



Third Surveillance Report
CANADIAN NORTHERN PRAWN TRAWL FISHERY Shrimp
Fishing Areas 5, 6, & 7

Certificate No.: MML-028

Intertek Moody Marine
November 2011

Authors:

Lead Assessor: Paul Knapman
Assessors: Howard Powles, Don Aldous, Colin Bannister

Intertek Moody Marine
99 Wyse Road Suite 815
Dartmouth Nova Scotia B3A 4S5
Contact: Paul Knapman
Tel: +1 902 422 4511

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

Scope against which the surveillance is undertaken: MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing as applied to the CANADIAN NORTHERN PRAWN TRAWL FISHERY Shrimp Fishing Areas 5, 6 and 7.

Species: *Pandalus borealis* **Area:** Shrimp Fishing Area 5, 6, 7 (Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic coast of Canada)

Method of capture: Trawl

Date of Surveillance Visit:	October 19, 2011			
Initial Certification	Date: 5 August 2008		Certificate Ref: MML-028	
Surveillance stage	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Surveillance team:	Lead Assessor: Paul Knapman Assessors: Don Aldous, Howard Powles, Colin Bannister (reviewer)			
Company Name: Address:	Association of Seafood Producers (ASP) Suite 302 Baine Johnstone Building 10 Fort William Place St John's A1C 1KA Newfoundland			
Contact 1	Derek Butler, Executive Director			
Tel No:	+1 (709)-726-3730			
Fax No:	+1 (709)-726-3731			
E-mail address:	dbutler@seafoodproducers.org			

2.0 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report contains the findings of the third surveillance audit in relation to the Association of Seafood Producers (ASP) Canadian Northern Prawn Trawl Fishery in Shrimp Fishing Areas 5, 6, 7. The surveillance audit was carried out in accordance with the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Certification Methodology (FCM) Version 6 (1) and MSC TAB Directive 033 v1 (January 19, 2011)

An announcement of the surveillance site visit was sent to recognised stakeholders on 22nd September 2011 and published on the MSC website advising stakeholders that the audit site visit would take place on October 19, 2011. (See appendix A).

The surveillance team – Don Aldous and Howard Powles - met with members of the client group, officials of the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and a contractor engaged by the client. 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. Howard Powles was a member of the original assessment team; Colin Bannister, who was also a member of the original assessment team, did not take part in the site visit but has reviewed the report.

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, ASP produced an Action Plan setting out the stages involved in addressing the Conditions raised. This is set out in the table alongside the heading 'ASP Action Plan'.

According to the terms of the Action Plan, the client has provided information on the work undertaken to date; this is set out alongside 'ASP Progress Report'.

The Intertek Moody Marine surveillance team evaluated progress against the Action Plan and made comments in ('Observations' and 'Conclusion') including:

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. If the score is 80 or more, the Condition is closed. Since this is the third annual surveillance audit concerning this fishery, there have been Conditions that were closed by previous audits. The issues associated with these PIs will be part of the overall review of the on-going operation of the fishery during this audit. This third annual audit will concentrate on the Conditions remaining open.

