also serves to inform stakeholders of the proposal to use the RBF and defines a set period of at least 30 days in which stakeholders are invited to submit comments on the proposal to use the RBF. Following that period, the assessment team will review all stakeholder input, recording why each comment has been accepted or rejected and review the proposal to use the RBF considering those comments.

1.1 Mechanism for stakeholders to comment on the proposed use of the RBF

Prior to participating, stakeholders should familiarise themselves with the MSC process using the resources provided on the MSC's website: <https://www.msc.org/what-you-can-do/engage-with-a-fishery-assessment>.

Global Trust encourages stakeholders not to withhold information, including their concerns and knowledge about the fishery in question; however, information that they cannot be shared with all stakeholders cannot be referenced in an assessment or used in determining assessment outcomes unless it relates to; a) financial transactions about certification, b) the financial affairs of individual companies or information that may lead to this information being made public, or c) information that is the subject of relevant national privacy or data protection legislation in the client's country.

When submitting information, stakeholders must provide objective evidence and references in support of any claims or any claimed errors of fact.

Comments on the proposed use of the RBF should be:

1. Sent to Global Trust Client Services: ClientServicesie@nsf.org.
2. Submitted by **17:00 UTC** on **Monday 8 March 2021**.

2 Marine Stewardship Council use of the Risk-Based Framework (RBF)

Table 1. Fishery information.

1	Fishery name
	Canada Scotia Fundy Haddock
2	CAB
	Global Trust Certification Ltd. (hereafter Global Trust)
3	Date that the proposal to use the RBF is submitted to the MSC
	Thursday 28 January 2021
4	Date stakeholder comment period closes on the proposal to use the RBF
	17:00 UTC on Monday 8 March 2021.
5	PI that the RBF is to be applied for
	1.1.1
6	Justification for use
	<p>The 5Zjm haddock (<i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i>) is a transboundary stock that is co-managed with the USA. As such, it has two management strategies.</p> <p><u>Fish and Oceans fishery decision-making framework incorporating the Precautionary Approach” (PA Policy)</u></p> <p>The 4VWX5 Groundfish IFMP (DFO 2018) states there is a 5Zjm haddock strategy that is compliant with Canadian policy guidance developed for this stock. These objectives, strategies and reference points are explicitly assigned to the management of the 5ZjM stock within Canada.</p> <p>The reference points are as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Target Reference (TRP) BMSY = 78,000 t. This value corresponds to the biomass needed for maximum sustainable yield. BMSY was calculated in 2012 using a Sissenwine-Shepherd production model (DFO 2012a). ▪ Limit Reference Point (LRP) = 10,340 t. The Limit Reference Point is based on Brecover (DFO 2012a). ▪ Upper Stock Reference (USR) = 40,000 t. The Upper Stock Reference is suggested based on generally higher recruitment when SSB is above 40,000 t. <p>These LRP TRP and USR reference points were established and agreed to be monitored every year through annual surveys and assessments. (DFO 2012a,DFO 2018)).</p> <p><u>Transboundary, Management Guidance Committee TMGC Harvest Strategy</u></p> <p>The Eastern Georges Bank haddock stock is shared and managed by the U.S. and Canada through a transboundary resource sharing agreement. This agreement includes an annual process for joint stock assessment, setting of a TAC, and harvest shares for each country.</p> <p>Since 1998, the Transboundary Resources Assessment Committee (TRAC) has reviewed Eastern Georges Bank Haddock stock assessments and projections necessary to support management activities for shared resources across the United States of America (USA)-Canada international Hague Line in the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region. These assessments have been conducted annually to advise the Transboundary Management Guidance Committee (TMGC) about the status of the resource and likely consequences of policy choices.</p> <p>In December 2002 meeting the TMGC agreed to a common F strategy at meeting. The F references used by both countries for “healthy” or “rebuilt” stocks were defined as 0.25 for Canada and 0.26 for the USA (TMGC Meeting Summary, Oct. 2, 2003). The current fishing mortality reference (Fref) of 0.26 for EGB Haddock was calculated from yield per recruit analysis and by coincidence $F_{0.1}=F_{40\%}=0.26$ (Findlay et al 2019).</p> <p>Therefore, the TMGC harvest strategy consists in maintain a low to neutral risk of exceeding the fishing mortality limit reference, $F_{REF}=0.26$. TRAC haddock assessment provide of catch advice for every two years</p>

