

## **MSC Surveillance Report**

**For The**

**US Atlantic Scallop Fishery**

**Facilitated By the**

**American Scallop Association**

Assessors: **Ivan Mateo, Lead Assessor**  
**Don Aldous, Assessor**

Report Code: **MSC021/SUR01**  
Date of Submission: **12<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

**SAI Global Assurance Services**  
3rd Floor, Block 3  
Quayside Business Park  
Mill Street  
Dundalk  
Co.Louth  
Ireland.  
T + 353 42 932 0912  
F + 353 42 938 6864  
[www.saiglobal.com/assurance](http://www.saiglobal.com/assurance)

<b>Client Name</b>	American Scallop Association (ASA)	
<b>Fishery Units</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Species</u>: Atlantic Sea Scallop (<i>Placopecten magellanicus</i>)</li> <li>• <u>Geographical Area</u>: The US Exclusive Economic Zone in the N.W. Atlantic</li> <li>• <u>Method of Capture</u>: New Bedford Dredge</li> </ul>	
<b>Date of Report</b>	January 12, 2015	
<b>Certification Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	
<b>Assessment Team</b>	Ivan Mateo (Lead Assessor) Don Aldous (Assessor)	
<b>On-site audit</b>	8-12 <sup>th</sup> December 2014	
<b>Surveillance Audit completion</b>	X	<b>Surveillance Audit 1:</b> January 12, 2015
		Surveillance Audit 2:
		Surveillance Audit 3:
		Surveillance Audit 4:
		Re-certification Audit:
<b>SAI Global Correspondence to:</b>	<b>Orla Minogue</b> Fisheries and Aquaculture Administrator <a href="mailto:orla.minogue@saiglobal.com">orla.minogue@saiglobal.com</a>	

## Contents

Summary .....	4
1. Introduction .....	6
2. The Surveillance Process.....	7
3. Summary of stakeholder and client meetings.....	9
4. Fishery observations .....	11
5. Stock status observations .....	11
6. Relevant changes to Legislation and Regulations .....	13
7. Relevant changes to Management Regime .....	13
8. The General Conditions of Certification .....	14
9. The Specific Conditions of Certification.....	15
10. Harmonization of Certificates.....	25
11. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	25
12. Outcome of SAI Global Assurance Services Decision .....	26
13. Information Sources .....	27
APPENDIX 1: Stakeholder Comments .....	32

## Summary

This report contains the findings of the first surveillance audit in relation to the certificate of the US Atlantic Scallop Fishery.

The assessment team was able to verify from interviews that no destructive fishing practices or controversial unilateral exemptions to an international agreement have been introduced since the fishery was assessed.

The assessment team was also able to verify that there have been no changes in scientific knowledge, scientific or management personnel or management policy that would adversely affect the assessment of the fishery against the MSC standard. Also, the assessment team evaluated progress against the 4 Conditions (PIs 2.2.3 Bycatch Species Information & Monitoring, 2.4.1 Habitat Outcome, 2.4.2 Habitat Management Strategy, 2.5.1 Ecosystem Outcome).

**The assessment team conclude that the client is on target, meeting the milestones of three of the four conditions to MSC certification. The first year milestones for condition one, however are not met and we conclude the client is behind target meeting this condition. A remedial action plan designed to bring the fishery back into line with the milestones will include, by the second annual audit, clear specific evidence addressing each of the first year and second year milestones.**

**SAI Global determines that:**

- **The US Atlantic Scallop Dredge Fishery continues to operate a well-managed and sustainable fishery and therefore, recommend that continued certification to the MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing is awarded.**

- Lead Assessor: Ivan Mateo

Dr. Ivan Mateo has over 15 years' experience working with natural resources population dynamic modeling. His specialization is in fish and crustacean population dynamics, stock assessment, evaluation of management strategies for exploited populations, bioenergetics, ecosystem-based assessment, and ecological statistical analysis. Dr. Mateo received a Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences with Fisheries specialization from the University of Rhode Island. He has studied population dynamics of economically important species as well as candidate species for endangered species listing from many different regions of the world such as the Caribbean, the Northeast US Coast, Gulf of California and Alaska. He has done research with NMFS Northeast Fisheries Science Center Ecosystem Based Fishery Management on bioenergetic modeling for Atlantic cod. He also has been working as environmental consultant in the Caribbean doing field work and looking at the effects of industrialization on essential fish habitats and for the Environmental Defense Fund developing population dynamics models for data poor stocks in the Gulf of California. Recently Dr. Mateo worked as National Research Council postdoc research associate at the NOAA National Marine Fisheries Services Ted Stevens Marine Research Institute on population dynamic modeling of Alaska sablefish.

- Assessor: Don Aldous

Don Aldous has been involved in fisheries management issues in Canada and the Pacific Islands since 1977. He has experience at all levels of fisheries management from Fishery Officer to Commissioner of a Regional Fisheries Management Organization. In Canada, he achieved a Senior Advisor position

in matters dealing with foreign and domestic fisheries management. He led teams of consultants preparing fisheries management plans for Fiji, Solomon Islands and Marshall Islands and has returned to conduct follow-up work in all three. On a regional scale, he has provided advice to FFA on issues related to fisheries management, development and MCS. Don is considered a P3 expert for Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) assessments and has been involved with MSC certifications in eastern Canada and eastern USA as a P3 expert, assessment team leader and peer reviewer. Don Aldous led the assessment team conducting the full assessment of the US Atlantic Scallop Fishery.

## 1. Introduction

This report sets out the results of the initial annual surveillance assessment of:

- The US Atlantic Scallop Fishery.

To be awarded an MSC certificate for the fishery, the applicants agreed in a written contract to develop an action plan for meeting the required 'Conditions' against the performance indicators that scored below 80% in the initial assessment. The client submitted action Plans for each Condition and these were approved by Intertek Fisheries Certifications as the certification body of record.

The applicant also agreed in a written contract to be financially and technically responsible for surveillance visits by an MSC accredited certification body, which would occur at a minimum of once a year, or more often at the discretion of the certification body (based on the applicant's action plan or by previous findings by the certification body from annual surveillance audits or other sources of information).

### Acronyms used in this document

ASA	American Scallop Association
CAB	Certifying Assessment Body (MSC)
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
FAM	Fisheries Assessment Methodology (MSC)
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
NEFMC	New England Fisheries Management Council
NEFSC	New England Fisheries Science Center
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
PI	Performance Indicator (MSC)
SAMS	Scallop Area Management Simulator
SASI	Swept Area Seabed Impact
SMAST	School for Marine Science and Technology
SYM	Stochastic Yield Model

### Announcement of Surveillance Audit

An announcement of the surveillance site visit was published on the MSC website on November 6, 2014 to provide an opportunity to stakeholders to meet with or submit information on the fishery to the assessment team. Additionally, written notification was sent to the list of stakeholders representing the consultation plan during the initial assessment of this fishery and in many cases follow up mails were also made to ensure that stakeholders had been provided with sufficient opportunity to participate in consultation.

