



2017-05-18

Faroe Islands Queen Scallop Fishery

Marine Stewardship Council Fishery Standards

Conformity Assessment Body: Vottunarstofan Tún ehf.

Client Corrective Action Plan to Address Causes of Suspension

The suspension of the certificate of this fishery and its causes were announced on the MSC website on the 3rd of January 2017. At the 3rd annual surveillance of the fishery, the assessment team concluded that progress against condition 4 and condition 5 remained behind target, 12 months after initially falling behind target, thus triggering suspension as required by clause 7.23.13.2 of MSC's Fisheries Certification Requirements (FCR) v2.0.

The fishery client has provided a plan of corrective action, addressing the causes of the suspension within the timeframe set by MSC's FCR, see appendix.

Information on this fishery are available on MSC's website:

<https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/faroe-islands-queen-scallop/@assessments>.

Vottunarstofan Tún ehf.

Fisheries Program Manager

Email: tun@tun.is

Tel.: +354 511 1330

Appendix:
Faroe Islands Queen Scallop fishery:
Client Corrective Action Plan to Address Causes of Suspension

Table 1: Condition 4

Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
	3.2.4	The fishery has a research plan that addresses the information needs of management	75 70
Rationale	<p><u>SG80a:</u> “A research plan provides the management system with a strategic approach to research and reliable and timely information sufficient to achieve the objectives consistent with MSC’s Principles 1 and 2.”</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u> To justify a score of 80, a research plan for the fishery must be provided.</p> <p><u>Previous conditions raised:</u> The fishery failed a previous assessment and this PI scored 60. For a failed fishery, no mandatory conditions or defined actions are specified (CR 27.21.3.1). The Public Certification Report (PCR) is required to outline draft and non-binding conditions for relevant PI’s. However, no conditions are found in the PCR, only in the Public Comment Draft Report. However, PCRs of failed fisheries are not to include any agreement from the client to address conditions (CR27.21.3.4).</p>		
Condition	A research plan for the fishery must be provided.		
Milestones	<p><u>Milestone 1:</u> At the first annual surveillance, a draft research plan shall be presented. Resulting score: 70</p> <p><u>Milestone 2:</u> At the second annual surveillance, the client shall provide a research plan for the fishery. Resulting score: 80</p>		
Client action plan	We as a company will contact both the Faroe Marine Research Institute and the Ministry of Fisheries in order to have monitoring formalized. We will also request a formal research plan and in this relation put our vessel fully equipped and crewed at disposal at no cost.		
Progress on Condition [Year 3]	<p>At the time of the 1st surveillance audit, the intent of this condition was clarified and it was stated that at the time of the 2nd surveillance audit that evidence should be provided that all of the outstanding research requirements as detailed in that surveillance had been planned (and in many cases already initiated). For example, outlining the research to be undertaken, detailing the responsible individuals / organisations and setting out how this will be funded.</p> <p>However, since the time of the last surveillance audit and indeed since the suspension of the fishery only limited research of relevance to the Faroes Queen Scallop fishery has been undertaken and no evidence of how this and other on-going research requirements were / are planned, funded or initiated has been presented. This in spite of a number of evident outstanding research gaps. This includes research highlighted at the time of the 2nd annual surveillance as being critical to address ‘behind target’ conditions, and which ultimately contributed to the suspension of the fishery.</p> <p>The clients Fishery Manual for the Faroese Queen Scallop Fishery identified the challenge in undertaking research and simply state that “Our research plan is (what we have stated under condition 3) to ensure a good field registration and to urge for more habitat studies with an involvement of FAMRI. We are steadily improving the</p>		

	<p>documentation of catch, bycatch and trash and we will get it reviewed by FAMRI or other competent capacity”.</p> <p>This statement and commitment are not adequate to meet the 2nd annual milestone and does not enable the performance indicator to be rescored.</p> <p>As noted at the time of the last assessment the FAMRI do produce an annual research plan for all Faroese Marine and fisheries research which is the subject of an annual contract between FAMRI and the Ministry of Fisheries. Although this could feature research of relevance to the Queen Scallop fishery, there is no fishery specific research included in this plan for the current planning period.</p> <p>Given the lack of fishery specific focus in this FAMRI research plan this does not provide evidence in support of the 2nd annual milestone so does not enable the performance indicator to be rescored.</p>
Status of condition	<p><u>This condition is concluded to be ‘Behind target’ for the second year running.</u></p> <p>This certification process has identified a number of areas where research is required. There are likely to be other areas of on-going research which should also contribute to informed management. This research needs to be identified, strategically and coherently planned, managed and funded to contribute to on-going management oversight in this fishery.</p> <p>Remedial action: A CAB is required to specify remedial action where a condition is behind target. However, a CAB must also remain independent and not provide explicit advice recognising that there may be a variety of ways of achieving the requirements of a condition. Furthermore, the description and milestones set out in the condition above already provide a structured remedial process.</p> <p>It is not clear what remedial action can be specified here as the condition and milestones are fairly self-explanatory. However, the assessors draw the fishery client’s attention to the requirements for this PI in the MSC CRv1.3. In particular, CB4.10.3, which states that “(Assessment) teams shall interpret a “research plan” in both SG80 and SG100 to mean a written document that includes a specific research plan for the fishery under assessment relevant to the scale and intensity and the issues requiring research”.</p>
Client Action	<p>The client has made an agreement with the Faroe Marine Research Institute (FMRI). FMRI will compose a research plan for the fishery of queen scallops. FMRI expects this research plan to be finish by the end of june 2017.</p>

