



**First Annual Surveillance Report
Gulf of Alaska (GOA) Pacific Cod Fishery
– Longline, Trawl, Pot and Jig**

Certificate Nos:

Longline	MML-F-071
Trawl	MML-F-073
Pot	MML-F-072
Jig	MML-F-070

Moody Marine Ltd.

Authors:

Jake Rice, Don Bowen, Susan Hanna, Paul Knapman

Moody Marine Ltd
815 – 99 Wyse Road
Dartmouth
Nova Scotia
B3A 4S5
CANADA

Tel: (1) 902 422 4551
Fax: (1) 902 422 9780
Email: enquiries@moodymarine.com
Web Site: www.moodyint.com

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

Scope against which the surveillance is undertaken: MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing as applied to the Pacific Cod Longline, Trawl, Pot and Jig Fishery.

Species: Pacific cod (*Gadus macrocephalus*)

Area: Gulf of Alaska (GOA)

Methods of capture: Longline, Trawl, Pot and Jig

Date of Surveillance Visit:	9-13th May 2011			
Initial Certification	Date: 22nd January 2010		Certificate Nos.: Longline MML-F-071 Pot MML-F-072 Trawl MML-F-073 Jig MML-F-070	
Surveillance stage	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Surveillance team:	Lead Auditor: Paul Knapman Team members: Jake Rice, Don Bowen, Susan Hanna			
Company Name: Address:	Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation Inc 431 W Seventh Avenue Suite 106 Anchorage Alaska AK 99501			
Contact 1	Jim Browning			
Tel No: E-mail address:	Tel: +1 907 276 7315 jbrowning@afdf.org			

2.0 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report contains the findings of the first surveillance audit in relation to the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundations (AFDF) Pacific Cod Fishery – longline, trawl, pot and jig - in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA). The surveillance audit was carried out in accordance with the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Certification Methodology (FCM) Version 6 (1).

An announcement of the surveillance site visit was sent to recognised stakeholders on 14th April 2011 and published on the MSC website advising stakeholders that the audit site visit would take place the week of 9th May. (See appendix A).

The surveillance team – Jake Rice, Don Bowen, Susan Hanna and Paul Knapman - met with members of the client group and staff at the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) (National Marine Fisheries Service – NOAA Fisheries) between 10th and 12th May 2011. Information and evidence was gathered on the status of the stock, the performance of the fishery throughout the year, measures to meet the Conditions of Certification and changes in management.

The following section is set out as a table within which general information about the status of the stock and the fishery for this reporting period is provided along with the surveillance team's observations, conclusions and recommendations on the current status of the fishery and the client's progress toward meeting the Conditions of Certification.

The table includes the original assessment scoring guideposts and scoring commentary and the requirements of the original Condition alongside the heading 'Activity assessed'. This identifies the areas in which the fishery was determined to perform below the level required by the MSC standard during the initial assessment, and the required actions to address these issues.

As required by the MSC certification methodology, AFDF produced an Action Plan setting out the stages involved in addressing the Conditions raised. This is set out in the table alongside the heading 'AFDF Action Plan'.

According to the terms of the Action Plan, the client has provided information on the work undertaken to date.

This progress has been evaluated by the Moody Marine surveillance team ('Observations' and 'Conclusion') against:

1. the commitments made in the Action Plan;
2. the intent of the original Condition; and,
3. the original scoring indicator, guideposts and commentary.

The influence of any overall legislative and management changes in the fishery are also taken into consideration.

When the Condition has been judged to have been met, a re-evaluation of the scoring allocated to the relevant Performance Indicator(s) in the original MSC assessment will be included within the evaluation, and if the score is 80 or more, then the Condition is closed.

	Comments																																																																																																																																			
	Stock status																																																																																																																																			
Activity assessed	<p>Moody Marine asked AFDF to prepare an update on the GOA Pacific cod stock status for 2010. The intent of this section is to bring background information up to date and so to allow subsequent condition information to be evaluated in light of the current situation.</p> <p>The principle results from the 2010 stock assessment are presented in the table below :</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Quantity/Status</th> <th colspan="2">Last year</th> <th colspan="2">This year</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>M (natural mortality)</td> <td>0.38</td> <td>0.38</td> <td>0.38</td> <td>0.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Specified/recommended Tier</td> <td>3a</td> <td>3a</td> <td>3a</td> <td>3a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Projected biomass (ages 3+)</td> <td>701,200</td> <td>684,200</td> <td>428,000</td> <td>401,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female spawning biomass (t)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Projected</td> <td>117,600</td> <td>148,100</td> <td>124,100</td> <td>111,900</td> </tr> <tr> <td> $B_{100\%}$</td> <td>291,500</td> <td>291,500</td> <td>256,300</td> <td>256,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td> $B_{40\%}$</td> <td>116,600</td> <td>116,600</td> <td>102,500</td> <td>102,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td> $B_{35\%}$</td> <td>102,000</td> <td>102,000</td> <td>89,700</td> <td>89,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F_{OFL}</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>0.51</td> <td>0.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$maxF_{ABC}$</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>0.42</td> <td>0.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Specified/recommended F_{ABC}</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>0.42</td> <td>0.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Specified/recommended OFL (t)</td> <td>94,100</td> <td>116,700</td> <td>102,600</td> <td>92,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Specified/recommended ABC (t)</td> <td>79,100</td> <td>97,900</td> <td>86,800</td> <td>78,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is the stock being subjected to overfishing?</td> <td>No</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>No</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is the stock currently overfished?</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is the stock approaching a condition of being overfished?</td> <td>No</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>No</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Summary of the Pacific cod catches in the GOA by fleet sector and gear type. All Catches include discards.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6" style="text-align: center;">Federal</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Trawl</th> <th>Longline</th> <th>Pot</th> <th>Other</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>13,618</td> <td>14,066</td> <td>11,576</td> <td>559</td> <td>39,820</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>19,401</td> <td>16,253</td> <td>20,135</td> <td>1,663</td> <td>57,452</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="6" style="text-align: center;">State</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>0</td> <td>312</td> <td>10,293</td> <td>2,497</td> <td>13,102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>0</td> <td>313</td> <td>14,316</td> <td>4,090</td> <td>18,719</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quantity/Status	Last year		This year		2010	2011	2011	2012	M (natural mortality)	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	Specified/recommended Tier	3a	3a	3a	3a	Projected biomass (ages 3+)	701,200	684,200	428,000	401,300	Female spawning biomass (t)					Projected	117,600	148,100	124,100	111,900	$B_{100\%}$	291,500	291,500	256,300	256,300	$B_{40\%}$	116,600	116,600	102,500	102,500	$B_{35\%}$	102,000	102,000	89,700	89,700	F_{OFL}	0.60	0.60	0.51	0.51	$maxF_{ABC}$	0.49	0.49	0.42	0.42	Specified/recommended F_{ABC}	0.49	0.49	0.42	0.42	Specified/recommended OFL (t)	94,100	116,700	102,600	92,300	Specified/recommended ABC (t)	79,100	97,900	86,800	78,200	Is the stock being subjected to overfishing?	No	n/a	No	n/a	Is the stock currently overfished?	No	No	No	No	Is the stock approaching a condition of being overfished?	No	n/a	No	n/a	Federal						Year	Trawl	Longline	Pot	Other	Total	2009	13,618	14,066	11,576	559	39,820	2010	19,401	16,253	20,135	1,663	57,452	State						2009	0	312	10,293	2,497	13,102	2010	0	313	14,316	4,090	18,719
Quantity/Status	Last year		This year																																																																																																																																	
	2010	2011	2011	2012																																																																																																																																
M (natural mortality)	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38																																																																																																																																
Specified/recommended Tier	3a	3a	3a	3a																																																																																																																																
Projected biomass (ages 3+)	701,200	684,200	428,000	401,300																																																																																																																																
Female spawning biomass (t)																																																																																																																																				
Projected	117,600	148,100	124,100	111,900																																																																																																																																
$B_{100\%}$	291,500	291,500	256,300	256,300																																																																																																																																
$B_{40\%}$	116,600	116,600	102,500	102,500																																																																																																																																
$B_{35\%}$	102,000	102,000	89,700	89,700																																																																																																																																
F_{OFL}	0.60	0.60	0.51	0.51																																																																																																																																
$maxF_{ABC}$	0.49	0.49	0.42	0.42																																																																																																																																
Specified/recommended F_{ABC}	0.49	0.49	0.42	0.42																																																																																																																																
Specified/recommended OFL (t)	94,100	116,700	102,600	92,300																																																																																																																																
Specified/recommended ABC (t)	79,100	97,900	86,800	78,200																																																																																																																																
Is the stock being subjected to overfishing?	No	n/a	No	n/a																																																																																																																																
Is the stock currently overfished?	No	No	No	No																																																																																																																																
Is the stock approaching a condition of being overfished?	No	n/a	No	n/a																																																																																																																																
Federal																																																																																																																																				
Year	Trawl	Longline	Pot	Other	Total																																																																																																																															
2009	13,618	14,066	11,576	559	39,820																																																																																																																															
2010	19,401	16,253	20,135	1,663	57,452																																																																																																																															
State																																																																																																																																				
2009	0	312	10,293	2,497	13,102																																																																																																																															
2010	0	313	14,316	4,090	18,719																																																																																																																															
Observations	<p>The GOA cod plan team updated all time series of abundance and biological sampling from surveys and commercial catches, and examined a large number of different analytical formulations of the assessment model. Five models were reviewed and three considered in the final assessment. Results of the final assessment produced downward revisions slightly larger than 10% for the key management reference benchmarks, compared to the estimates of the reference benchmarks in 2009. Estimates of fishable biomass of 428 kmt and spawning biomass of 124 kmt represent larger reductions; approximately 35 % and 15% respectively, from the same estimates in the 2009 assessment. However the 2011 SSB is still more than 20% larger than the B40% for this stock, and has increased slightly more than 20% from a historical low in the mid 2000s. The year classes in the 2005-2007 were average or large compared to those observed since the early 1980s, but the 2008 year class is the smallest in the time series. The recommended ABC of 86,800 t is consistent with the current harvest control rule, and has been accepted for management.</p>																																																																																																																																			
Conclusions	The stock is not overfished nor at risk of being overfished in the near future.																																																																																																																																			