Ivan Mateo and Don Aldous conducted this first fishery surveillance audit.

Table 1 provides a list of the stakeholders and management organizations engaged in the process either through meetings, conference call or submission of information. These consultations focused on the questions and evidence that demonstrates the status of the US Atlantic Sea Scallop stock, the performance of the fishery throughout the year and measures that supported the fulfilment of the Conditions of Certification placed upon the American Scallop Association at the initial certification decision.

**Table 1.** Meetings with the following management and scientific organizations of the US Atlantic Scallop fishery that were held during December 8-12, 2014.

Organization	Attendees	Location	Date
Client meeting	John Whiteside	Dartmouth, MA	December 8, 2014
NEFMC	Deirdre Boelke Tom Nies	Newburyport, MA	December 9, 2014
NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Division	Travis Ford	Gloucester, MA	December 9, 2014
SMAST	Kevin Stokesbury	New Bedford, MA	December 11, 2014
NEFSC	Dvorah Hart	Woods Hole, MA	Dec 12, 2014

A number of scientific and meeting reports were also examined by the surveillance team in producing this report, as detailed in the information sources section.

## 2. The Surveillance Process

The Surveillance Audit followed the current version of MSC procedures and methodologies and implemented by SAI Global accredited MSC Procedures (QP).

MSC Scheme Document	Issue Date
MSC Certification Requirements version 1.3	January 14, 2013
MSC Guidance to the Certification Requirements version 1.3	January 14, 2013

The determination of the Surveillance level based on Table C3 and C4 was as follows:

- 1 point for use of the default assessment tree;
- 1 point for the four conditions;
- 2 points for a P2 score <85; and
- 2 points for a condition on an outcome PI.

The score was calculated by adding scores from sections 1-4 in Table C3

<b>Default Assessment tree used?</b>	
Yes	0
No	2
<b>2. Number of conditions</b>	
Zero conditions	0

Between 1-5 conditions	1
More than 5	2
<b>3. Principle Level Scores</b>	
≥85	0
<85	2
<b>4. Conditions on outcome Pls?</b>	
Yes	2
No	0

The surveillance score of 5 was used to identify the surveillance level appropriate to the fishery.

<b>Table C4: Surveillance Level Years after certification or recertification</b>					
<b>Surveillance score (from Table C3)</b>	<b>Surveillance level</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>
2 or more	Normal Surveillance	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit & recertification site visit

The surveillance audit was conducted as a normal annual onsite audit based on the score of 5.

The Surveillance Audit was comprised in general of:

1. A review and evaluation of the fishery status, scientific evaluation and changes to the management regime and regulation since the initial assessment with respect to confirming that the fishery continues to meet the MSC Principles and Criteria for certification.
2. A review and evaluation of the client activities and evidence that supports the implementation of the Action Plans agreed at the original certification of each fishery.

The surveillance audit consisted of the announcement to stakeholders and interested parties as required through the MSC website and more direct stakeholder contact with the original stakeholders that took part in the initial assessment and management organizations that comprise the management system and regime for American Scallop Association. Through this process, a stakeholder consultation plan was developed as part of the on-site assessment.

Individual letters were sent to stakeholders and management agencies, with follow up e-mails and information on the objectives of the surveillance audit. From this, a surveillance on-site meeting plan was organized and appointments for each individual meeting set. Due to the nature of the management of US Atlantic Sea Scallop, and the geographic location of the respective clients of American Scallop Association.

- On site Surveillance Audit dates were December 8-12, 2014.
- On-site audits were performed by Ivan Mateo (Lead Assessor) and, Don Aldous (Assessor).

Meetings generally consisted of a 90-180 minute discussion with a pre-set generic agenda used in each case. The agenda was set out so as to allow specific stakeholder interests and concerns to be

covered through a structured approach. Client fishery meetings had their own specific Agendas and consisted of a more lengthy exchange and consultation.

Information and notes from the consultation phase of the assessment were combined with a review of formal documentation from science and management agencies, regulatory amendments and the direct evidence collected during each of the client consultation meetings.

### **3. Summary of stakeholder and client meetings**

Arising out of the stakeholder consultation plan preparation a considerable number of stakeholders were contacted directly by surface mail and e-mail. Arising out of this process a final direct consultation plan for the audit was undertaken. Table 2 details the dates, meeting locations and organizations that were consulted through direct meetings or conference calls during the on-site surveillance assessment.

All meetings were conducted by the Surveillance Team Assessors.

**Table 2. Consultation Meetings during on Site Surveillance Assessment of the US Atlantic Scallop Fishery.**

Organization	Attendees	Location	Date	Purpose
Client meeting	John Whiteside	Dartmouth, MA	December 8, 2014	Collection of evidence for completion of milestones.
NEFMC	Deirdre Boelke Tom Nies	Newburyport, MA	December 9, 2014	Update on management and habitat impact. Collection of evidence for completion of milestones.
NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Division	Travis Ford	Gloucester, MA	December 9, 2014	Update on management issues. Collection of evidence for completion of milestones.
SMAST	Kevin Stokesbury	New Bedford, MA	December 11, 2014	Update on surveys and bycatch reporting. Collection of evidence for completion of milestones.
NEFSC	Dvorah Hart	Woods Hole, MA	Dec 12, 2014	Update on stock assessment.

## 4. Fishery observations

**Table 3.** Annual Catch Data.

		2013 (t)	2014 (preliminary) (t)
<b>Catch Data</b>	Total OFL established for the fishery in the most recent fishing year.	31,555	30,419
	Unit of Certification (UoC) share of the total TAC established for the fishery in the most recent fishing year.	Days fished are assigned rather than quota	Days fished are assigned rather than quota
	Client share of the total TAC established for the fishery in the most recent fishing year	Days fished are assigned rather than quota	Days fished are assigned rather than quota
	<b>Total green weight catch taken by the client group in the two most recent calendar years.</b>	<b>15,612</b>	<b>11,329</b>

## 5. Stock status observations

The following information was gleaned from the scallop stock assessment update in 2014. (NEFMC 2014a) with references in this section applicable to that document.

U.S. sea scallop landings were high and stable during 2003-2012, averaging about 25,000 mt meats, almost three times higher than the long-term 1950-1999 mean. Landings in 2013 declined to 18,641 mt meats, the lowest since 2000, but still over twice the long-term mean.