Item	<i>P. borealis</i> in SFA 5,6,7
1	Stock status
Activity assessed	<p>Stock status for SFA's 5 and 6 was last reviewed through a Canadian (CSAS) peer review process in February 2011; although the assessment schedule for this stock is normally every two years, a full assessment was done one year after the previous assessment at the request of industry stakeholders because of concerns about a stock decline in SFA 6. For SFA 7 the most recent full status assessment was through NAFO in October 2010; a mid-year review based on an interim monitoring report was done prior to the meeting of NAFO's Scientific Council in September 2011.</p> <p>Exploitation patterns in the fishery (number of vessels, distribution of fishing etc) have generally not changed. There has been a reduction in number of inshore vessels fishing, as individual allocations to some vessels have been combined and fished from a single vessel. With the reduction in TAC in SFA 6, several enterprises have had their allocations removed, consistent with the "last-in first-out" policy.</p> <p><u>SFA 5</u> Stock status remains positive, with commercial (large vessel) CPUE's remaining above the long term mean in recent years and fishable and spawning stock biomass at or above the long term mean since the late 1990s. Female SSB was assessed to be in the healthy zone (above the upper stock reference) in the most recent assessment (end of 2010). The exploitation rate in 2010 was estimated at 19%, above the base exploitation rate of 15%, but this level of exploitation is not considered a concern (see Section 2)</p> <p>The 2011 TAC was set at the same value as that in 2010, at 23,300 t. This was expected to give an exploitation rate of 16%, close to the "base" rate of 15%.</p> <p><u>SFA 6</u> Stock status is declining from historical highs. Fishable and spawning stock biomass levels have declined continuously from a high in 2006, although values for 2009 and 2010 were essentially the same. Values are currently below the long-term averages. In 2010 spawning stock biomass was about 10% below the upper stock reference identified in the new rules-based management framework, and accordingly was in the cautious zone.</p> <p>In response to the biomass decline the TAC for 2011 was set based on a further reduction from 2010 and 2009 levels (2009 – 85,725 t; 2010 – 61,632 t; 2011 – 52,387 t). This was expected to give an exploitation rate of 17.8% in 2011, compared to 20% in 2010.</p> <p><u>SFA 7</u> Shrimp in SFA 7 are assessed and managed by NAFO. Stock status is declining from historical highs. According to the most recent stock update (an interim monitoring report provided to NAFO Scientific Council in September 2011), biomass indices in 2010 were 70-80% (depending on survey and biomass component) lower than the historical maxima recorded in 2007. Spawning stock biomass (ca. 35,000 t in 2010) is above but approaching a B_{LIM} identified by NAFO (based on a decline of 85% from the maximum observed index level) of 19,300 t.</p> <p>Based on the September 2010 full assessment, NAFO's Fishery Commission in early 2011 set the TACs for 2011 and 2012 at 19,200t and 17,000t respectively. These would be equivalent to exploitation rates of 16% and 14% respectively, using the agreed method of calculating exploitation rate based on the average biomass from the 4 previous surveys (2 previous years since there are two surveys per year). Had the exploitation rates been calculated using the protocol from SFAs 5 and 6 (based on biomass from the most recent year only) values would have been higher, since the stock is declining.</p> <p>NAFO subsequently revised the TAC set in early 2011, based on results from the September 2011 interim monitoring report. NAFO's Fisheries Commission in September 2011 set TACs for 2012 and 2013 at 12,000 t and 9,350 t respectively (Pers. Comm., D. Orr).</p>

	<p>Canada is allocated 83% of the NAFO TAC. Accordingly, the Canadian TAC was 24,990 t in 2010 and 15,994 t in 2011, based on NAFO quota values set prior to September 2011.</p>
--	--

Management Measures Review

In June 2011 federal and provincial Ministers with responsibility for fisheries announced a review of management measures in the northern shrimp fishery off Newfoundland and Labrador. This review is expected to focus on allocation issues, particularly with respect to shares to the offshore and inshore fleets and the “last-in -first out” principle