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator 1.3.1.2 (GOA longline, trawl and pot fisheries) Does information indicate any changes in structure that would alter reproductive capacity?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 Data strongly indicate a robust age, sex and genetic structure in the stock, such as would maintain reproductive capacity.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 Evidence exists that the fishery has not caused changes in stock structure that would affect recruitment. Or potentially adverse changes in structure are clearly identified and effective remedial measures are in place.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 Changes in stock structure have been detected but there is no evidence of negative effect on recruitment of the stock. Or potentially adverse changes in structure are identified and remedial measures are in the process of implementation over defined timeframes.</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale Baseline and subsequent routine stock structure analyses have not been conducted for Pacific cod in GOA that would permit structural change to be observed. The survey catch is measured and aged so some data to address this must be available to address this issue. Stark et al. 2007 provide an analysis of growth and maturation for GOA cod but temporal (as opposed to seasonal) changes were not reported. It is interesting to note that a study was published in the 1960's (Ketchen, K.S. 1964. Preliminary results of studies on a growth and mortality of Pacific cod (<i>Gadus macrocephalus</i>) in Hecate Strait, British Columbia. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada 21:1051-1067) which may provide an interesting comparison.)</p> <p>The score would have been higher if there was an evaluation to show that the fishery had no harmful effects on stock structure in relation to reproductive capacity.</p> <p>Condition for GOA longline, trawl and pot fisheries The client is required to provide evidence of the affect of the fishery on stock structure and whether this has had an adverse affect on recruitment.</p> <p>If the evidence suggests recruitment has been adversely affected remedial measures must be implemented. <u>It is required that this Condition is met by the second annual surveillance audit.</u></p> <p>In order to achieve this outcome it is recommended that the client:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evaluates the evidence of change in the stock structure in relation to reproductive capacity and relate this to the activities of the fishery. b) If there is evidence of a potentially damaging change in stock structure caused or assumed to be caused by the fishery, appropriate remedial measures should be defined and implemented by year four of the certification.
AFDF Action Plan	It is AFDF's and the industry working group's belief that the GOA Pacific cod longline fishery already meets Condition 1 as set forth above for a directed fishery

	<p>in 2010, depending on clarification of some terminology by the assessment team members. It is thought that the current gonadal maturity sampling program on the catch of Pacific cod conducted by NMFS provides data directed at effects of the fishery on reproductive capacity, however, the sample size and the length of time series may not provide the statistical power to discern fishery effects to the desired level. AFDF will provide to the certification body information from AFSC staff pertaining to part (a) of the recommended approach to this Condition by the second year of the certification. Any outstanding issues raised in the consultation with the certifier, will be resolved in the following annual audit. AFDF fully expects that these activities will provide the necessary information to meet the Condition. If the certification body deems it necessary to require additional work, AFDF will work closely with working group sector members and AFSC staff to see if additional sampling would ensure meeting the Condition, and act to acquire funding for the additional sampling in as quick and efficient a manner as practical.</p>
<p>AFDF Progress Report</p>	<p>Grant Thompson (NMFS) provided a PowerPoint Presentation on work that he had undertaken with his colleague Tersa A'mar on describing the affect of the fishery on stock structure and whether this has had an adverse affect on recruitment.</p> <p>The presentation showed that if reproductive potential is taken to be proportional to spawning biomass, then reproductive potential over the time period 1977-2010 has ranged from 46-84% of what it would have been in the absence of fishing in the EBS (2010 ratio = 48%), and from 45-96% of what it would have been in the absence of fishing in the GOA (2010 ratio = 51%).</p> <p>Neither EBS nor GOA recruitment appeared to bear a strong relationship to either fishing mortality or spawning biomass (fishing mortality $R^2 = 3\%$ in the EBS, 11% in the GOA; spawning biomass $R^2 = 9\%$ in the EBS (with a negative slope) and 1% in the GOA).</p> <p>Age composition was calculated two ways, by assuming that: 1) fishing mortality for each gear, year, and season was equal to the value estimated in the most recent stock assessment; and 2) fishing mortality for each gear, year, and season was zero. All other parameters were assumed to have values equal to those specified or estimated in the most recent stock assessment. For example, the recruitment time series was assumed to be unaffected by fishing mortality.</p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>The information presented to the surveillance and audit team was relevant to the Condition and of high scientific merit. The analysis of change in age composition of the spawning biomass over time was clear and soundly done. It does document that the fishery indeed has had some effect on the age composition of the spawning biomass, which is almost necessarily going to occur when any fishery, including well-managed and sustainable ones, commences or expands on a stock. The information provided also documents that in no sense is the spawning biomass or the reproductive potential of the stock depleted or now dependent on incoming recruitment. The ancillary modelling provides additional support for the conclusion that even if the age composition of the spawning biomass has changed over time, reproductive potential of the stock has not been decreased.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>The material presented to the surveillance and audit team goes a long way towards meeting this Condition. The changes in numbers at age are consistent with the expected effects of a sustainable fishery. Total mortality does increase such that numbers at age of older age groups decline in abundance over time. However, the spawning biomass is comprised of a number of age classes, and the greatest declines are in the oldest ages, which have always comprised only a minority of the reproductive individuals in this stock. The types of modelling provided by Drs.</p>