### Mortality from all sources

About 65% of landings during 2003-2012 were from the Mid-Atlantic region, 32% from Georges Bank, 2% from Southern New England and under 1% from the Gulf of Maine; the proportion from the Mid-Atlantic was higher than in earlier periods. A shift in the fishery towards Georges Bank occurred in 2013, when 64% of the landings were from Georges Bank, 32% from the Mid-Atlantic, 2% from Southern New England and 3% from the Gulf of Maine. Discards were highly variable with year and region. Maximum discards were 2553 mt meats in 2003. Discards have decreased since 2004, likely due to changes in gear regulations; estimated discards in 2013 were 437 mt meats. Incidental fishing mortality (mortality of scallops that interact with the gear but are not caught) is highly uncertain; based on two studies from the 1970s and 1980s, incidental fishing mortality on small scallops was estimated as 0.2 times fully recruited fishing mortality on Georges Bank, and 0.1 times fully recruited fishing mortality in the Mid-Atlantic. Natural mortality for all but the largest size group was estimated at 0.16 for Georges Bank and 0.2 for the Mid-Atlantic, an increase from 0.12 and 0.15, respectively, in the last assessment. Plus group natural mortality was estimated as 1.5 times that of smaller scallops.

### Survey Data

A scallop survey using a lined scallop dredge and a random-stratified design has been conducted every year since 1979 on Georges Bank and the Mid-Atlantic Bight.

Based on this survey, biomass and abundance remained relatively low from 1979-1995 on Georges Bank and 1979-1998 in the Mid-Atlantic. The indices rose dramatically starting in 1995 on Georges Bank and 1998 in the Mid-Atlantic, and were fairly stable from 2003-2009.

Decreases have been observed in both regions in recent years, although the indices are still well above levels observed previous to 1995. Paired tows experiments that compared dredge catches to densities observed using the HabCam towed camera system estimated the efficiency of the dredge as 0.41 on sand and 0.27 on gravel/cobble habitat (Appendix B4).

A video drop camera survey was conducted between 2003 and 2012 on Georges Bank and the Mid-Atlantic, using a systematic grid design. This survey generally shows declining trends, with biomass and abundance somewhat less than the expanded dredge survey.

A towed camera ("HabCam") survey was used for the first time in this assessment (Appendix B6). The survey was conducted during 2011-2013 on Georges Bank and 2012-2013 in the Mid-Atlantic. HabCam is towed behind a vessel, taking rapid-fire photographs of the sea bottom. Estimates from HabCam were obtained using a model-based approach, using a zero-inflated generalized additive model combined with kriging of the residuals. Biomass and abundance estimates from HabCam were similar to those from the dredge.

### **Environmental effects on recruitment**

Two putative environmental factors were explored as predictors of recruitment in the Mid-Atlantic Bight (Appendix B8). A tentative relationship was found between food supply (phytoplankton) and recruitment. Additionally, the spatio-temporal distribution of the sea star *Astropecten americanus*, a predator of small invertebrates, including juvenile sea scallops, appear to correlate to the spatio-temporal patterns of scallop recruitment in the southern Mid-Atlantic Bight.

### **Estimation of Fishing Mortality (F), Biomass, Recruitment**

A forward projecting size-structured estimation model (CASA) was used for estimation of biomass, fishing mortality and recruitment. Growth in the model was based on growth increment data from shell growth ring analysis. Three models were used, one each for the open and closed portions of Georges Bank, and a model for the Mid-Atlantic. The models appeared to give good estimation for some years, but in the Georges Bank Closed and Mid-Atlantic models, estimates of abundance and biomass had poor diagnostics in years associated with very strong year classes. Model estimated biomass and abundance generally declined, and fishing mortality increased, during 1975-1995. The biomass in the Georges Bank closed areas increased rapidly after these areas were closed to fishing in 1994.

Estimated biomass in Georges Bank open and the Mid-Atlantic increased more gradually as fishing mortality was slowly reduced starting around 1998. Estimated overall fully recruited fishing mortality in 2013 was 0.32, and biomass was estimated at 132,561 mt meats. This was slightly higher than direct expanded estimates from the dredge survey (129,113 mt meats) and HabCam (111,157 mt meats). Explorations were made in incorporating density-dependent mortality on juvenile scallops into the CASA model in order to better model the population dynamics of large year classes, and initial results appear to be promising.

### **Stock status definition**

The SYM (Stochastic Yield Model) was used to estimate reference points. This model explicitly takes into account parameter uncertainty, including key uncertainties in natural mortality and stock-recruit relationships, when estimating maximal sustainable yield (MSY) and the associated biomass and fishing mortality reference points BMSY and FMSY. Estimated whole stock MSY, FMSY and BMSY were 23,798 mt meats, 0.48 and 96,480 mt meats, respectively.

### **Evaluate stock status**

The estimated fishing mortality in 2013 was 0.32, which was below both the previous and new FMSY estimates (0.38 and 0.48, respectively). The estimated biomass in 2013 is 132,561 mt meats. The stock is considered overfished if the biomass is less than half of BMSY. BMSY was estimated as 125,358 in the previous assessment and 96,480 mt meats in this assessment. Thus, the 2013 stock biomass was above both

BMSY estimates.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the sea scallop stock was neither overfished nor was overfishing occurring in 2013, regardless of whether the previous or new reference points are used.

**Table 4.** From the Stock Status Update (NEFMC 2014a).

	SARC 50 (2010)	SARC 59 (2014)
OFL	$F = 0.38$	$F = 0.48$
ABC/ACL (25% chance of exceeding OFL)	$F = 0.32$	$F = 0.38$
ACT for LA fishery (25% chance of exceeding ABC)	$F = 0.28$	$F = 0.34$
Bmsy (1/2 Bmsy)	125,358 (62,679)	96,480 (48,240)

### Projections

Projections were conducted using the SAMS (Scallop Area Management Simulator), which models scallops on a relatively fine spatial scale in order to model effects such as closures and re-openings of areas. Example simulations, based on expected management during 2014-2016, predict gradual increases in biomass and landings.

## 6. Relevant changes to Legislation and Regulations

There were no changes to legislation or regulations since the fishery was originally assessed against the MSC criteria. Any changes in annual management plans are recorded in Section 7.

## 7. Relevant changes to Management Regime

The assessment report of the US Scallop Fishery was based on information up to January 2012. Since then there have been two Frameworks establishing the quotas and specific management measures for each of the subsequent years 2013 and 2014. In addition, Framework 26 is currently in draft (December 2014) providing the same for the 2015 year. Each of these three Frameworks is summarized here from information provided during the site visit.