Item	<i>P. borealis</i> in SFA 5,6,7
2	Conditions closed by previous audits
	<p>The team reviewed the conditions that had been closed from previous audits to ensure the continuation of commitments undertaken by the client.</p> <p>Condition 1 – reference points and decision rules</p> <p>In the second annual audit (2010), Condition 1 was closed out, as the Team concluded that the 80 SG had been met for the relevant PIs. However in the audit report observations on this Condition, the Audit Team expressed concern that although the harvest rules specified a cautious exploitation rate of 15%, the TAC adopted for SFA 6 for 2010 would have generated an exploitation rate of 20%. While noting that the TAC had been reduced, and that this exploitation rate was not excessive for a northern shrimp stock, the report noted that it appeared that the new rules-based framework was not being followed, and recommended that the situation be monitored in future audits.</p> <p>During the current audit, the Audit Team was shown a document from a member of the client organization querying the assertion from the Year 2 audit that the new rules-based framework for this fishery had not been fully implemented in 2010 in SFA 6 since the TAC was based on an exploitation rate higher than the “base” rate of 15%. The Client noted that in the documentation of the rules-based framework which has been adopted for this fishery (Annex I to the IFMP), 15% is given as the <i>base</i> exploitation rate to be used as a guideline at low stock abundance, but that at high stock abundance there was allowance in the rules-based framework to fish to a higher exploitation rate.</p> <p>The Team agrees with this reading of the Annex I, but had been under the impression that the 15% exploitation rate was to be a guideline for management of the fishery. This impression is reinforced by the fact that exploitation rates in SFA 6 over the past decade have fluctuated around the 15% level (DFO 2011).</p> <p>As outlined in the description of the rules-based framework (Annex I to the IFMP), the exploitation rate to be targeted in the fishery at high stock abundance levels is to be a proportion of F_{MSY}; however the value of F_{MSY} is not known. The rules-based framework as currently written could be interpreted as allowing flexibility in setting the exploitation rate at high abundance levels, provided that the stock abundance is in the healthy zone.</p> <p>The Team noted that, in fact, in setting the 2011 TAC for SFA 6, industry and fishery managers adopted a TAC that would give an exploitation rate of 17.8%, lower than the 20% adopted for 2010. Accordingly, the rules-based framework is operating to limit (and indeed reduce) exploitation rate for the stock as abundance declines. We also note that the exploitation rates practiced in recent years (15-20%) are lower than those practiced in other North Atlantic pandalid fisheries (for example the new IFMP for the Scotian Shelf uses a limit reference level for exploitation rate of 20% and provides strong justification that this is a conservative harvest level for a pandalid stock). Further, exploitation rates quoted are actually indices that underestimate the real exploitation rate (since the estimate of biomass from which they are calculated are from surveys which underestimate actual biomass because catchability is less than 100%).</p> <p>The Team also notes that in SFA 5 the TAC selected for 2010 gave an exploitation rate of 19%, above the base 15% rate; again, this is consistent with the rules-based framework as currently written, and is a relatively conservative exploitation rate for a pandalid stock.</p> <p>Accordingly we consider that the wording of the 80 SG for the relevant PIs continues to be met and the condition remains closed out.</p> <p>However, it seems clear that the current wording of the rules-based framework does not provide explicit rules for setting TACs based on exploitation rates to be applied in the critical, cautious and healthy zones. Accordingly, we recommend that for this fishery, a more explicit set of decision rules be put in place that clearly outline what the intended exploitation rates will be at different levels of abundance, in the critical, cautious and healthy abundance zones. This will be of particular importance as the fishery enters the re-certification process in 2012.</p>

Condition 3 – ETP species

In September 2010 DFO conducted a review of status of the two wolfish species which are listed as Threatened under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) and which occur in the fishery area. The Committee on Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) is reviewing status of these species and is expected to publish its conclusions in 2013.

No new species at risk have been listed on SARA Schedule 1 in the fishery area since the last audit.

Condition 4: Unobserved Fishing Mortality

Based on the review completed for Year 2 of the certification, unobserved fishing mortality should not be significant for this fishery. This continues to be included in the on-going assessment of impacts of the fishery.

