

Bio.inspecta (mandated by q.inspecta) Walker Seafood Australian albacore, yellowfin tuna, and swordfish longline fishery

Marine Stewardship Council variation request

Table 1 – Variation request

1	10 October 2019
2	CAB
	Bio.inspecta (mandated by q.inspecta)
3	Fishery name and certificate number or CoC certificate number
	Walker Seafood Australian Australian albacore, yellowfin tuna, and swordfish longline
4	Lead auditor or program manager
	Dr Sabine Daume
5	Request prepared by
	Dr Sabine Daume
6	Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested
	<p>1. Fisheries scored against v1.3:</p> <p>Implementation timeframes: Existing fisheries (in assessment or certified) shall apply the new standard requirements (...) at their first reassessment commencing after 1st October 2017. (FCR V2.0 p. 9). (Note: the 'new standard requirements' referred to in this clause are the FCRv2.0, though the Fisheries Certification Process v2.1 can also be used.)</p>

	<p>FCR V.2.0 7.23.13.1.b.i. If the progress against the measurable outcomes, expected results or (interim) milestones specified when setting the condition is judged to be behind target, the CAB shall specify the remedial action, and any revised milestones, that are required to bring process back on track within 12 months to achieve the original condition by the original deadline.</p> <p>FCRv2.0 7.23.13.2: In the event that the CAB determines that progress against a condition is not back 'on target' within 12 months of falling 'behind target', the CAB shall: a. Consider progress as inadequate. b. Apply the requirements of GCR 7.4 (suspension or withdrawal).</p> <p>2. All fisheries listed in Appendix 1:</p> <p>FCRv2.0 7.11.1.3 (and subclauses): The CAB shall draft conditions to result in improved performance to at least the 80 level within a period set by the CAB but no longer than the term of the certification unless: a. There are exceptional circumstances, and the CAB determines that achieving a performance level of 80 may take longer than the period of certification. The CAB shall interpret exceptional circumstances in 7.11.1.3.a to refer to situations in which, even with perfect implementation, achieving the 80 level of performance may take longer than the certification period.</p> <p>FCRv2.0 7.24.2 (and subclauses): When conducting a re-assessment of a certified fishery, the CAB shall (...) evaluate progress against certification conditions. Unless exceptional circumstances apply (7.11.1.3) or paragraph (b) applies, the fishery shall have met all conditions and milestones. (...) In the event that there are unmet conditions, the CAB shall apply 7.23.13.1 and 7.23.13.2 (except 7.23.13.2.b.) in determining the adequacy of progress against those conditions and milestones. If the CAB concludes that the client has made inadequate progress, it shall not grant a new fishery certificate.</p>
7	How many times has a variation for this requirement been accepted for the same assessment of the same fishery?
	This relates to the Mega variance submitted to the MSC on the 11 December 2018 and accepted by the MSC on the 28 February 2019.

Table 2 – Variation justification

1	Proposed variation	
	<p>It relates to all tuna and tuna-like highly migratory species. In the context of this variation request, we refer to the tuna and swordfish stocks. Walker seafood tuna and swordfish fishery was listed as part of the variance but there are no other Pacific swordfish fisheries currently certified or in assessment and therefore would not be under any harmonisation requirement per se.</p> <p>We propose to align Pacific swordfish of the Walker Seafood fishery to the same one-off Principle 1 alignment which was already accepted by MSC under the mega variance. As this fishery is currently scored against CRv1.3 we are proposing to rescore swordfish against FCRv2.0 for Principle 1 at the next available opportunity which is the current 4th annual surveillance audit to align with the rescoring of the other tuna species which is occurring as well. It is noted that this rescoring would have to take place at reassessment anyway which is starting now with preparations for the ACDR.</p> <p>We are proposing to provide all of these in an annex to the 4th annual surveillance report. The proposal avoids producing a report in which different P1 species are scored against different versions of the Certification Requirements. This would be an anomalous situation for which it would be hard to explain the logic to readers and the client.</p>	
2	Additional time requested	
	Original deadline date	29 th October 2019
	Modified deadline date requested	29 th November 2019
	Length of additional time requested	4 weeks
3	Justification	
	<p>This will allow an alignment of rescoring all of Principle 1 (tuna and swordfish species) against common certification requirements in one report. The ACDR for the re-assessment of the fishery is also due to be posted around the end of November 2019</p>	
4	If a fishery assessment, implications for assessment	
	<p>There are no implications as the scores and rationales under FCR 2.0 will also be made public as part of the ACDR which will be due at the same time.</p>	
5	If a fishery assessment, mitigation of the implications for assessment	
	NA	

6	If a fishery assessment, how many conditions does the fishery have and will their progress be affected (positive or negative)?
	Progress will not be affected there are 10 conditions.
7	What is the status of the current assessment or audit?
	The fishery is at the 4 th annual surveillance and due to start the re-assessment this year. The last surveillance report (by Control Union Pesca) was posted on the 5 th April 2019, only 4 months before the 4 th audit was conducted due to the re-assessment timelines.
8	Further comments
	- Please include any further relevant information.
9	If applicable, additional information added after the MSC's request