**Framework 24** (NEFMC 2014b) sets specifications for the Atlantic sea scallop fishery for the 2013 fishing year, including days-at-sea allocations, individual fishing quotas, and sea scallop access area trip allocations. This action also sets default fishing year 2014 specifications, in case the New England Fishery Management Council delays the development of the next framework, resulting in implementation after the March 1, 2014, start of the 2014 fishing year, and transitional measures are needed. In addition, Framework 24 adjusts the Georges Bank scallop access area seasonal closure schedules, and because that changes exemptions to areas closed to fishing specified in the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, Framework 24 must be a joint action with that plan (Framework 49). Framework 24 also continues the closures of the Delmarva and Elephant Trunk scallop access areas, refines the management of yellowtail flounder accountability measures in the scallop fishery, makes adjustments to the industry-funded observer program, and provides more flexibility in the management of the individual fishing quota program.

**Framework 25** (NEFMC 2014c) sets specifications for the Atlantic sea scallop fishery for fishing year 2014, including days-at-sea allocations, individual fishing quotas, and sea scallop access area trip allocations. This action also sets precautionary default FY 2015 specifications, in case NMFS implements the next framework after the March 1, 2015, start of fishing year 2015, and the fishery must operate under transitional measures. Framework 25 also allows vessels to land pounds that went un-harvested in Closed Area I Access Area in 2012 and 2013 in a future year; develops Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic windowpane flounder accountability measures; and provides full-time scallop vessels the option to exchange their allocated Delmarva Access Area trip for 5 days-at-sea.

**Framework 26** (NEFMC 2014d) draft now, final in Spring May 2015

This framework to the Scallop Fishery Management Plan (FMP) sets fishery specifications for fishing year (FY) 2015 and default measures for FY 2016. The New England Fishery Management (Council) decided to develop a one-year action only, including default measures for Year 2 only (FY2016). This decision was made to set specifications for one year only since another action, the EFH Omnibus Amendment, is considering changes to closed areas that may or may not have impacts on scallop fishery specifications in the future. Final action for the EFH Omnibus Amendment is expected in early 2015 and it is expected to be implemented in the Fall of 2015. A subsequent scallop action could consider measures to address potential changes to scallop access areas on Georges Bank that may result from the EFH action. Following that, scallop specifications could then be set for FY2016 and FY2017 based on any new closed areas and scallop access areas.

**Habitat Plan Review** (NEFMC 2014e)

Prior efforts to minimize the adverse effects of Council-managed fisheries on essential fish habitat (EFH) were largely developed and implemented plan by plan, although fishery effects on EFH are cumulative across fishery management plans because fish and fishery distributions overlap across both species and plans. In 1999, NOAA Fisheries implemented the first Habitat Omnibus Amendment that addressed new Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act mandates in most New England Council FMPs. The amendment also identified and described EFH for the 18 species managed by the Council, major threats to EFH from both fishing and non-fishing related activities, and proposed conservation and enhancement measures and designated Habitat Areas of Particular Concern for Atlantic salmon and Atlantic cod. EFH Omnibus Amendment 2 is currently in development and public hearings were ongoing at the time of the surveillance audit. The plan includes the use of the Swept Area Seabed Impact (SASI) model for analyzing the effects of fishing on Essential Fish Habitat. This will be an important development in determining the impact of the scallop dredge fishery on habitat.

## **8. The General Conditions of Certification**

The general 'Conditions' set for each Certificate holder were as follows:

- ASA must recognize that MSC standards require regular monitoring inspections at least once a year, focusing on compliance with the 'Conditions' set forth in this report (as outlined below) and continued conformity with standards of certification;
- ASA must agree by contract to be responsible financially and technically for compliance with required surveillance audits by an accredited MSC certification body, as a contract must be signed and verified by a CAB prior to certification being awarded;
- ASA must recognize that MSC standards require a full-evaluation for certification (as opposed to yearly monitoring for update purposes) every five years;
- Prior to receiving final certification, ASA shall develop, an Action Plan for meeting the Condition for continued Certification and have it approved by a CAB.

During the surveillance audit the client was deemed to be in conformance with these general conditions of certification. Prior to the initial certification of the client fishery, an Action Plan was developed and submitted to the CAB by the client and accepted by the assessment team. During the surveillance audit, the audit team conducted an evaluation of progress made in meeting the conditions of certification and assessed whether there were any changes in management or science that would affect certification. Evidence collected during the audit site visit includes:

- Stock status updates for directed species and bycatch stocks;
- Statements collected during interviews; and
- Documents listed in section 1.

## 9. The Specific Conditions of Certification

During the initial assessment of the fishery, a conditional score was allocated for **4 Performance Indicators** of the MSC Default Scoring Tree. The original context and rationale is presented in Appendix 3 in detail and in summary below at the time of full assessment.

**A conditional score was assigned for the following Performance Indicators (PIs):**

Performance Indicator	PI	Fishery Name	Fishing Method	Score
2.2.3	Bycatch Species Information & monitoring	US Atlantic Scallop Fishery	New Bedford Dredge	75
2.4.1	Habitat outcome	US Atlantic Scallop Fishery	New Bedford Dredge	60
2.4.2	Habitat Management Strategy	US Atlantic Scallop Fishery	New Bedford Dredge	70
2.5.1	Ecosystem outcome	US Atlantic Scallop Fishery	New Bedford Dredge	60

**Table 5.** Table of Conditions, Action Plan and Observations from Evidence Collected during the Surveillance Audit.

<b>Item 5:</b>	<b>Condition 1 (of 4)</b>	
<i>Performance Indicator &amp; Guidepost Issue</i>	<b>PI 2.2.3: Information on the nature and amount of bycatch is adequate to determine the risk posed by the fishery and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage bycatch.</b>	Scoring issue 80b was not met  Information is sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.
<i>Condition 1</i>	<p><i>The client is required to ensure that by the third annual audit there is sufficient information collected on main bycatch species to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits, meeting the second scoring issue of SG80.</i></p> <p>The following milestones will be monitored during each surveillance audit:  <b>By the first annual audit the client will demonstrate that measures have been put in place to collect quantitative information concerning the main bycatch species in the scallop fishery.</b>  By the second annual audit the client will provide evidence of the quantitative information that has been collated for the main bycatch species in order to estimate their outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.  By the third annual audit the client will provide evidence that there is sufficient information collected on main bycatch species to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.</p> <p>The above provides incremental steps in achieving the condition. Only when the final step is complete will the team be able to provide a revised score. By the third annual audit the required minimum score is 80.</p>	
<i>Action Plan</i>	<p><b>By the first annual audit: The client will advocate, by writing to NEFMC and attend/participate in NEFMC meetings, to promote/encourage federal fishery managers to implement procedures to collect quantitative information concerning the main bycatch species of the fishery in order to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.</b></p> <p><b>At the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of this advocacy and the response/action that has been achieved.</b></p> <p>By the second annual audit: The client will have collated quantitative information concerning the main bycatch species of the fishery to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits. The client will provide a written report on the information that has been collated.</p> <p>By the third annual audit: The client will present evidence that there is sufficient information collected on the main bycatch species to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits, thereby meeting the second scoring issue of SG80.</p>	
<i>Evidence</i>	The initial assessment was conducted on the basis that there is one main bycatch species (winter flounder) that, since they are in an overfished condition in Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic States (NEFMC 2011), the stock is vulnerable to the fishery	