	<p>Thompson and A'mar support the conclusion that there are certainly sufficient numbers of spawners to maintain the reproductive potential of GOA Pacific cod. However, this work should be augmented by at least some opportunistic gonadal sampling and histological analysis of spawning Pacific cod of various ages, to document that fecundity per unit of spawning biomass is high enough in the younger mature ages to ensure spawning potential is being maintained. With that additional information this Condition could be considered to be fully met.</p> <p>The Condition is considered to be on target for completion within the two year timeline.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator 2.1.2.1 (GOA longline fishery) Is information available on the nature and extent of the by-catch (capture of non-target species)?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 Information is available on all non-target species directly affected by the fishery including the distribution and ecology. Accurate records are kept on the nature and extent of all by-catch species including species size and sex composition.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 Information is available on non-target species directly affected by the fishery including their distribution and/or ecology. Quantitative information is available on significant by-catch. If obtained by sampling, this is considered sufficient to provide adequate information.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 The main non-target species affected have been identified and qualitative information is available on significant by-catch</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale Weight or numbers of target and non-target bycatch species (invertebrates, fish, marine mammals, reptiles, and birds) caught in the longline fishery are recorded in the Daily Catch Production Logbook maintained by the vessel operator and reported to NOAA Fisheries Regulation (50 CFR part 679.5).</p> <p>The Observer Program routinely collects quantitative information (numbers and weights) on non-target species directly affected by the fishery. For the more frequently affected non-target species, data from sampling is considered sufficient to estimate by-catch rate with reasonable precision. The species or taxa most frequently bycaught include sculpins, skates, sleeper sharks, starfish, anemone, grenadier and seabirds.</p> <p>While the overall level of observer coverage in the Pacific cod fishery is considered to be good there are deficiencies and recognised concerns with the level of observer coverage for vessels <60' and in the 60'-125' sector. These are being addressed by the Council.</p> <p>Impacts and acceptable limits have been estimated for protected species. The current ESA Biological Opinion allows for four short-tailed albatross mortalities over a two-year period in the groundfish longline fleet. Limits have not been determined for other impacted birds such as the Northern fulmar, but the bycatch of this species represents a small source of mortality relative to the size of the population.</p> <p>The score would have been higher if the observer program recorded bird by-catch to the species level.</p> <p>Condition for GOA longline The client is required to provide quantitative information on the accidental bycatch of seabirds to the species level. <u>It is required that this Condition is met by the second</u></p>

	<p><u>annual surveillance audit.</u></p> <p>It is recommended that in order to achieve this Condition the client reviews and provides a report on the current state of knowledge on impacted seabirds to the species level.</p>
<p>AFDF Action Plan</p>	<p>Based on information from the NPFMC website and discussions with Ed Melvin of Washington Sea Grant, a leading researcher on both longline and trawl fisheries seabird impact, AFDF and the working group sector members believe that the current Pacific cod longline fishery already meets this Condition. Data on seabird bycatch has been collected to the species level or species group level in the Alaska longline fisheries since 1993. Gulls, alcids and some other species are lumped, because in the case of gulls, particularly juveniles, specific species ID's are difficult even for experts. It is our understanding that shearwaters are collected by species, but are not broken out by species in the SAFE reports - this is also true of alcids - few are caught so they are lumped. The "unidentified" category results largely from sampling at night when a dark bird comes over the roller in less than prime condition - difficult to tell a fulmar from a shearwater but should always be able to tell an albatross from either of these. It is important is to get the albatross ID's correct, since they are the species most vulnerable in these fisheries.</p> <p>AFDF and the working group will provide the review of current information within the first 12 months of the certification, and if the certifier decides that there are gaps or insufficient information on impacts to specific species, AFDF will work with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to see if additional information can be gathered.</p>
<p>AFDF Progress Report</p>	<p>Ed Melvin – Washington Sea Grant – was available to make a presentation during the course of the site visit. He reviewed the state of knowledge of both the impacts of the fishery on seabirds and the adequacy of current approaches to mitigation of these impacts. However, discussions with surveillance team members and Ed Melvin indicated that the team was actually interested in the seabird mortality by species in the years since 2006, when the last published information was available. Mr. Melvin indicated that he didn't have that data, but Shannon Fitzgerald with NMFS was reviewing the data for the recent years and that a report with data through 2010 would be available in June 2011.</p> <p>The team met with Shannon Fitzgerald on May 12th and discussed recent mortality levels and trends. He confirmed that a report would likely be available in June, which should meet this Condition, providing there are no issues that surface regarding upward trends of mortality of certain species.</p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>During the audit the team received presentations on mitigation research and current efforts to document seabird bycatch from trawl and longline fisheries in the BSAI from Ed Melvin and Shannon Fitzgerald, respectively. Those presentations and a submission the team received from the Alaska Seafood Cooperative in association with a seabird related Condition for the flatfish trawl sector clarified the difficulties associated with the identification of seabird bycatch at sea and confirmed, nevertheless, that observers would always be in a position to separate albatross from other species. Although the team acknowledged that seabird bycatch has been quantified for many years, they noted that that published data are now dated (most recent estimated are from 2006). The team was informed that data from 2007 to 2010 was being loaded into the NMFS catch accounting database and that this undertaking has taken somewhat longer than anticipated. Currently, NMFS is comparing overlapping years of data with the old database to determine if the use of the new database provided a consistent time series. Data through 2010 should be</p>

	available later this summer.
Conclusion	The team considers that progress in obtaining current estimates of seabird bycatch is satisfactory and, given that more recent data than 2006 will shortly be available, were content to keep this Condition open until they received these new data and the client's analysis of these data with respect to their estimated impact on the bycatch species.