Table 1. Fishery information.

corresponding to low (25%), neutral (50%), and high (75%) probability that the fishing mortality (F) would exceed the reference level (Fref = 0.26).
However, on the last stock assessment for 5Zjm cod (TRAC 2019), it was found that the status of the stock could not be assessed because the model was rejected and there were no reference points to assess their status. Therefore, while the Groundfish IFMP has established reference point points for 5Zjm Haddock which they have to be monitored through annual surveys, it's not clear for the team whether they are being used or not .

MSC FCP 2.2 G7.7.3 states “Where it is not yet clear whether a scoring element under in either P1 or P2 meets the criteria in Table 3, the use of the RBF should be announced to stakeholders and the site visit planned assuming that an RBF assessment will be needed”

Based on the clause above, the team decided to use RBF on PI 1.1.1

References

DFO. 2012. Reference points consistent with the precautionary approach for a variety of stocks in the Maritimes Region. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2012/035.

DFO 2018. 4VWX5 Groundfish IFMP

Finley, M., E.N. Brooks, Q. McCurdy, M.A. Barrett, Y. Wang. 2019. Assessment of Haddock on Eastern Georges Bank DFO TRAC Reference Document 2019/01

TRAC 2019. Transboundary Resources Assessment Committee. 2019. Eastern Georges Bank haddock TRAC Status Rep 2019/03; 10 p.

Table 2. MSC Fisheries Certification Process v2.2 §Table 3: Criteria for triggering the use of the RBF.

Performance Indicator	Criteria	Consideration	Notes
1.1.1 Stock status	Stock status reference points are available, derived either from analytical stock assessment or using empirical approaches.	Yes	Use default Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts within default assessment tree for this PI.
		No	Use Annex PF (RBF) for this PI.
2.1.1 Primary species Outcome and 2.2.1 Secondary species outcome	Biologically based limits are available, derived either from analytical stock assessment or using empirical approaches.	Yes	Use default Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts within default assessment tree for this PI.
		No	Use Annex PF (RBF) for this PI.
2.3.1 ETP species outcome	Can the impact of the fishery in assessment on ETP species be analytically determined?	Yes	Use default Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts within default assessment tree for this PI.
		No	Use Annex PF (RBF) for this PI.
2.4.1 Habitats outcome	In line with the MSC Fisheries Standard habitats guidance (GSA3.13.1.1), are both of the following applicable? 1. Information on habitats encountered is available. 2. Information on impact of fishery on habitats encountered is available.	Yes	Use default Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts within default assessment tree for this PI.
		No	Use Annex PF (RBF) for this PI.
2.5.1 Ecosystem outcome	Is information available to support an analysis of the impact of the fishery on the ecosystem?	Yes	Use default Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts within default assessment tree for this PI.

Table 1. Fishery information.

			No	Use Annex PF (RBF) for this PI.
--	--	--	----	---------------------------------

3 Template information and copyright

This document was drafted using the 'MSC Use of the RBF in a Fishery Assessment Form v3.1'. While amendments have been made to formatting in order to comply with Global Trust's corporate identity, Global Trust has ensured that content and structure follow that of the original template.

The Marine Stewardship Council's 'MSC Use of the RBF in a Fishery Assessment Form v3.1' and its content is copyright of "Marine Stewardship Council" - © "Marine Stewardship Council" 2020. All rights reserved

Table 3. Template version control.

Version	Date of publication	Description of amendment
1.0	15 August 2011 15 November 2011	Date of first release. Date of application. Created as one of the Normative Documents to accompany release of MSC Certification Requirements v1.0
2.0	08 October 2014	Updates in line with release of Fisheries Certification Requirements v2.0
3.0	17 December 2018	Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.1
3.01	28 March 2019	Minor document change for usability
3.1	25 March 2020	Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.2

A controlled document list of MSC program documents is available on the MSC website (www.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