	<p>despite the fact that their catch is less than 5% of the total.</p> <p>The client provided no evidence of having initiated or completed the tasks associated with the first annual audit, although a log of activities during the past year indicates attendance at meetings of the New England Fisheries Management Council. There is no record that the client provided any advocacy in writing to the NEFMC on this issue.</p> <p>There is also no evidence indicating any progress towards meeting the second milestone for the first annual audit in that no advocacy was undertaken and no evidence of results were provided.</p> <p>During the audit interviews with the fishery managers and scientists, there was no evidence that the client had contacted anyone interviewed concerning this matter since the fishery was certified.</p>
<p><i>Conclusion and Outcome on Condition 1</i></p>	<p>The client is considered to be behind target in meeting of the first year milestone of this condition.</p> <p>The Surveillance Audit Team considers that the client has made variable degrees of progress relative to all of the requirements of the Client Action Plan - some more than others. However, progress against the conditions summarized in Table 5 is judged to be "behind target" as the evidence provided was deemed to be insufficient to raise the score to the SG80 level. Therefore, the conditions cannot be closed out at this particular time.</p> <p>Guidelines provided for the MSC v1.3 scheme document state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSC CR 27.22.8.1b - "The CAB shall document whether progress is 'on target', 'ahead of target' or 'behind target', as well as its rationale for such a judgment." Accordingly to (i), "If 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 at the next surveillance audit to achieve the original condition by the original deadline."</li> </ul> <p>The ramifications of any shortfalls with regards to a Condition is expected to include the implementation requirement specified by MSC CR section 27.22.9 which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSC CR 27.22.9 - "In the event that the CAB determines that progress against conditions is inadequate and/or a condition is not back 'on target' within 12 months of falling 'behind target', the requirements of 7.4 (suspension or withdrawal) shall be applied."</li> </ul> <p>Accordingly, based on MSC CR 27.22.8.1b, the Surveillance Audit Team has set revised milestones to bring the process back on track within 12 months to achieve the original condition by the original deadline. Under CR 7.4.3.4. the fishery has 1 year to respect commitments in the original action plan. Revised milestones have been set in the current surveillance audit and will be included in the next surveillance report. The assessment Team will evaluate if the progress against these revised milestones are back "on target" during the next surveillance audit (Please refer to Table 6). A remedial action plan designed to bring the fishery back into line with the milestones will include, by the second annual audit, clear specific evidence addressing each of the first year and second year milestones.</p> <p><b>Status of Condition 1: Open – Behind target.</b></p>

<b>Item 5:</b>	<b>Condition 2 (of 4)</b>	
<i>Performance Indicator &amp; Guidepost Issue</i>	<b>PI 2.4.1: The fishery does not cause serious or irreversible harm to habitat structure, considered on a regional or bioregional basis, and function.</b>	<p>SG 80 scoring issue a is not met:</p> <p>The fishery is highly unlikely to reduce habitat structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.</p>
<i>Condition 2</i>	<p>The client is required to present evidence by the fourth annual audit that the fishery is highly unlikely to reduce habitat structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.</p> <p>The following milestones will be monitored during each surveillance audit:  <b>By the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of representation to the management authority to advocate for further analysis and strategic options regarding the impact of the fishery on marine habitat.</b>  By the second annual audit the client will provide evidence of work to document the benthic habitat impact and recovery rates within the area in which the US limited access scallop fishery operates.  By the third annual audit the client will present a report of the habitat impacts of the fishery and the management measures being considered to meet the condition.  By the fourth annual audit the client will provide evidence that the fishery is highly unlikely to reduce habitat structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.  The above provides incremental steps in achieving the condition. Only when the final step is complete will the team be able to provide a revised score. By the fourth annual audit the required minimum score is 80.</p>	
<i>Action Plan</i>	<p><b>By the first annual audit: The client will advocate, by writing to NEFMC and attend/participate in NEFMC meetings, to promote/encourage federal fishery managers to use the Swept Area Seabed Impact model (SASI) to assess fishing effort impact on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) in the scallop grounds.</b></p> <p><b>At the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of this advocacy and the response/action that has been achieved.</b></p> <p>By the second annual audit: the client will have reviewed the results of the SASI / fishing impact assessment and will have begun to compile a report to document the benthic habitat impact and recovery rates within the area in which the US limited access scallop fishery operates.</p> <p>By the third annual audit: the client will provide a complete written report of the SASI / fishing impact on EFH assessment. If the EFH assessment concludes the fishery is highly likely to reduce habitat structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm, the client will show that management measures are being considered to avoid this.</p> <p>By the fourth annual audit: the client will provide written evidence to show that the fishery is highly unlikely to reduce habitat structure and function to a point where there</p>	

	would be serious or irreversible harm based on the expected results of the SASI assessment.
<i>Evidence</i>	<p>The client provided a List of Activities during 2014 (See Section 13) that included attendance of meetings of the NEFMC Habitat Committee where this topic would have been discussed.</p> <p>New England Council was able to confirm considerable involvement of the industry including members of the ASA in the many meetings leading to the development of the Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2, currently in draft.</p> <p>Also, The New England Council was able to confirm that the SASI model has been adopted as the tool being used to assess fishery impacts.</p>
<i>Conclusion and Outcome on Condition 2</i>	<p>This evidence is sufficient to conclude that the client has met the first year milestone of the action plan and is on target to meet this condition by the fourth annual audit as planned.</p> <p><b>Status of Condition 2: Open – On target.</b></p>