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator 2.1.2.4 (GOA longline and pot fisheries) Are the effects of supply and use of bait known?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 All significant impacts of the supply and use of bait are known, and are negligible.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 There is adequate knowledge of the use of bait including sources and amounts and there is sufficient information to indicate that collection of bait does not cause significant conservation problems.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 Types of bait, extent of use and sources of supply are known. Although little information is known on the amounts used, their collection is unlikely to cause significant conservation problems.</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale</p> <p>Longline: The main bait species used in the longline fishery are sardines, herring, and squid (J. Browning pers. comm.) Some of the herring is obtained from local stocks, but most is from the US east coast. Some long liners use Alaskan by-caught squid, but most squid comes from Argentina or the US east coast. Sardines are purchased from Washington.</p> <p>Information on the quantities used was not available.</p> <p>The score would have been higher if information was available on the quantities of bait species and it had been determined that such quantities do not compromise the conservation status of the bait species.</p> <p>Pot: The main bait species used in the pot fishery are herring. Most of the herring is obtained from local Alaskan stocks.</p> <p>Information on the quantities used was not available.</p> <p>The score would have been higher if information was available on the quantities of bait species and it has been determined that such quantities do not compromise the conservation status of the bait species.</p> <p>Condition for GOA longline and pot The client is required to determine the origin and quantities of bait that are used within the fishery and evaluate and confirm that such quantities do not compromise the conservation status of the bait species. <u>It is required that this Condition is met by the second annual surveillance audit.</u></p> <p>It is recommended that in order to achieve this Condition the client reviews and provides a report on the species, quantities, origin and stock status in order to confirm that their use as bait is not compromising their long term sustainability.</p>

AFDF Action Plan	AFDF will work with sector members of the industry working group to gather information on quantity and species of bait used in the Pacific cod longline fishery in the Gulf of Alaska management area. Based on initial information, squid is the predominant bait species, and almost none of the squid used is harvested in Alaska. This fleet survey will provide sufficient information to evaluate whether the level of bait usage compromises the conservation status of the bait species. This information will be provided to the certifier within the first 24 months of certification.
AFDF Progress Report	The client provided a summary of the bait usage for the longline Pacific cod fishery in the BSAI and GOA.
Observations	<p>An incomplete summary report was provided to the team on the site visit. A revised report was submitted after the site visit.</p> <p>The information provided indicates that Argentine squid (<i>Illex argentines</i>) and short-finned or summer squid (<i>Illex illecebrosus</i>) are the preferred bait species for the longline fishery, with approximately 4,000 tons of <i>Illex</i> species being used annually. Pacific Saury (<i>Cololabris saira</i>) appears to be an alternative bait species with an estimated usage of 80-200 tons. Price and availability appears to be the deciding factor as to which species is favoured throughout the Pacific cod fishing season.</p> <p>Sardines (California Pilchard), (<i>Sardinops sagax</i>) are the bait of choice in the pot fishery accounting for an estimated 2,250 – 2,500 tons or 98% of the bait. Dutch Harbor or Alaska herring (<i>Clupea pallasii</i>) accounts for an estimated 40 – 50 tons.</p> <p>The client action plan indicated that information would be made available to the surveillance team within the first 12 months of the certification. The report was not received until 15 months after the certification.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The summary report did not consider the stock status of the bait species used in the longline and pot fisheries and so the team were not able to conclude whether the quantities used in the fisheries compromised their conservation status.</p> <p>In accordance with the Condition, it is anticipated that the client will provide the audit team with a complete report by the second audit.</p>

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator: 2.1.3.2 (longline, trawl and pot) Is any gear lost during fishing operations and can 'ghost fishing' occur?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 There is detailed knowledge of the type, quantity and location of gear types lost during fishing operations. The impact of gear loss on habitat, target and non-target species has been well estimated or recorded.</p> <p>The effect of gear loss on target and non-target species has been measured and shown to have negligible effects on habitats, ecosystems or species of concern.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 There is knowledge of the type, quantity and location of gear lost during fishing operations. Estimates can be made on the extent of adverse effects, including 'ghost fishing'.</p> <p>Estimates made show that losses do not cause unacceptable impacts on the ecosystem.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 Some recording of gear losses takes place and an assessment can be made of ecosystem impacts, including possible 'ghost fishing'</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale Longline: Observers are required to evaluate gear performance during hauls of longlines using a coded system. This code indicates if there were problems with the gear that may have affected the amount of fish caught. There are seven different codes that are applicable. However, there appear to be no estimates of the amount of longline gear that may be lost in the Pacific cod fishery.</p> <p>Ghost fishing of lost gear in soft bottom sediments is considered unlikely as gear will be quickly buried. It is possible that there is some ghost fishing by lost longline gear on hard bottom substrates, but this remains to be studied.</p> <p>The score would have been higher if there was information on the amount of gear lost by the longline fleet and information was available on the extent to which ghost fishing takes place and lost gear impacts the benthos, particularly in hard bottoms.</p> <p>Trawl: Although lost gear may be noted in vessel logbooks, there appears to be no formal recording or collating of when and where trawl gear is lost. Impacts of lost trawl gear are likely to be minimal in terms of ghost fishing. The amount of gear lost is likely to be small but cannot be quantified. Overall although little information is available, the relationship between typical levels of lost trawl gear in trawl fisheries and the very low impact of lost trawl gear strongly suggests that there will be no measurable effects from gear loss.</p> <p>Pot: Observers are required to evaluate gear performance during hauls of pots using a coded system. This code indicates if there were problems with the gear that may have affected the amount of fish caught. There are seven different codes that are</p>

