

Control Union Pesca Ltd.

Namibia hake trawl and longline fishery

MSC Variation Request

Control Union Pesca Ltd.

56 High Street, Lymington, Hampshire,
SO41 9AH, United Kingdom

Tel: 01590 613007 Fax: 01590 671573

Email: infopesca@controlunion.com

Website: cupesca.com

1 Marine Stewardship Council variation request

Table 1 – Variation request

1	Date submitted to MSC
	06/03/2020
2	CAB
	Control Union Pesca Ltd.
3	Fishery name and certificate number or CoC certificate number
	Namibia hake trawl and longline fishery
4	Lead auditor or programme manager
	Hugh Jones
5	Request prepared by
	Hugh Jones
6	Scheme requirement for which variation requested
	FCR V2.0 - 7.13 Preliminary Draft Report for client review FCP V2.1 - 7.19 Client and Peer Review Draft Report
7	How many times has a variation for this requirement been accepted for the same assessment of the same fishery?
	Zero.

Table 2 – Variation justification

1	Proposed variation	
	The CAB is requesting a change of MSC process from FCR2.0 to FCP2.1 from the point of FCR7.13 onwards, excluding FCR 7.13.1.2.	
2	Additional time requested	
	Original deadline date	N/a
	Modified deadline date requested	N/a
	Length of additional time requested	N/a
3	Justification	
	<p>The Namibia hake fishery overlaps with the South African hake fishery, impacting Principles 1 and 3. Harmonisation discussions between the respective CABs (CU Pesca and Lloyds Register) began during this Namibia hake fishery’s site visit in March 2018 and have continued to date. Harmonization discussions were held in January 2020 and a consensus on Principle 1 and Principle 3, leads to a shared conditions on some PIs. The conditions and milestones now are harmonised and requires the two fisheries to develop joint action plans.</p> <p>The South African hake fishery follows the Fisheries Certification Process (FCP V2.1). The Namibia hake fishery is using the Fisheries Certification Requirements (FCR V2.0), the assessment timelines in relation to action plan development and reporting stages are not aligned. This is causing significant issues for the progressing through the assessment process.</p> <p>This variation requesting seeks to allow the Namibia hake fishery to move into the FCP process from the point of the FCP V2.1 - 7.19 Client and Peer Review Draft Report onwards allowing alignment of the timelines between the respective CABs and fisheries. It is proposed that the reporting template used in the assessment (MSC Full Assessment Reporting Template FCR V2.0 (8th October 2014)) is not upgraded to save significant costs and time.</p>	
4	If a fishery assessment, implications for assessment	
	<p>As the fishery is still in assessment and prior to all formal reviews, there are no further timeline or certificate requirements that may be affected. The MSC Peer Review College has been kept updated on the progress of this assessment.</p> <p>Currently both fisheries (Namibia hake fishery and South African hake fishery) share the same status: both have finalised their CDR/PR drafts as of 24/03/2020. However the difference in process requirements (FCP vs FCR) means that there will now be separation in the timelines to finalise their respective client action plans. This process divergence has potential implications with respect to action planning development and risks further consequences on: coordination of planning meetings, timing for agreement and pressure to complete the actions plans between the fisheries. Additionally there is a risk that this divergence may lead to unintentional or deliberate attempts to derail / impose additional requirements by either party on the opposing fishery. Moving Namibian Hake assessment to FCP2.1 removes any timeline risk associated with action planning development and provides a defined point (60 days from PRDR/CDR submission) to which both fisheries must work to in order to have their CAPs completed.</p>	

	<p>This proposal if accepted would also allow further coordination between the CABs with respect to whether other entities are suitably involved and have been verified (FCP 7.19.8).</p> <p>There is also a divergent process with respect to peer review which may specifically may lead to further complications. For example, for Namibia Hake (FCR) the CAP will be subject to Peer Review whilst the South African Hake CAP will not be (FCP). This could lead to situations where the Namibian assessment (sent to Peer reviewers at a later date) could, on peer review, be required to have changes to conditions with follow on amendments to CAPs. This could lead to further misalignment with South Africa Hake CAPs and require further time delays on both assessments. Moving NAM to FCP2.1 mitigates these risks: alignment of peer reviews on both fisheries under FCP mean feedback and any further harmonisation requirements / new conditions can be dealt with at the same time.</p> <p>The divergent processes could lead to PCDRs being published at significantly different times. This may perpetuate further alignment issues – for example if stakeholder comments on the second fishery to reach PCDR requires rescoring / consideration of CAPs etc there is risk to timelines and application of harmonisation requirements. This may lead to further timeline extensions requests from CABs if future harmonisation of CAPs and scores are required from PCDR forward. Moving NAM to FCP2.1 mitigates these risks.</p> <p>Moving Namibian Hake to FCP would also improve stakeholder consultation - reporting timelines on PCDR and DFR if aligned would mean more effective dialogue between stakeholders and CABs given that consultation would happen in unison, rather than at potentially distant time frames. This is important given the significant overlap between stakeholders in the fisheries (WWF, birdlife, SADSTIA, MARAM, NHA, MFMR). Given that the report is yet to reach public comment stage, there is clear and structured opportunity for stakeholders to make comment on the report or bring new information pertinent to the scoring of the fishery in the assessment for the assessment team’s consideration. Stakeholders would be informed directly regarding the assessment timeline, should this Variation Request be accepted.</p> <p>Objections – CUP do not think these changes make any additional significant implication to the assessment from the FCR2.0. ANNEX PD has some small changes from FCR to FCP. PD 2.2.4 has been introduced this has no bearing on the assessment as such. There is the addition of PD 2.3.6-9 in FCP which aid the clarity of the NoO and would assist in the process if required. There are also changes to PD 2.4.3 for allowance of amended NoO.</p> <p>Finally, not adopting the FCP PCDR template for the Namibian fishery would represent a cost savings and process efficiencies and CUP have considered that there would not be any material impact to the content or evaluation. If directed, CUP would include “written stakeholder comments” which seems to be the only substantial content addition between the two template versions.</p>
5	If a fishery assessment, mitigation of the implication for assessment
	N/A, as no assessment implications are perceived. As mentioned above, stakeholders will be directly notified if the assessment process is changed.
6	If a fishery assessment, how many conditions does the fishery have and will their progress be affected (positive or negative)?
	Zero. The fishery is currently in assessment.
7	What is the status of the current assessment?

	The fishery is currently in assessment. The client draft report has been drafted.
8	Further comments
9	If applicable, additional information added after MSC's request