<b>Item 5:</b>	<b>Condition 3 (of 4)</b>	
<i>Performance Indicator &amp; Guidepost Issue</i>	<p><b>PI 2.4.2: There is a strategy in place that is designed to ensure the fishery does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to habitat types.</b></p>	<p>SG 80 scoring issues “a”, “b”, and “c” are not met:</p> <p>There is a partial strategy in place, if necessary, that is expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance or above.</p> <p>There is some objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or habitats involved.</p> <p>There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented successfully.</p>
<i>Condition 3</i>	<p>The client is required to demonstrate by the fourth annual audit that:</p> <p>There is a partial strategy in place that is expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance of PI 2.4.1.</p> <p>There is some objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or habitats involved.</p> <p>There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented successfully.</p> <p>The following milestones will be monitored during each surveillance audit:</p> <p><b>By the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of their representation to the management authority to advocate for further analysis and strategic options regarding the impact of the fishery on marine habitat.</b></p> <p>By the second annual audit the client will provide evidence of work to document the benthic habitat impact and recovery rates within the area in which the US limited access scallop fishery operates.</p> <p>By the third annual audit the client will present a report of the habitat impacts of the fishery and the management measures being considered to meet the condition.</p> <p>By the fourth annual audit, the client will demonstrate by the fourth annual audit that:</p> <p>There is a partial strategy in place that is expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance of PI 2.4.1.</p> <p>There is some objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or habitats involved.</p> <p>There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented successfully.</p> <p>The above provides incremental steps in achieving the condition. Only when the final step is complete will the team be able to provide a revised score. By the fourth annual audit the required minimum score is 80.</p>	

<p><i>Action Plan</i></p>	<p><b>By the first annual audit: The client will advocate, by writing to NEFMC and attend/participate in NEFMC meetings, to promote/encourage federal fishery managers to use the Swept Area Seabed Impact model (SASI) to assess fishing effort impact on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) in the scallop grounds.</b></p> <p><b>At the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of this advocacy and the response/action that has been achieved.</b></p> <p>By the second annual audit: The client will have reviewed the results of the SASI/fishing impact assessment and will have begun to compile a report to document the benthic habitat impact and recovery rates within the area in which the US limited access scallop fishery operates.</p> <p>By the third annual audit: The client will provide a complete written report of the SASI/fishing impact on EFH assessment. If the EFH assessment concludes the fishery is highly likely to reduce habitat structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm, the client will show that management measures are being considered to avoid this.</p> <p>By the fourth annual audit: The client will provide written evidence to show:  There is a partial strategy in place that is expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance of PI 2.4.1.  There is some objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or habitats involved.  There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented successfully.</p>
<p><i>Evidence</i></p>	<p>The client provided a List of Activities during 2014 (See Section 13) that included attendance of meetings of the NEFMC Habitat Committee where this topic would have been discussed.</p> <p>New England Council was able to confirm considerable involvement of the industry including members of the ASA in the many meetings leading to the development of the Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2, currently in draft.</p> <p>Also, The New England Council was able to confirm that the SASI model has been adopted as the tool being used to assess fishery impacts.</p>
<p><i>Conclusion and Outcome on Condition 3</i></p>	<p>This evidence is sufficient to conclude that the client has met the first year milestone of the action plan and is on target to meet this condition by the fourth annual audit as planned.</p> <p><b>Status of Condition 3: Open – On target.</b></p>

<b>Item 5:</b>	<b>Condition 4 (of 4)</b>	
<i>Performance Indicator &amp; Guidepost Issue</i>	<b>PI 2.5.1: The fishery does not cause serious or irreversible harm to the key elements of ecosystem structure and function.</b>	<p>The SG 80 scoring issue a is not met:</p> <p>The fishery is highly unlikely to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be a serious or irreversible harm.</p>
<i>Condition 4</i>	<p>The client is required to present evidence by the fourth annual audit that the fishery is highly unlikely to disrupt benthic communities structure and function to a point where there would be a serious or irreversible harm.</p> <p>The following milestones will be monitored during each surveillance audit:  <b>By the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of their representation to the management authority to advocate for further analysis and strategic options regarding the impact of the fishery on marine habitat.</b>  By the second annual audit the client will provide evidence of work to document the benthic habitat impact and recovery rates within the area in which the US limited access scallop fishery operates  By the third annual audit, the client uses the above information to evaluate the likely impacts of scallop dredge fishing on these key elements of the ecosystem. If unacceptable impacts are identified, by the fourth annual audit, the client implements new management strategies and measures to detect and manage ecosystem impacts of the fishery ensuring key elements are protected.  The above provides incremental steps in achieving the condition. Only when the final step is complete will the team be able to provide a revised score. By the fourth annual audit the required minimum score is 80.</p>	
<i>Action Plan</i>	<p><b>By the first annual audit: The client will advocate, by writing to NEFMC and attend/participate in NEFMC meetings, to promote/encourage federal fishery managers to use the Swept Area Seabed Impact model (SASI) to assess fishing effort impact on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) in the scallop grounds.</b></p> <p><b>At the first annual audit the client will provide evidence of this advocacy and the response/action that has been achieved.</b></p> <p>By the second annual audit: the client will have reviewed the results of the SASI / fishing impact assessment and will have begun to compile a report to document the benthic habitat impact and recovery rates within the area in which the US limited access scallop fishery operates.</p> <p>By the third annual audit: the client will provide a complete written report of the SASI / fishing impact on EFH assessment. If the EFH assessment concludes the fishery is highly likely to reduce benthic communities structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm, the client will show that management measures are being considered to avoid this.</p> <p>By the fourth annual audit: the client will provide written evidence to show that the fishery is highly unlikely to reduce benthic communities structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm based on the expected results</p>	

	of the SASI assessment.
<i>Evidence</i>	<p>The client provided a List of Activities during 2014 (See Section 13) that included attendance of meetings of the NEFMC Habitat Committee where this topic would have been discussed.</p> <p>New England Council was able to confirm considerable involvement of the industry including members of the ASA in the many meetings leading to the development of the Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2, currently in draft.</p> <p>Also, The New England Council was able to confirm that the SASI model has been adopted as the tool being used to assess fishery impacts.</p>
<i>Conclusion and Outcome on Condition 4</i>	<p>This evidence is sufficient to conclude that the client has met the first year milestone of the action plan and is on target to meet this condition by the fourth annual audit as planned.</p> <p><b>Status of Condition 4: Open – On target.</b></p>

**Table 6.** Remedial Action Plan for Proposed Milestones for Condition 1 (P1:2.2.3).

<i>Performance Indicator &amp; Guidepost Issue</i>	<b>PI 2.2.3: Information on the nature and amount of bycatch is adequate to determine the risk posed by the fishery and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage bycatch.</b>	<b>SG 80: Information is sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.</b>
<i>Condition(s) &amp; Milestone(s)</i>	<p><b>Second Annual Audit:</b>  By the second annual audit: The client will advocate, by writing to NEFMC and attend/participate in NEFMC meetings, to promote/encourage federal fishery managers to implement procedures to collect quantitative information concerning the main bycatch species of the fishery in order to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.</p> <p>During the second audit the client will provide evidence of this advocacy and the response/action that has been achieved with a logbook of activities.</p> <p>By the second annual audit: The client will have collated quantitative information concerning the main bycatch species of the fishery to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits. The client will provide a written report on the information that has been collated.</p>	
<i>Client Progress</i>		
<i>Evidence, Conclusion &amp; Outcome</i>		

An additional reporting requirement in each Surveillance Report to include details for any conditions that are raised during the surveillance audit that refer to conditions raised in the previous assessment(s), closed at some point during the (re)certification period, and which are being 're-raised' in the surveillance audit (CR section CG4).