	<p>applicable. We were not made aware of any formal estimate of the amount of pot gear that may be lost in the Pacific cod fishery, however, we did hear that in some locations there were periodic lost pot recovery programs.</p> <p>Pots are required to have biodegradable escape panels and escape rings to limit the temporal effect of any ghost fishing.</p> <p>Condition for GOA longline, trawl and pot The client is required to quantify and identify the location of lost fishing gear and assess the extent of adverse effects, including “ghost fishing”. If adverse effects are identified identify ways of reducing gear loss and implement a program to monitor improving performance. <u>It is required that this Condition is met by the second annual surveillance audit.</u></p>
<p>AFDF Action Plan</p>	<p>AFDF will work with sector members of the industry working group to initiate a program of recording amount, location and date of longline gear loss in the Pacific cod fishery in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island management area. This information will be provided to the certifier within the first 24 months of certification. Some information on gear loss may be grouped so that confidentiality of sensitive location information cannot be traced to individual vessels. Biodegradable panels are required on all pot gear in both State and Federal waters fisheries.</p> <p>If the results of this program suggest that particular fishing areas are creating significant and unacceptable impacts, AFDF will identify ways of reducing gear loss and implement a program to monitor improving performance in this aspect of operations.</p>
<p>AFDF Progress Report</p>	<p>AFDF have produced a gear loss reporting form for each gear sector (trawl, longline, pot) which they plan to distribute.</p> <p>Alaska Seafood Cooperative (ASC), the client for the BSAI & GOA Flatfish Certification and a client group member in the Pacific cod certification, has conducted a survey of gear loss for the Head & Gut Catcher Processor (H & G CP) sector in the Bering Sea, in accordance with their own similar Condition of Certification. ASC has agreed to supply that information to AFDF for this certification.</p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>At the site visit the team was informed that AFDF were working with sector members of the industry working group to initiate a program recording data on trawl, longline and pot gear loss in the Pacific cod fishery in the BSAI management area and that this would mirror the work that had already been initiated in the H & G CP Sector in the BSAI management area.</p> <p>The client has suggested that the gear loss and recovery information from the H & G CPs will be applicable to the Trawl Catcher Vessels (CVs) operating in both BSAI and GOA. The assumption that information from the catcher-processor survey will be applicable to catcher vessels will need to be tested before the extrapolation can be accepted.</p> <p>Following the site visit the client provided a copy of a gear loss reporting form that they plan to distribute between vessels operating in the BSAI and GOA trawl, longline and pot fisheries.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>While progress has been made on this Condition the client will have to make rapid progress in distributing the lost gear forms and encouraging their completion in order to meet the requirements of this Condition.</p>

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator 2.2.1.2 (GOA trawl) Are interactions of the fishery with such species adequately determined?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 Reliable quantitative estimates are made of the interactions of all populations directly related to the fishery, and qualitative information is available on indirect impacts. Incidental mortalities are recorded and reported.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 Adequate quantitative estimates are made of the effects of interactions directly related to the fishery.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 The main interactions directly related to the fishery are known.</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale Adequate quantitative estimates are made of the effects of interactions directly related to the fishery with mammals & the short-tailed albatross. Disturbance competition and by-catch are also understood for mammals, and exclusion zones around breeding sites and haulout sites exist based on foraging and disturbance studies.</p> <p>The inter-actions of seabirds and the trawl fishery has been reasonably well studied and documented (e.g. Zador <i>et al.</i> 2008). There have also been a number of <i>ad hoc</i> studies by, for example, Melvin <i>et al.</i> on various Alaskan fisheries that provide considerable information about seabird by-catch and mitigation.</p> <p>The score is lower than otherwise on competition quantification and incomplete incidental mortality recording (especially seabirds). Much effort has been directed at understanding the interactions of seabirds with other fisheries, notably the long-line fisheries, in the region but bird strikes in gears and vessels by species are incompletely recorded (PSEIS). The interactions of the trawl fisheries with seabirds needs better quantitative definition, especially in the extent of the net sonde (third) cable in causing injury and mortality.</p> <p>Condition for GOA trawl The client is required to provide adequate quantitative estimates of the effects of the fishery on seabirds by the first annual surveillance audit.</p>
AFDF Action Plan	<p>Based on information from the NPFMC website and discussions with Ed Melvin of Washington Sea Grant, a leading researcher on both longline and trawl fisheries seabird impact, AFDF and the industry working group believe that the current Pacific cod trawl fishery may already meet this Condition. Data on seabird bycatch has been collected to the species level or species group level in the Alaska trawl fisheries since 1993. Gulls, alcids and some other species are lumped, because in the case of gulls, particularly juveniles, specific species ID's are difficult even for experts. It is our understanding that shearwaters are collected by species, but are not broken out by species in the SAFE reports - this is also true of alcids - few are caught so they are lumped. The "unidentified" category results largely from</p>

	<p>sampling at night when a dark bird is taken in less than prime condition - difficult to tell a fulmar from a shearwater, but observers should always be able to tell an albatross from either of these. It is important to get the albatross ID's correct, since they are the species most vulnerable in these fisheries.</p> <p>AFDF and the industry working group will review the literature and state of knowledge regarding impacts of the trawl fishery and adequacy of mitigation measures specified within the first 12 months. If the certifier decides that there are gaps or insufficient information on impacts to specific species or inadequacy of mitigative measures, AFDF will work with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to see if additional information and/or measures can be implemented.</p>
AFDF Progress Report	<p>Ed Melvin – Washington Sea Grant – was available to make a presentation during the course of the site visit. He reviewed the state of knowledge of both the impacts of the fishery on seabirds and the adequacy of current approaches to mitigation of these impacts. However, discussions with surveillance team members and Mr. Melvin indicated that the team was actually interested in the seabird mortality by species in the years since 2006, when the last published information was available. Mr. Melvin indicated that he didn't have that data, but Shannon Fitzgerald with NMFS was reviewing the data for the recent years and that a report with data through 2010 would be available in June 2011.</p> <p>The team met with Shannon Fitzgerald on May 12th and discussed recent mortality levels and trends. He confirmed that a report would likely be available in June, which should meet this Condition, providing there are no issues that surface regarding upward trends of mortality of certain species.</p>
Observations	<p>During the audit the team received presentations on mitigation research and current efforts to document seabird bycatch from trawl and longline fisheries in the BSAI from Ed Melvin and Shannon Fitzgerald, respectively. Those presentations and a submission the team received from the Alaska Seafood Cooperative in association with a seabird related Condition for the flatfish trawl sector clarified the difficulties associated with the identification of seabird bycatch at sea and confirmed, nevertheless, that observers would always be in a position to separate albatross from other species. Although the team acknowledged that seabird bycatch has been quantified for many years, they noted that that published data are now dated (most recent estimated are from 2006). The team was informed that data from 2007 to 2010 was being loaded into the NMFS catch accounting database and that this undertaking has taken somewhat longer than anticipated. Currently, NMFS is comparing overlapping years of data with the old database to determine if the use of the new database provided a consistent time series. Data through 2010 should be available later this summer.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The team considers that progress in obtaining current estimates of seabird bycatch is satisfactory and, given that more recent data than 2006 will shortly be available, were content to keep this Condition open until they received these new data and the client's analysis of these data with respect to their estimated impact on the bycatch species.</p>