Item	<i>P. borealis</i> in SFA 5,6,7
3	Condition 2: Ecological Impacts of the Fishery
Activity assessed	<p>This Condition relates to better understanding and informing management of the effects of the fishery on seabed habitats and communities in order that, where appropriate and necessary, management measures can be adopted. Eight PIs that were considered deficient in the initial assessment of the fishery were combined to create this Condition. The following bullet points reflect the narrative used for the 80 SG for each of these PIs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and distribution of all main habitat types are known in adequate detail. Information is recent. The distribution of fishing operations is monitored and the sensitivity of key habitats is understood (PI 2.1.1.1). • Impacts of gear use on the habitat are identified or can be reliably estimated including reliable information on the extent, timing and location of use (PI 2.1.3.1). • It can be demonstrated that the fishery does not have unacceptable impacts upon habitats within major fishing areas or on sensitive habitats elsewhere (PI 2.1.4.3). • Appropriate information is available on the effects of the fishery on biological diversity, community structure and productivity. This does not indicate any unacceptable impacts (PI 2.1.4.4). • Management strategies are in place to detect and reduce ecosystem impacts, although these may not have been fully tested, they are considered appropriate to adequately protect key elements of the ecosystem within main fishing areas (PI2.1.4.5). • There are appropriate evaluated procedures used for measuring performance relative to the objectives (3A.3.4). • Measures are being applied to minimize any environmental impacts and there is evidence that the measures are working (3A.7.1). • Suitability of no-take zones and closed areas / seasons has been reviewed and these have been or are currently being implemented and enforced if and where appropriate (3A.7.2). <p>To ensure that, as a minimum, each of the PIs achieve the 80 scoring guidepost the assessment team recommended that the client should address the following:</p> <p>Within the second year of certification:</p> <p>a) Based on existing information, the spatial distribution of fishing effort should be documented.</p> <p>b) Existing data should be compiled and used to map seabed habitats and, where possible, associated species.</p> <p>Within the third year of certification:</p> <p>c) Based on the initial assessments above, develop a program to fill key knowledge gaps.</p> <p>d) Review information on the sensitivity of the identified seabed habitats and associated species.</p> <p>e) Compile information from existing studies of gear impacts on the identified seabed habitats.</p> <p>f) Using information from a, b, c, d, e above, assess the likely impacts of the fishery - taking into account extent, timing and location.</p> <p>g) Assess the acceptability of the current impacts of the fishery on habitat structure.</p> <p>h) Assess the acceptability of current impacts on biological diversity, community structure, and productivity.</p> <p>i) Review the effectiveness of existing policies, operating procedures and codes of conduct for coral conservation.</p> <p>Within the fourth year of certification:</p> <p>j) If appropriate, using the information and outcomes from the above, new management strategies should be outlined and measures implemented to detect and minimize ecosystem impacts of the fishery and to ensure that key elements of the ecosystem are protected. In particular, the suitability of no-take zones and closed areas / seasons should be reviewed, and implemented and enforced if and where appropriate.</p>
ASP Action Plan	<p><u>Action Plan Condition 2</u></p> <p>Existing information on the spatial distribution on fishing effort/catch, as well as existing data on seabed habitats and associated species will be compiled. This existing work will form the</p>