There were no new conditions raised as a result of this first surveillance audit.

## 10. Harmonization of Certificates

The MSC wishes to discourage overlapping assessments to avoid potential financial, consistency and credibility costs, including:

- fisheries managers, scientists and stakeholders receiving duplicate requests for information
- duplication of costs for a fishery's certification, including that expense incurred by fishery management agencies pre- and post-certification; and
- the possibility of different assessments placing different conditions upon the same fisheries managers and upon different fishery clients.

The full assessment of this fishery did not identify any other overlapping certified fisheries requiring harmonization.

## 11. Conclusions and Recommendations

The assessment team conducting this 1<sup>st</sup> surveillance audit confirms that American Scallop Association have met the general requirements for continued certification to the MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing.

The assessment team also concludes that there is sufficient evidence and information provided by the clients and substantiated through the course of consultation meetings during the surveillance audit to confirm that commitment to meeting three of the four specific conditions of certification have been met. **The first year milestones for condition one, however are not met and we conclude the client is behind target meeting this condition.** The Surveillance Audit Team considers that the client has made variable degrees of progress relative to all of the requirements of the Client Action Plan - some more than others. However, progress against the conditions summarized in Table 5 is judged to be "behind target" as the evidence provided was deemed to be insufficient to raise the score to the SG80 level. Therefore, the conditions cannot be closed out at this particular time.

Guidelines provided for the MSC v1.3 scheme document state:

- MSC CR 27.22.8.1b - "The CAB shall document whether progress is 'on target', 'ahead of target' or 'behind target', as well as its rationale for such a judgement." Accordingly to (i), "If 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 at the next surveillance audit to achieve the original condition by the original deadline."

The ramifications of any shortfalls with regards to a Condition is expected to include the implementation requirement specified by MSC CR section 27.22.9 which states:

- MSC CR 27.22.9 - "In the event that the CAB determines that progress against conditions is inadequate and/or a condition is not back 'on target' within 12 months of falling 'behind target', the requirements of 7.4 (suspension or withdrawal) shall be applied."

Accordingly, based on MSC CR 27.22.8.1b, the Surveillance Audit Team has set revised milestones to bring the process back on track within 12 months to achieve the original condition by the original deadline. Under CR 7.4.3.4, the fishery has 1 year to respect commitments in the original action plan. Revised milestones have been set in the current surveillance audit and will be included in the next surveillance report. The assessment Team will evaluate if the progress against these revised milestones are back "on target" during the next surveillance audit (Please refer to Table 6)

A remedial action plan designed to bring the fishery back into line with the milestones will include, by the second annual audit, clear specific evidence addressing each of the first year and second year milestones. Therefore, the assessment team recommends that continued certification be awarded to the respective client fisheries with the understanding that this remedial action plan will be implemented.

SAI Global determines that the timelines and related Action Plans for the Condition placed on the client fisheries remain unchanged from the original conditions set and that these will be subject to annual surveillance audit, next scheduled in December 2015.

The surveillance score remains 5 therefore on-site surveillance audit will be necessary.

<b>Table C4: Surveillance Level Years after certification or recertification</b>					
<b>Surveillance score (from Table C3)</b>	<b>Surveillance level</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>
2 or more	Normal Surveillance	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit	On-site surveillance audit & recertification site visit

## **12. Outcome of SAI Global Assurance Services Decision**

SAI Global determines that:

- The US Atlantic Scallop Fishery continues to operate a well-managed and sustainable fishery and therefore, continued certification to the MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing is awarded.

### 13. Information Sources

#### Meetings:

Refer to table of meetings itemized in Section 3 (Table 2).

#### Reports & publications:

NEFMC (2014a) STOCK ASSESSMENT FOR ATLANTIC SEA SCALLOPS IN 2014, UPDATED THROUGH 2013  
<http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/crd/crd1409/partb.pdf>

NEFMC (2014b) Framework 24 to the Scallop FMP  
<http://www.nefmc.org/library/framework-24-1>

NEFMC (2014c) Framework 25 to the Scallop FMP  
<http://www.nefmc.org/library/framework-25-1>

NEFMC (2014d) Framework 26 to the Scallop FMP (draft)  
[http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/Draft-FW26\\_July2014\\_1.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/Draft-FW26_July2014_1.pdf)

NEFMC (2014e) Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2  
<http://www.nefmc.org/management-plans/habitat>

NEFMC (2014f) Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) Report for Fishing Year 2013  
<http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/SAFE-Report-for-Fishing-Year-2013.pdf>

NEFMC (2011) 52<sup>nd</sup> Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (52<sup>nd</sup> SAW) Assessment Report, US Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, 2011  
[http://archive.nefmc.org/tech/cte\\_mtg\\_docs/110914/GF%20Docs/7\\_PrePublication\\_Copy\\_SAW\\_52\\_Assess\\_Report\\_08092011-AOB-jw-b.pdf](http://archive.nefmc.org/tech/cte_mtg_docs/110914/GF%20Docs/7_PrePublication_Copy_SAW_52_Assess_Report_08092011-AOB-jw-b.pdf)

Client's Log of Activities for 2014.

## **Summary of evidence Submitted by Clients Specific to MSC Conditions**

The following documents were provided by the client prior to, at or immediately post the on-site surveillance audit.

