

Introduction

Stakeholder input template

This template shall be used by stakeholders who wish to provide input into fisheries assessments.

To provide input on a fishery assessment, please complete sections 1 and 2 and email the template to the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) completing the assessment.

Section 3 is optional if you have further input.

Stakeholder input is most useful to the assessment team when it is attributed to a Performance Indicator (PI), which assessment teams use to score fisheries, in the 'Evaluation results' section of the report.

Objective evidence or references should be provided in support of any claims or any claimed errors of fact.

An alternative method of stakeholder input is through attendance at the site visit and discussion with the assessment team, whether in person or remote.

If the fishery you are wishing to provide input on is at Final Draft report stage, information on objections can be found on the MSC website.

Contact the **CAB** or **your local MSC Outreach representative** if you have questions on completing the template

Template format

The stakeholder input template is formatted to allow assessment teams to respond to all stakeholder input, and copy the tables into the reporting template for upload to the MSC website.

Please add each point to a new row for easier categorisation.

Use 'Alt + Enter' for line breaks within cells.

Any queries related to the template should be sent to standards@msc.org

Resources

[MSC Fisheries Standard](#)

[MSC Fisheries Certification Process](#)

Instructions for CABs and assessment teams

CABs should complete the CAB response columns shaded blue in each page, noting that only the options listed in the Codes page may be used in the CAB Response Code cells.

Stakeholder contact and assessment details

Category	Contact details
Title	Dr
First name*	Glen
Last name*	Holmes
Organisation*	The Pew Charitable Trusts
Email*	gholmes@pewtrusts.org
Department	International Fisheries
Job title	Officer
Description	Pew is an international non-profit organization, headquartered in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, that works on environmental, economic, and health policy at national, sub-national, and international levels.
Phone number	202-540-6953
Postal address	901 E St. NW, Washington, DC, USA 20004
Fishery name*	CFTO Indian Ocean Purse Seine Skipjack fishery
Certification body (CAB)*	Control Union Pesca (formerly MEC)
Assessment Stage*	Stakeholder input on the Announcement Comment Draft Report
Register*	I wish to register as a stakeholder - please keep me informed about each stage of the assessment process

Guidance
Optional
Please enter the legal or registered name of your organisation or company.
Optional
Optional
Optional description of your organisation
Optional
Optional
As the fishery appears in the Fisheries Update or on fisheries.msc.org.
Insert the stage of the assessment that you're providing input.
Please indicate whether you'd like to register as a stakeholder for this assessment.

