

# MSC Variation Request Form



Version 2.0, 8 October 2014

MSC Variation Request Form v2.

## Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request

<b>Date submitted to MSC</b>	08 Feb 216
<b>Name of CAB</b>	Acoura
<b>Fishery Name</b>	Northern Ireland Pelagic Sustainability Group (NIPSG) Irish Sea-Atlantic mackerel, WOS herring & NS herring <a href="https://www.msc.org/track-a-fishery/fisheries-in-the-program/in-assessment/north-east-atlantic/northern-ireland-pelagic-sustainability-group-%28nipsdg%29-irish-sea-atlantic-mackerel-wos-herring-and-ns-herring">https://www.msc.org/track-a-fishery/fisheries-in-the-program/in-assessment/north-east-atlantic/northern-ireland-pelagic-sustainability-group-%28nipsdg%29-irish-sea-atlantic-mackerel-wos-herring-and-ns-herring</a>
<b>Lead Auditor/Programme Manager</b>	Andy Hough (NIPSG) Jason Combes
<b>Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested</b>	CR 1.3: 24.2.3.3  b. Review the outcomes of any scoring of the fishery previously undertaken <b>against the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements.</b>  c. Assess new information following all steps from scoring the fishery (27.10) <b>to peer review (27.14) against the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements.</b>  i. The team may limit the scope of this assessment to the re-scoring of those PIs for which there is new information and <b>for which the requirements have changed in the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements.</b>
<b>Is this variation sought in order to fulfil IPI</b>	No

<b>1. Proposed variation</b>
------------------------------

Requirements for sub sections of CR 1.3: A24.2.3 will not be applied
--

<b>2. Rationale/Justification</b>
-----------------------------------

The NIPSG fisheries assessment has encountered delays resulting from extensive and protracted harmonisation discussions in 2015 concerning the Mackerel component. More than 9 months elapsed between the site visit and the publication of the PCDR meaning CR V1.3 A24.2.3 (same as CR2.0 7.3.4.3) has not been complied with.

Acoura accept responsibility for this oversight. As a corrective action Acoura has followed the procedural steps of CR V1.3 A24.2.3

This variation requests that MSC permit the assessment to proceed without following the sub requirements within CR V1.3 A24.2.3 highlighted in bold, namely the need to apply the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements (CR2.0) and submit the slightly modified scores for Peer Review.

Given that the changes to the scoring do not have a significant impact, we propose to use only one of the original Peer Reviewers.

The clauses that we seek to vary from add unintended consequences as opposed to adding robustness in this assessment. Instead, the rescore would be limited to the CR1.3 tree. The justification is as follows

**Responsibility**

- The critical stage in the timeline was missed by the CAB, although it is noted that the delays were incurred as a result of internal and external factors. It is not reasonable for the fishery clients to bear the brunt of the consequences

**Time**

- The client, stakeholders and the MSC would rather avoid further delay

**Cost**

- Additional cost to the client

**Complexity**

- A provisional rescoring for Mackerel has been undertaken using CR1.3 with no significant impact on the outcome. An additional round of scoring to elements of the CR2.0 tree adds complexity especially in relation to the new PI 1.2.1 and particularly 1.2.1f
- If carried out then the assessment reports will contain a CR1.3 and CR2.0 hybrid scoring tree resulting in an additional level of complexity for future surveillances and harmonisation with, and against, other fisheries. Acoura believe this will prove detrimental to the clients (and

other fisheries) on an ongoing basis	
<b>3. Implications for assessment (required for fisheries assessment variations only)</b>	
The intention is to release the Public Comment Draft Report as soon possible and in line with the MINSA Mackerel assessment. This will avoid the need for harmonisation caused by differing procedural approaches.	
<b>4. Have the stakeholders of this fishery assessment been informed of this request? (required for fisheries assessment variations only)</b>	Stakeholders will be informed through the publication of this variation request and MSC response on MSC.org. Acoura will also inform the identified stakeholder community via email of the variation
<b>5. Further Comments</b>	
Nil	