	<p>basis of a qualitative analysis on sensitivity of key habitats and gear impacts.</p> <p>The RAP will apply existing information to evaluate the risk of unacceptable impacts on ecosystem function as a result of the shrimp fishery and identify options for mitigation in areas where high risk of impairing ecosystem function may be identified. The RAP will also identify any important knowledge gaps.</p> <p>In consultation with NSAC, the client will work to develop a monitoring program and propose strategies to address areas where there is a high risk of impairing ecosystem function.</p>
<p>Conclusion from Second Audit</p>	<p>While good progress has been made on setting up a GIS and entering data, the Year 2 milestone as outlined above has not been attained and so progress is behind target. In accordance with the MSC Fisheries Certification Methodology v6 if progress is judged to be behind target the certification body shall specify remedial action and time frame within which it shall be achieved.</p> <p>The surveillance team therefore stipulates that the work as outlined in the Year 2 milestone, i.e. Based on existing information, the spatial distribution of fishing effort should be documented; Existing data should be compiled and used to map seabed habitats and, where possible, associated species, should be completed by December 31st 2010 and evidence of this should be provided to the assessment team by this date.</p> <p>The audit team recommends that the client mobilize appropriate expertise in the coming months to review the information produced for the Year 2 milestone, assess the potential ecological impacts of the fishery, develop further mitigation measures if necessary, in order to ensure that the condition is met by Year 4. This would also ensure that meeting the MSC condition both contributes to and benefits from other related initiatives.</p>
<p>ASP Progress Report</p>	<p>ASP contracted with the Marine Institute's Centre for Sustainable Aquatic Resources to conduct work related to this condition. Dr. Scott Grant of the Centre reported on the progress on that work to the Audit Team on October 19, 2011.</p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>The Client provided evidence in January 2011 that the year two milestones had been met, as required by the second annual audit. The Audit Team confirmed during the site visit that the milestones for Year 2 have been fully met, by reviewing the on-line atlas that displays fishery and habitat information for the fishery area.</p> <p>The Team met with the client and with Dr. Scott Grant of the Centre for Sustainable Aquatic Resources of the Fisheries and Marine Institute of Memorial University, who had been contracted by the client to work on deliverables for Year 3 under this Condition (points c-i under "Activity Assessed" above). Dr. Grant provided a preliminary written and verbal report on progress toward these deliverables.</p> <p>The work planned by Dr. Grant appeared to the audit team to be consistent with meeting the year 3 deliverables, and there has been progress toward meeting these. Dr. Grant noted that work on the deliverables had been delayed by departure of key staff in June and July 2011, who had been assigned to this task.</p> <p>The Team noted the progress made and past performance of Dr. Grant and team (who did the study of unobserved fishing mortality in response to Condition 3 in Year 2, on time and to a high standard). In light of these observations, we conclude that progress is being made toward meeting the milestones. However these have not been met in Year 3 as required in the Condition for certification.</p> <p>At its meeting with DFO, the team was advised of progress toward development of a sponge-coral protection strategy for the fishery area. DFO's Newfoundland and Labrador and Central and Arctic Regions are working together to develop this strategy, which will cover Atlantic Canadian waters from the Laurentian Channel to Davis Strait and Baffin Bay. Following stakeholder meetings in fall 2010 (with the fishing and oil and gas industries, and ENGO's), a draft strategy was prepared and this is currently being reviewed by DFO Management. The</p>

	<p>strategy is based on other strategies developed in Maritimes and Pacific Regions of DFO. Once the draft has been approved, there will be further stakeholder consultations on the draft.</p> <p>DFO held a major peer review workshop on conservation of sensitive habitat features (including sponges and corals) in 2010. The Science Advisory Report from this meeting includes maps of sponge and coral habitats throughout Canada, preliminary assessments of sensitivity of these habitats and preliminary considerations on encounter protocols. A second workshop to further define encounter protocols and management measures is planned for 2012. A detailed Research Document on distribution and sensitivity of sponge and coral habitats in Atlantic Canada was produced for this meeting and is publicly available.</p>
Conclusion of the Third audit	<p>The Year 3 milestones as outlined above (points c-i under “Activity Assessed” above) have not been attained and therefore the client is behind target in meeting with this condition of certification. In accordance with Tab Directive 33 and the Fisheries Certification Methodology, the client has until the next annual audit to rectify this situation, failing which procedures to suspend or withdraw the certification will be required to be initiated.</p> <p>The Audit Team strongly recommends that the Client work to achieve these milestones as expeditiously as possible, since the results of work on the year 3 milestones will be necessary to achieve the year 4 milestone. Since the end results of the Year 3 work include assessments of the acceptability of impacts of the fishery on habitats and ecosystems, and an assessment of the effectiveness of existing policies, operating procedures and codes of conduct for coral conservation, these results along with recommendations for the year 4 milestone (recommendations on new management strategies, if necessary) will have to be reviewed by the Northern Shrimp Advisory Committee and its MSC Working Group to ensure that this Condition is fully met, which further argues for rapid completion of the Year 3 milestones.</p>