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator 2.1.5.2 and 2.3.1.3 (GOA Longline)</p> <p>2.1.5.2 - Does the removal of non-target stocks have unacceptable impacts on ecosystem structure and function?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 The ecological consequences of current levels of removal of non-target stocks has been quantified and documented to be within acceptable, pre-determined, limits</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 Sufficient information is available on consequences of current levels of removal of non-target species to suggest no unacceptable impacts of the fishery on ecological systems within major fishing areas</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 The removal of non-target stocks could lead to impacts upon ecological systems (applying the precautionary approach where necessary). A program is in development to identify these and, if appropriate, reduce these to acceptable, defined limits.</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale Based on the results of ecosystem modelling, there is no evidence to suggest that removal of non-target stocks by the longline fishery has unacceptable impacts (Aydin et al. 2007). The major species caught as bycatch are grenadier, sculpins, miscellaneous fish, sharks, sea star, skates, and seabirds (including northern fulmar, shearwater, black-footed albatross, Laysan albatross, and short-tailed albatross). There are currently no directed commercial fisheries for shark species in federal or state managed waters of the GOA and most incidentally caught sharks are not retained. From 1997–2008, shark catches composed from 19% to 64% of the estimated Other Species total catches. Spiny dogfish composed 47% of total shark catch, Pacific sleeper sharks 29%, unidentified sharks 18%, and salmon sharks 6%. Bycatch of these species appear to be within acceptable limits although species-level assessments have not been carried out for all affected species and assessments are lacking for some groups (e.g., grenadiers). The one species group of concern appears to be skates. Given the imprecise nature of skate biomass estimates, bycatch of skate in groundfish fisheries is of possible concern (Ormseth and Matta 2007).</p> <p>2.3.1.3 Do management measures allow for recovery of affected populations?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 Appropriate rebuilding measures are being implemented to promote recovery to specified levels as quickly as is possible. Additional measures are being implemented to prevent problems in the future.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 Appropriate rebuilding measures have been implemented. Measures have been tested and can be shown to be promoting the rebuilding of affected populations to specified levels within specified timeframes</p>

	<p>Scoring Guidepost 60 Appropriate rebuilding measures exist and are being implemented. Measures may not have been tested</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale Since 2003 increased market prices for skates have both triggered a directed fishery for skates and have increased retention and deliveries of incidentally caught skates. However, since 2005, directed fishing has been prohibited for all skate species in the GOA, but skates continue to be incidentally caught by these fisheries. Skate catch in the GOA from all sources ranges from 6,000 to 10,000 or more tons annually, and perhaps has increased in recent years. The long-line fishery for Pacific cod is a major source of skate bycatch. Given the imprecise nature of skate biomass estimates, bycatch levels in groundfish fisheries is of possible concern (Ormseth and Matt 2007).</p> <p>Condition for GOA Longline The client is required to ensure that by the second annual audit sufficient information is available on the consequences of current levels of removal of skate species. If this information shows unacceptable impacts on the skate stocks the client must identify and implement ways of reducing these impacts such that they contribute to the rebuilding of skate populations to acceptable levels within specified timeframes.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>AFDF Action Plan</p>	<p>AFDF will provide the certifier/annual audit team information on the level of skate bycatch in the Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod longline fishery within the first 24 months following certification. If the results of the assessment (exploitation rates) are determined to be unacceptable for the skate population in the GoA, AFDF will work with the sector members and staff of AFSC to provide methods to reduce impacts so that they allow a rebuilding of skate populations within specified timeframes.</p> <p>Based on information from the NPFMC website and discussions with Nick Sagalkin, Area Groundfish biologist with Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) in Kodiak, AFDF and the GoA sector members of the working group believe that the current GoA Pacific cod longline fishery already meets this Condition. Below is material available on the NPFMC website.</p> <p>http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/ http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/current_issues/non_target/Ospecies_problem.pdf .</p> <p>“In May of 2004, a final rule was published that removed skates from the other species complex in the Gulf of Alaska. This rule established ABCs and TACs, based on survey biomass, for Big, Longnose and other skates and thus provided a measure of protection against possible overfishing of skates in the Gulf of Alaska.”</p> <p>Also an excerpt from FMR No. 08-48 “Annual Management Report for the Groundfish Fisheries in the Kodiak, Chignik and South Alaska Peninsula Management Areas, 2007”, available on the ADF&G Division of Commercial Fisheries website at: http://www.sf.adfg.state.ak.us/FedAidPDFs/fmr08-48.pdf</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS SKATE SPECIES</p> <p>Historical Background</p> <p>NMFS previously managed skates under the “Other species” assemblage that also includes sharks, sculpins, squid, and octopi. This category was designed to monitor and protect species that have not traditionally been economically important, but may have an important ecological role and have potential for economic development (Gaichas et al. 2003). This “Other species” category has an annual TAC based on 5% of the sum of all other GOA FMP target species’ TACs each year.</p> <p>Skates have been managed in state-waters under parallel seasons since the late 1980s. In 1998, the BOF mandated that a commissioner’s permit was necessary to target skates in state waters. This regulation gave ADF&G the authority to restrict fishing depth, define seasons, specify fishing areas, establish minimum sizes, specify legal gear, require completed logbooks, and require other conditions determined to be necessary for conservation and management purposes. Skate seasons in state waters are prosecuted under the annual global Emergency Order (EO) and are defined as parallel seasons with the additional requirement of the commissioner’s permit. The State of Alaska does not set a separate quota for state waters, nor does the state administer a separate season for skates in state waters. When the other species assemblage closes in federal waters, that closure is also in effect for state waters. Should a particular gear type, such as longlines, be closed for directed fisheries because of bycatch constraints, that closure is additionally in effect for state waters under the parallel structure of the global EO.</p> <p>Starting in 2003, several markets for skate products, primarily in the Republic of Korea, were willing to purchase skates for as much as \$0.25 per pound. At this price, skates were more valuable than some species of salmon and several other species of groundfish. In addition, fishers targeting skates were able to retain Pacific cod up to 20% of their retained skate weight, making even relatively small amounts of bycatch lucrative for participants. As a result, the skate harvest increased significantly in the CGOA (Table 20). Prior to 2003, most skates were taken as</p>
--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>bycatch, typically early in the season during Pacific cod fisheries.</p> <p>Interest in directed skate fisheries increased after the 2003 season primarily by longline fishers following CGOA Pacific cod closures. Most of the initial interest was for participation in directed state-waters fisheries. However, many of the longline vessel operators learned they could fish in federal waters if they had a LLP. Around this same time, unofficial reports indicated skate abundance outside 3 nm was as strong, if not stronger, than inside 3 nm. As many of the longline vessels already had the necessary federal endorsements for the CGOA, the majority of vessel operators moved their fishing operations outside of state waters. Under federal guidelines, no logbook or delivery notification requirements were placed on those participating.</p> <p>The 2006 skate fishery followed this general pattern with two notable exceptions. In late February of that year, NMFS placed skates in bycatch status, which reduced their bycatch limit from the “Other species” combined 5% TAC, and disallowed directed fishing. This was done due to concerns of overfishing and the lack of information on skate biology or population size. Additionally, ADF&G discontinued issuing commissioner’s permits for skates. Despite this, 138 vessels harvested over 3.5 million pounds of skates from state and federal waters during 2006.</p> <p>2007 Kodiak Area Skate Fishery</p> <p>The 2007 skate fishery was by bycatch only in both state and federal waters. A total of 185 vessels harvested 3.2 million pounds of skates. Approximately 10% of the harvest came from state waters.</p>
<p>AFDF Progress Report</p>	<p>The AFDF provided a submission to the surveillance team following the site visit. Included with the submission were tables extracted from NMFS and, possibly other sources that indicate the catch levels of Alaska, big, long nose and other skate species in the GOA fisheries.</p> <p>Also included in the submission was the following Information Bulletin of November 23, 2010:</p> <p>NMFS Prohibits Retention of Longnose Skate in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska</p> <p>The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is prohibiting retention of longnose skate in the Western Regulatory Area (between 159 degrees and 170 degrees W. longitudes) of the Gulf of Alaska (GOA), effective 12 noon, Alaska local time, November 24, 2010, according to James W. Balsiger, Administrator, Alaska Region, NMFS.</p> <p>This action is necessary because the 2010 total allowable catch of longnose skate in the Western Regulatory Area of the GOA has been reached and is issued pursuant to 50 CFR 679.20(d)(2). NMFS is requiring that longnose skate caught in this area be treated in the same manner as prohibited species and discarded at sea with a minimum of injury.</p> <p>This information bulletin only provides notice of a regulatory change. For the purposes of complying with the regulatory change, you are advised to see the actual text in the Code of Federal Regulations.</p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>Little of the information provided by the client speaks directly to the requirements of the Condition to provide data on the bycatch of skate species in the cod fishery and to evaluate, for each species where possible, the impact of the bycatch on the</p>