### **Evidence submitted Client with reference to the Specific Conditions of Certification**

**Letters sent:** none provided

### **Log of activities undertaken by Client representative**

#### **Log of Activities**

##### **January 23, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Oversight Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/january-23-2014-oversight-committee-meeting>

##### **January 28-30, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Enforcement Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/index.php?p=library/enforcement-committee-report-january-2014>

##### **February 4-6, 2014, ASMFC Winter Meeting**

ACCSP

[http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Winter2014/ACCSPExecutiveCommittee\\_Supplemental.pdf](http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Winter2014/ACCSPExecutiveCommittee_Supplemental.pdf)

Spiny Dogfish and Coastal Sharks Management Board

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Winter2014/SpinyDogfishandCoastalSharksManagementBoard.pdf>

[http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Winter2014/SpinyDogfishCoastalSharksBoard\\_Presentations\\_Winter2014.pdf](http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Winter2014/SpinyDogfishCoastalSharksBoard_Presentations_Winter2014.pdf)

##### **February 11-13, 2014, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council meeting**

Omnibus Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC) Framework

[http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab\\_03\\_Omnibus\\_Acceptable\\_Catch\\_Framework.pdf](http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab_03_Omnibus_Acceptable_Catch_Framework.pdf)

##### **February 25-26, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Habitat Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/index.php?p=library/habitat-committee-february-2014>

##### **March 28, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Oversight Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/march-28-2014-groundfish-oversight-committee>

##### **April 1, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Advisory Panel <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/april-2-2014-groundfish-advisory-panel>

##### **April 4, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Oversight Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/april-3-2014>

**April 8-10, 2014, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council meeting**

SAW/SARC Presentation [http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-03\\_SAW\\_SARC-Presentation.pdf](http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-03_SAW_SARC-Presentation.pdf)

Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology Amendment [http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-09\\_SBRM.pdf](http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-09_SBRM.pdf)

Costs Associated with Current Observer Program [http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-10\\_Costs-Associated-with-Current-Observer-Program-p95r.pdf](http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-10_Costs-Associated-with-Current-Observer-Program-p95r.pdf)

**April 22-24, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Enforcement Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/index.php?p=library/enforcement-committee-report-april-2014>

**May 12-15, 2014, ASMFC Spring meeting**

Spiny Dogfish Management Board

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Spring2014/SpinyDogfishManagementBoard.pdf>

[http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Spring2014/SpinyDogfishBoard\\_Supplemental.pdf](http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Spring2014/SpinyDogfishBoard_Supplemental.pdf)

ACCSP <http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Spring2014/ACCSPExecutiveCommittee.pdf>

Law Enforcement Committee

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Spring2014/LawEnforcementCommittee.pdf>

**June 9, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Oversight Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/june-9-2014-groundfish-oversight-committee>

**June 10-14, 2014, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council meeting**

Omnibus Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC) Framework [http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-08\\_Omnibus-ABC-Framework.pdf](http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-08_Omnibus-ABC-Framework.pdf)

**June 17-19, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

**July 29, 2014, ASMFC Law Enforcement Committee**

**August 4, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Oversight Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/august-4-2014-groundfish-oversight-committee-meeting>

**August 5-7, 2014, ASMFC Summer Meeting**

Spiny Dogfish Management Board

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/SummerMeeting2014/SpinyDogfishManagementBoard.pdf>

[http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/SummerMeeting2014/SpinyDogfishBoardPresentations\\_Aug2014.pdf](http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/SummerMeeting2014/SpinyDogfishBoardPresentations_Aug2014.pdf)

ACCSP

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/SummerMeeting2014/ACCSPExecutiveCommittee.pdf>

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/SummerMeeting2014/ACCSPCoordinatingCouncil.pdf>

**August 7, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish PDT Meeting <http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/140807-A18-presentation.pptx>

**August 8, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Research Steering Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/august-8-2014-research-comiittee-meeting>

**August 12-14, 2014, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council meeting**

NOAA Office of Law Enforcement Report

U.S. Coast Guard Report

**September 2, 2014, ASMFC - MA DMF Public Hearing on Striped Bass Draft Addendum IV and Spiny Dogfish Draft Addendum V**

[http://www.asmfc.org/files/PublicInput/SpDogfishDraftAddendumV\\_PublicComment\\_Aug2014.pdf](http://www.asmfc.org/files/PublicInput/SpDogfishDraftAddendumV_PublicComment_Aug2014.pdf)

**September 3, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish PDT Meeting <http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/140908-GF-PDT-memo-to-SSC-re-GOM-Cod.pdf>

**September 16, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Advisory Panel <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/september-16-2014-advisory-panel>

**September 17-18, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Oversight Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/september-17-18-2014-oversight-committee-meeting>

**September 24, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish PDT Meeting

**September 30 – October 2, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Stock Assessment Review Committee [http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/3\\_SAW59\\_SummRpt-b.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/3_SAW59_SummRpt-b.pdf)

Groundfish Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/library/groundfish-september-2014>

Observer Policy Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/library/observer-policy-september-2014-1>

**October 7-9, 2014, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council meeting**

Spiny Dogfish Committee [http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-07\\_Spiny-Dogfish-Specifications.pdf](http://www.mafmc.org/s/Tab-07_Spiny-Dogfish-Specifications.pdf)

**October 15, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish PDT Meeting

**October 27-30, 2014, ASMFC Annual Meeting**

Law Enforcement Committee

<http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/LawEnforcementCommittee.pdf>

ACCSP [http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/ACCSP\\_ExecutiveCommittee.pdf](http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/ACCSP_ExecutiveCommittee.pdf)

Spiny Dogfish Management Board

[http://www.asafc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/SpinyDogfishBoard\\_1.pdf](http://www.asafc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/SpinyDogfishBoard_1.pdf)

[http://www.asafc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/SpinyDogfishBoard\\_Supplemental.pdf](http://www.asafc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/SpinyDogfishBoard_Supplemental.pdf)

[http://www.asafc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/SpinyDogfishBoardPresentations\\_Oct2014a.pdf](http://www.asafc.org/files/Meetings/Annual2014/SpinyDogfishBoardPresentations_Oct2014a.pdf)

**October 28, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish PDT Meeting

**November 12-13, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish Committee

[http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/1\\_141030-GF-OSC-memo-cover.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/1_141030-GF-OSC-memo-cover.pdf)

<http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/nov.-12-13-2014-groundfish-cte.-meeting>

[http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/5\\_141107\\_FW53\\_1.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/5_141107_FW53_1.pdf)

**November 18-20, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

NOAA Office of Law Enforcement Report

U.S. Coast Guard Report

**December 3, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Research Steering Committee <http://www.nefmc.org/calendar/dec.-3-2014-research-steering-cmte>

**December 9-11, 2014, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council meeting**

NOAA Office of Law Enforcement Report

U.S. Coast Guard Report <http://www.mafmc.org/s/MAFMC-01OCT14-30NOV14.pdf>

**December 10, 2014, New England Fishery Management Council meeting**

Groundfish PDT Meeting

## **APPENDIX 1: Stakeholder Comments**

The certification criteria include a requirement that CABs shall include all written submissions made by stakeholders during the annual surveillance audit process in full in the appendix of the annual Surveillance Reports, together with the explicit responses of the assessment team that identify:

There were no written submissions provided to the annual surveillance audit team during the site visit for the first annual surveillance audit.