Performance Indicator (PI) input

Performance Indicator (PI)	Input summary	Input detail	Evidence or references	Suggested score change	CAB response to stakeholder input	CAB response code
Performance Indicator - please copy and paste row and insert more than one row against a Performance Indicator	Summary sentence	Detail of stakeholder input	Objective evidence or references should be provided in support of any claims or claimed errors of fact.	If suitable, please provide a suggested score change based on your input and evidence - Optional	The CAB shall respond in this column. CAB responses should include details of where different changes have been made in the report (which section it falls etc.)	The CAB shall assign a response code to each row completed by the stakeholder.
Principle 1 - Sustainable fish stocks						
1.1.1 - Stock status						
1.1.2 - Stock rebuilding						
1.2.1 - Harvest strategy						
		For this SI to receive a score of SOG6, "The harvest strategy is likely to work based on prior experience or plausible argument." Plausible experience shows that the harvest strategy is NOT likely to work. As noted in the report, the 2018 skipjack catch was 129% of the limit set under the HCR, which continues an increasing trend of catch from both the USA (15,609 mt in 2015 to 34,185 mt in 2018) and of the overall IOTC fleet (44,723 mt in 2016 to 107,701 mt in 2018). Therefore the harvest strategy, which now primarily relies on a catch limit, has been shown, with direct evidence, to neither be able to restrict the overall IOTC catch to the level set by the HCR (470,029 in 2018) or to the level that corresponds to the ETRP (approximately 527,000 mt). Based on direct evidence of fishing activity in previous years and specifically the past year, the harvest strategy is NOT likely to work. Increases in catch in 2017 and 2018 have also likely pushed the stock below the TRP, based on the fact that they were at or exceeded the ETRP, and that there was already a 51/48 chance the stock was below the TRP in 2016. Alternative tools cited in the report are unlikely to effectively work to restrict skipjack catch. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Yellowfin catch reductions will actually drive an increase in skipjack catch- The number of supply vessels will not have a direct effect on skipjack catch- The number of active boats does not restrict the number of overall FADs that can be placed in the water each year or the number of sets that can be made, and therefore has no direct effect on the skipjack catch	Report of the 21st Working Party on Tropical Tuna and datasets of WPPT21 https://www.ilo.org/wpt21/working-party-tropical-tuna-wp21	-40		
1.2.1 - Harvest Strategy Evaluation						
1.2.2 - Harvest control rules and tools (i) HCRs evaluation		The evidence shows that the HCR has NOT been effective in controlling exploitation To determine if the HCR is effective in controlling exploitation, catch should be compared to the ETRP, not to EMDY, as the goal of the harvest strategy and HCR is to maintain the stock at the TRP and catch below the ETRP. (Paragraph 5 of Res 16/02 states "The HCR described in paragraphs 6–12 seeks to maintain the Skipjack tuna stock biomass at, or above, the target reference point while avoiding the limit reference point", where the TRP is 0.480 and the LRP=0.285.) Using this more appropriate measuring stick, it is clear the the HCR has been unable to limit the catch in the most recent year to the ETRP or to the catch limit set for 2015. Therefore this SI does not meet the SOG6 requirement that the "HCRs are effective in controlling exploitation."	IOTC Resolution 16/02	-40		
1.2.2 - Harvest control rules and tools						
1.2.3 - Information and monitoring						
1.2.4 - Assessment of stock status						
Principle 2 - Minimising environmental impacts						
2.1.1 - Primary species outcome						
2.1.2 - Primary species management						
2.1.3 - Primary species information						
2.2.1 - Secondary species outcome						
2.2.2 - Secondary species management						
2.2.3 - Secondary species information						
2.3.1 - ETP species outcome						
2.3.2 - ETP species management						
2.3.3 - ETP species information						
2.4.1 - Habitats outcome						
2.4.2 - Habitats management strategy						
2.4.3 - Habitats information						
2.5.1 - Ecosystem outcome						
2.5.2 - Ecosystem management strategy						
2.5.3 - Ecosystem information						
Principle 3 - Effective management						
3.1.1 - Legal and/or customary framework						
3.1.2 - Consultation, roles and responsibilities						
3.1.3 - Long term objectives						
3.2.1 - Fishery-specific objectives						
3.2.2 - Decision-making processes						
3.2.3 - Compliance and enforcement						
3.2.4 - Monitoring and management performance evaluation						

Coding options to be used by CABs

Options are provided in the tables below for CAB responses

The options in the blue shaded cells in this page are provided as drop-down selections in the main table:
Justifications for each of the values selected should be given in the relevant 'CAB response' columns in

CAB response coding

Table	Performance Indicator comments
Variable	PRDR CAB response code
Preamble	Stakeholder input is:
Coding options	Accepted (no score change) Accepted (score increased) Accepted (non-material score reduction) Accepted (material score reduction to <80) Accepted (material score reduction to <60) Not accepted (no score change)

Version control

Version	Date of publication
1.0	Monday, February 7, 2011
2.0	Wednesday, April 15, 2015
3.0	Monday, December 17, 2018

Copyright notice

The Marine Stewardship Council “Template for Stakeholder Input into Fishery Assessments v3.0” and its content is copyright of “Marine Stewardship Council” - © “Marine Stewardship Council” 2018. All rights reserved.