	sustainability of skates species.
Conclusion	The client has stated that this information will be presented for evaluation at the second annual audit. The team looks forward to seeing both a time series of recent skate by-catches, broken down by species and gear type, and an assessment of the extent to which levels of bycatch pose unacceptable risks to those species.

	Comments
Activity assessed	<p>Performance Indicator 3A.1.4 (GOA pot and jig) Is the management system subject to external review?</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 100 The management system is subject to regular and frequent external review. Monitoring and evaluation are ongoing and improvements quickly tested and implemented.</p> <p>Results of on-going evaluation of management performance are made public.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 80 The management system is subject to external review at appropriate intervals. Monitoring and evaluation are responsive to reviews. Results of the reviews are made public.</p> <p>Scoring Guidepost 60 There are mechanisms in place to allow for external review.</p> <p>Score 75</p> <p>Scoring Rationale The management system is subject to regular and frequent external review. The NPFMC system conducts regular reviews of the groundfish fisheries including during which external parties have full opportunity for critical comment. Reviews of FMP amendments include input from the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), the Advisory Panel (AP), external scientists, industry, environmental nongovernmental organizations, and the general public. The Plan Development Team solicits peer reviews of stock assessments and its meetings consider outside views regarding its analyses.</p> <p>For the U.S. as a whole, legal challenges to Council and NMFS management decisions regarding the groundfish fisheries have often required managers to explain and justify their management actions. Agencies such as the Government Accountability Office (GAO) have conducted a number of intensive reviews of the federal fisheries management process. Congressional committees have conducted oversight and legislative hearings regarding the region's fisheries and the Magnusson/Stevens Act itself is subject to periodic review.</p> <p>The Council and NMFS frequently turn to outside sources for technical advice, particularly regarding scientific matters and monitoring issues. For example, a panel of seven distinguished outside scientists conducted a review of the Alaskan groundfish fisheries directed toward describing current management strategies, determining whether the current quota setting approach was consistent with the MSA and if it was considerate of ecosystem needs (Goodman et al. 2002). Pacific cod was subjected to a Center for Independent Experts (CIE) review in 2001 that assessed the "next generation" models and use of decision theory to recommend harvest targets and limits.</p> <p>The team concludes that the management system has mechanisms in place for external review, and uses them on a regular basis. Monitoring and evaluation are an ongoing process. Examples of review recommendations that have been tested or implemented.</p>

	<p>It is not known whether the state sector of the fishery is subject to a similar level of external review. It is for this reason that the Condition is scored below 80.</p> <p>Condition for GOA pot and jig</p> <p>The state's external management review process is clearly described and shows that it is monitored, evaluated and responsive to reviews and that the results of the reviews are made public. It is required that this Condition is met <u>by the first annual audit.</u></p>
<p>AFDF Action Plan</p>	<p>AFDF agrees to provide the certifier with a complete report on the external management review process in place for the State of Alaska's groundfish management system within the first 12 months of certification. If the certifier considers there to be any deficiencies in the report or in the external management system, AFDF will work with the sector members of the industry working group and the certifier to specify a workable timeline for improvement.</p> <p>Additional regulatory information applicable to Condition :</p> <p>Title 16.05.221. Boards of Fisheries and Game.</p> <p>(a) For purposes of the conservation and development of the fishery resources of the state, there is created the Board of Fisheries composed of seven members appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by a majority of the members of the legislature in joint session. The governor shall appoint each member on the basis of interest in public affairs, good judgment, knowledge, and ability in the field of action of the board, and with a view to providing diversity of interest and points of view in the membership. The appointed members shall be residents of the state and shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation or geographical location of residence. The commissioner is not a member of the Board of Fisheries, but shall be ex officio secretary.</p> <p>Title 16.05.251. Regulations of the Board of Fisheries.</p> <p>Title 16.05.258. Subsistence use and allocation of fish and game.</p> <p>Title 16.05.260. Advisory committees.</p> <p>Title 16.05.270. Delegation of authority to commissioner.</p> <p>Title 16.05.300. Board meetings.</p> <p>Title 16.05.730. Management of wild and enhanced stocks of fish.</p> <p>Title 16.05.735. Management of offshore fisheries.</p> <p>5 AAC 96.625. Joint board petition policy.</p>
<p>AFDF Progress Report</p>	<p>The client provided a submission that included a short report on the Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF), its authority and the external review process that it follows. Included in the submission was PowerPoint material describing the BPF and their allocation functions and public input.</p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>The client provided a submission after the site visit which included a short report and PowerPoint material describing an overview of the BOF process that was provided to the Cook Inlet Salmon Task Force in May 2008 by Jim Marcote of the BOF.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>The surveillance team conclude that the AFDF have not provided a complete report on the external management review process for the State of Alaska's groundfish management system. As a result progress on the condition is considered to be behind target and in order to rectify this the surveillance team require the report to be provided to them by 31st July 2011.</p> <p>The AFDF response should be guided by the elements of the SG80 as well as the associated text that was provided in the scoring rationale in the original assessment report. The focus should be on describing (synthesizing from available material) for</p>

	<p>the state of Alaska:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the state's role in both conservation and allocation decisions; • the types of external review (as distinct from public comment) that exist; • the timing (intervals) of this review; • the process by which monitoring and evaluation (M&E) responds to such reviews; • the existence of reports in which the results of reviews are made public.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Any complaints against the certified operation; recorded, reviewed and actioned

The certified operation considered here is the following signatories to the AFDF GOA Pacific cod MSC certification programme:

Trawl:

Western Gulf of Alaska Fishermen, United Catcher Boats, Alaska Whitefish Trawlers Association, Trident Seafoods, Peter Pan Seafoods, Unisea, Icicle Seafoods, Ocean Beauty Seafoods, North Pacific Processors Inc., International Seafoods of Alaska, Pacific Seafood Group (dba Island Seafoods), Westward Seafoods, Alyeska Seafoods, Best Use Coalition, Fishing Company of Alaska

Longline:

American Seafoods Company, Aleutian Spray Fisheries, Cape Romanzof Fisheries, Jubilee Fisheries, Glacier Fish Company, Tatoosh Seafoods, Alaska Longline Company, Blue North Trading Company, Alaskan Leader Fisheries, Shelford's Boat Ltd., Bering Select Seafoods, Trident Seafoods, Ocean Beauty Seafoods, North Pacific Processors Inc., International Seafoods of Alaska, Pacific Seafood Group (dba Island Seafoods), Peter Pan Seafoods, Alaska Fresh Seafoods, Unisea, Kachemak Bay Fishermen, Icicle Seafoods, Westward Seafoods, Deep Sea Fisheries, F/V Alpine Cove

Pot:

Shelford's Boat Ltd., Tatoosh Seafoods, United Fishermen of Alaska, Trident Seafoods, Peter Pan Seafoods, Unisea, Icicle Seafoods, Ocean Beauty Seafoods, North Pacific Processors Inc. International Seafood of Alaska, Pacific Seafood Group (dba Island Seafoods), Alaska Fresh Seafoods, Westward Seafoods, Alyeska Seafoods, F/V Alpine Cove

Jig:

Alaska Jig Association, Trident Seafoods, Peter Pan Seafoods, Unisea, Icicle Seafoods, Ocean Beauty Seafoods, North Pacific Processors Inc., International Seafoods of Alaska, Alaska Fresh Seafoods, Pacific Seafood Group (dba Island Seafoods), Westward Seafoods

There were no reported incidents of any complaints against the AFDF member companies relating to the scope of MSC certification.

Any relevant changes to legislation or regulation.

No relevant changes in legislation or regulation were reported in this surveillance period.

Any relevant changes to management regime.

No relevant changes in management were reported in the surveillance period.

Overall Conclusions

The overall management of the fishery continues to at least the level as during the full assessment.

AFDF and/or NMFS have taken action toward addressing the Conditions of Certification raised during the MSC certification assessment.

Progress on the Condition related to PI 2.1.3.2 for the trawl, longline and pot fisheries was considered to be satisfactory but it is noted that the client will have to make rapid progress in distributing the lost gear forms and encouraging their completion in order to meet the requirements of this Condition by the second annual audit.

Progress on the Conditions related to PIs 2.1.2.1 for the longline fishery and 2.2.1.2 for the trawl fishery (both of which relate to the interaction of the fisheries with seabirds) were considered to be satisfactory but the team would like to see more recent bycatch data related to seabirds and the clients analysis of these data with respect to their estimated impact on each species. Therefore the Conditions remain open.

Progress on the Condition related to PI 3A.1.4 for all gear types is behind target and the client is required to rectify this by providing the surveillance team with a complete report on the external management review process in place for the State of Alaska's groundfish management system by 31st July 2011.

Progress on all of the remaining Conditions is considered to be on target with respect to their stated timelines.

MSC Certification should therefore continue subject to the delivery of the required outcomes in relation to the external management review process (PI 3A.1.4) identified above within the specified timeline and to the satisfaction of the audit team.

Information Sources:

Meetings

- Monday 9th May was left open to stakeholders to meet and/or speak via conference call to the surveillance team. No stakeholders met with or submitted information to the surveillance team.
- Tuesday 10th May an all day meeting was held at the Alaska Fisheries Science Centre. The meeting was attended by the surveillance team and, in the course of the day, the following people participated in the meeting:
Steve Barbeaux, Pat Livingston, Jason Anderson, Ed Richardson, Sandra Lowe, Ingrid Spies, Anne Hollowed, Mark Wilkins, Bob Lauth, Thom Wilderbuer, Buck Stockhausen, Jim Browning, Jim Ianelli, Stephanie Zador, Craig Rose, Paul Spencer, Doug DeMaster.
- Wednesday 11th May an all day meeting was held at the Alaska Fisheries Science Centre. The meeting was attended by the surveillance team and, in the course of the day the following people participated in the meeting:
Jim Ianelli, Stephanie Zador, Mark Wilkins, Martin Dorn, Grant Thompson (by phone and webex), Tersea A'mar, Tom Wilderbruer, Buck Stockhausen, Sarah Gaichas, Ingrid Spies, Sandra Lowe, Jim Browning, Jason Anderson, Ed Richardson.
- Thursday 12th May an all day meeting was held at the Alaska Fisheries Science Centre. The meeting was attended by the surveillance team and, in the course of the day the following people participated in the meeting:
Jim Ianelli, Tom Gelatt, Ed Melvin, Doug DeMaster, Anne Hollowed, Ingrid Spies, Sandra Lowe, Jim Browning, Jason Anderson, Ed Richardson, Shannon Fitzgerald.

NB. The site visit combined the Pacific cod, pollock and flatfish fisheries, in the BSAI and GOA hence, the meetings included specialists that cover all three fisheries and their associated species as well as other components of the BSAI and GOA ecosystem.

Reports etc. provided and reviewed in the course of the surveillance audit

Browning, J. 2011. Client Report for the First Annual Audit, Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation, 431 W Seventh Avenue, Suite 106, Anchorage, Alaska, AK 99501

Melvin, E., Dietrich, K.S., Fitzgerald, S. Cardoso, T., 2011. Reducing seabird strikes with trawl cables in the Pollock catcher-processor fleet in the eastern Bering Sea. *Polar Biol.* (2011) 34:215-226

Thompson, G.C. Ianelli, J.N., Wilkins M.E. 2010 Chapter 2, Assessment of the Pacific cod stock in the Eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 7600 Sand Point Way, Seattle, Washington. <http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/refm/stocks/assessments.htm>

Zador, S. and S. Gaichas. (eds.). 2010. "Ecosystem Considerations for 2011." Appendix C. Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Groundfish Resources of the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Region. North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 West 4th Avenue, Suite 306, Anchorage, Alaska.

Standards and Guidelines used:

1. MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing
2. MSC Fishery Certification Methodology Version 6. September 2006
3. TAB Directives - all

APPENDIX A



**At-Sea Processors Association
Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock Fishery
Gulf of Alaska Pollock Fishery**

**Best use Cooperative
Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Flatfish Fishery
Gulf of Alaska Flatfish Fishery**

**Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation
Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific Cod Fishery
Gulf of Alaska Pacific Cod Fishery**

**MSC Certification
Certification Body: Moody Marine Ltd**

Combined Annual Surveillance Audits

Moody Marine Ltd. will be making their surveillance team – Jake Rice, Don Bowen, Susan Hanna, Paul Knapman - available to meet with stakeholders between 9th and 13th May 2011 in Seattle.

MSC certification requires annual surveillance audits of all certified fisheries. These audits have two principal functions:

1. To review any changes in the management of the fishery, including regulations, key management or scientific staff or stock evaluation
2. To evaluate the progress of the fishery against any Conditions of Certification

Should you have any information on this fishery that you feel should be considered in the audit and/or if you would like to arrange a meeting with the surveillance team, please advise us of:

- a) your name and contact details
- b) your association with the fishery; and,
- c) the issues you would like to discuss

Please email or fax these details to Paul Knapman – p.knapman@moodyint.com Fax No. 1 902 422 9780

April 2011