

## Marine Stewardship Council

### Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request Form V1.3

<b>Date submitted to MSC</b>	<i>8<sup>th</sup> September 2014</i>
<b>Conformity Assessment Body</b>	MacAlister Elliott & Partners Ltd
<b>Fishery Name/CoC Certificate Number</b>	Walker Seafoods albacore & yellowfin tuna, swordfish and mahi mahi longline fishery
<b>Lead Auditor/Programme Manager</b>	Jo Gascoigne
<b>Scheme requirement(s) to vary from</b>	CR 27.4.3
<b>Is this variation sought in order to undertake an expedited P1 assessment (CR annex CL)?</b>	<i>No</i>

#### **1. Proposed variation**

*It is proposed to remove mahi mahi as one of the units of certification from the fishery currently under assessment*

#### **2. Rationale/Justification**

*The rationale for removing this species as a UoC is that in the absence of stock assessments and harvest control rules, there is not enough information to effectively evaluate the stock of this species under P1 requirements. It is therefore requested that mahi mahi be considered as 'main retained' under P2 instead.*

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

*This decision was made in consultation with the client group. This will not affect the status or timeline of any other element in this assessment. In addition, if granted, the removal of this species from P1 will address concerns from one of the stakeholders.*

#### **4. Have the stakeholders of this fishery assessment been informed of this request? (required for fisheries assessment variations only)**

Not at present.

#### **5. Further Comments**

*Please include any further relevant information.*

## 6. Confidential Information

Please include any information that cannot be published here.  
This may include information covered by provisions of CR 24.4.

*[Please note, this section is OPTIONAL and is designed to include supplementary information to the rationale provided above. As this information will not be published, the rationale for the variation that is published should make sense without the inclusion of this section. For example, if the rationale section included a statement that the variation to continue all the steps of the assessment is needed because the client has instructed the CAB not to proceed, this section could add that the reason for this is that the client has insufficient funds to continue with the assessment due to unforeseen costs. It would therefore be impossible for the CAB to complete the assessment.]*

## EXPEDITED PRINCIPLE 1 ASSESSMENT FOR MAIN RETAINED PRINCIPLE 2 STOCKS

### 7. Main retained Principle 2 stock(s) for which an expedited Principle 1 assessment is sought

*Please list the stocks for which an expedited P1 assessment is sought. These must be stocks assessed in the existing certified fishery as 'main retained species'*

### 8. Evaluation of potential impact on Principle 2

*If a P2 species is certified under P1, there could be potential impacts to bycatch, habitat, or ecosystem scoring, depending on any altered persecution of the fishery that may arise. Please provide a discussion of this potential for the specific fishery in question here.*

### 9. Evaluation of potential impact on Principle 3

*If a P2 species is certified under P1, there could be potential impacts to the scoring of the fishery-specific management system, depending on how specific the initial evaluation of these impacts was to the initial Principle 1 stock(s). Please provide a discussion of this potential for the specific fishery in question here.*

### 10. Based on the potential impacts identified in 8 and 9, please list any additions to the expedited assessment requirements given in Annex CL that will be necessary to ensure the fishery is accurately assessed against Principles 1, 2, and 3 with the proposed additional P1 stocks.

*These could include rescoring of some P2 and/or P3 performance indicators, additional team member or peer reviewer involvement, etc.*