Table 2. Condition 5

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	3.2.5	There is a system of monitoring and evaluating the performance of the fishery-specific management system against its objectives. There is effective and timely review of the fishery-specific management system	75 70
Rationale	<p>SG80b: “The fishery-specific management system is subject to regular internal and occasional external review.”</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u> The annual review processes have both internal and external elements. The Minister may commission an external review of a specific element of the management system, but there is no formal mechanism that requires such action on a regular basis</p>		

	<p>and it has not happened in recent years for the scallop fishery. For this reason, the score has been reduced.</p> <p><u>Previous conditions raised:</u> The fishery failed a previous assessment and this PI scored 75. For a failed fishery, no mandatory conditions or defined actions are specified (CR 27.21.3.1). The Public Certification Report (PCR) is required to outline draft and non-binding conditions for relevant PI's. However, no conditions are found in the PCR, only in the Public Comment Draft Report. However, PCRs of failed fisheries are not to include any agreement from the client to address conditions (CR27.21.3.4).</p>
Condition	Formal mechanisms to review the fishery must be implemented. These mechanisms should provide for internal reviews on a regular basis and occasionally external review.
Milestones	<p><u>Milestone 1:</u> At the first annual surveillance the client shall provide evidence that formal mechanisms for internal review of the fishery-specific management system have been initiated. <u>Resulting score:</u> 70</p> <p><u>Milestone 2:</u> At the second annual surveillance, the client shall provide evidence that formal mechanisms for internal review of the fishery-specific management system have been implemented and the mechanisms for occasional external review has been initiated. <u>Resulting score:</u> 70</p> <p><u>Milestone 3:</u> At the fourth and final annual surveillance evidence of an external review of the fishery shall be presented. <u>Resulting score:</u> 80</p> <p><i>An internal review of the fishery shall be maintained for the period of certification.</i></p>
Client action plan	We as a company will contact the Faroe Marine Research Institute and the Ministry of Fisheries in order to have implemented a formal review mechanism evaluating the performance of the management system.
Progress on Condition [Year 3]	<p>A review was undertaken immediately prior to last year's 2nd surveillance audit (Ridao Cruz 2015) which provided a summary of landings and to a lesser extent effort and catch sizes. Prior to this 3rd surveillance another short review was undertaken by the same author, primarily focused on CPUE – which is reflected in the scoring of Condition 2.</p> <p>Both reviews were very focussed on catch and effort data alone (i.e. a proxy stock assessment). The scope of these did not include consideration a wider range of relevant management issues or advice, nor did it review the efficacy and appropriateness of the management system, which might normally be expected to be part of a fishery evaluation, such as the appropriateness of management controls (i.e. TAC in the Northern areas but not in the Eastern Area) or the merits of issuing a further exploratory licence in the south, or of changes to gear configuration.</p> <p>It is understood that the 2015 review was requested and funded by the fishery client, perhaps in anticipation of the MSC surveillance audit, and carried out by FAMRI. This did not seem to be as a result of a 'formal mechanism for internal review of the fishery-specific management system'.</p> <p>As noted at the time of the 1st surveillance audit a letter was sent on 30th April 2013, by Ulla Wang (special adviser within the Ministry of Fisheries) to O.C Joensen (the client fishery) which states:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"The Ministry of Fisheries will annually review the management system for the Faroese queen scallop fishery. This will be based on the scientific report from the Faroese Marine Research Institute as well as information from the industry involved. Every 5 years the Ministry of Fisheries will also initiate an external review of the management system for the queen scallop fishery".</i></p> <p>In spite of this Ministerial commitment neither the review for the 2014/15 fishery nor that of the 2015/16 fishery was as a result of this formal process, nor did it cover all</p>

	<p>areas referred to in this letter (i.e. the <i>management system</i>). The Ministry confirmed that no review of the fishery has been undertaken by them since the time of the last surveillance in August 2015. In addition, the Ministry have confirmed that no plans are currently in place for external review of the fishery.</p>
<p>Status of condition</p>	<p>Given that the reviews which have been undertaken since certification have taken a narrow focus on landings and effort and are not the result of the management process; and given that the focus of the review for this Performance Indicator should be the “fishery specific management system”, it is concluded that this does not meet the intent of the 2nd milestone. <u>It is therefore concluded that this condition is Behind target for the 2nd year running.</u></p> <p>Remedial action: A CAB is required to specify remedial action where a condition is behind target. However, a CAB must also remain independent and not provide explicit advice recognising that there may be a variety of ways of achieving the requirements of a condition. Furthermore, the description and milestones set out in the condition above already provide a structured remedial process.</p> <p>Again, it is not clear what remedial action can be specified here as the condition and milestones are fairly self-explanatory. However, the assessors would highlight that fulfilment of this condition is likely to require input from the Ministry of Fisheries – as was committed to in the letter of 30th April 2013. One sensible approach (which would tie in with earlier conditions) could be for all management of the fishery to be defined in a management plan – which is then the subject of review, as per the requirements of this PI.</p>
<p>Client Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Internal review of the fishery specific management system will be conducted by the Ministry or other independent expert (with or without involvement of the FMRI). (b) That this internal review will be completed within a few months (before surveillance). (c) A renewed commitment to external review being conducted; from the text of the condition one must deduct that this condition is most likely to require input from the Ministry or independent expert. (d) FMRI expects to deliver this by Q1 2018. A letter confirming this is under way from FMRI – a copy will be forwarded ASAP.

End of document