Item	<i>P. borealis</i> in SFA 5,6,7
4	Condition 5: Measurable and Explicit Long and Short Term Objectives
Activity assessed	<p>This Condition relates to the need for the management system to clearly identify short and long term objectives and implement precautionary measures where sufficient information is lacking. The following bullet points reflect the narrative used for the 80 SG for each PI that was considered to be deficient in this area of the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management system contains short and long-term resource and environment objectives (PI 3A.3.1). • Appropriate, formalized measures exist to evaluate and implement a precautionary approach in the development and application of operational procedures in the absence of sufficient information (PI 3A.3.3). <p>To ensure that, as a minimum, that these PIs achieve the 80 SG the assessment team recommended that within the third year of the certification the client should ensure that:</p> <p>a) Management plans should more explicitly specify measurable long and short-term resource and environmental objectives, and appropriate formalized measures should be used to implement a precautionary approach in the absence of sufficient information.</p>
ASP Action Plan	<p>Action Plan Condition 5</p> <p>The client will work with DFO in consultation with NSAC to discuss the development measurable and explicit long and short-term objectives and include these in the IFMP.</p>
Conclusion from second Audit	<p>With regard to objective, strategies, and measures, the IFMP now contains most of the requirements that led to the setting of this condition. It contains an explicit commitment to the implementation of the precautionary approach when setting exploitation rates for the directed fishery, and it contains a provisional framework of reference points and harvest rules for the directed fishery.</p> <p>Although the IFMP refers to individual strategies and management measures for ecologically sensitive areas, it does not contain a higher-level commitment to applying a precautionary approach to management of the impact of fishing on sensitive habitat, species, and the ecosystem (i.e. a commitment to precautionary action in the absence of appropriate knowledge). The team considers that this is a significant omission that should be remedied.</p> <p>Also, for the existing text to be consistent with the MSC Principle 1 and 2 it is recommended to include modest additions along the lines illustrated by the following:</p> <p>Conservation and Sustainable Harvest</p> <p>3rd overarching objective: ‘To mitigate the impacts on other species, <i>habitat</i>, and the ecosystem where shrimp fishing occurs’</p> <p>3rd bullet of management measures: ‘Control fishing mortality by setting an annual TAC, <i>taking into account the role of shrimp in the ecosystem</i>’</p> <p>After 6th bullet of management measures, add extra bullet: ‘<i>Promote the use of fishing gear and fishing practices that minimize impact on sensitive habitat</i>’ The key word here is <i>habitat</i>, as opposed to species.</p> <p>Co-management of the Resource</p> <p>3rd overarching objective: co-management should take into account the PA and harvest rules by adding text after Fisheries Act, for example, ‘in line with the implementation of the precautionary approach and harvest rules’.</p> <p>Progress against this Condition is on target for delivery within the third year of the certification.</p>
ASP Progress Report	<p>The 2007 version of the IFMP for The Northern Shrimp – Shrimp Fishing Areas (SFA’s) 0-7 and the Flemish Cap has been modified in consultation with industry to meet this condition (MSC Working Group). The initial meeting of the MSC Working Group to review was held May 17th. A draft version of the revised Fishery Objectives was circulated for comment on June 13, 2011. The edits have been represented in the IFMP online (however no indication is given of the changes in the online version). It can be accessed online at http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/peches-fisheries/ifmp-gmp/shrimp-crevette/shrimp-crevette-2007-eng.htm.</p>
Observations	<p>The IFMP includes resource and environmental objectives in the Fishery Objectives section of the Plan (Section 1.1) and are emphasised in Annex I dealing with the application of the pre-</p>

	<p>cautionary approach. This responds to the first bullet of this condition (PI 3A.3.1).</p> <p>The second bullet of the condition requires formalized measures to evaluate and implement a precautionary approach where sufficient information is lacking. It should be noted that this PI refers to habitat and ecosystem issues as well as management measures for the target species. In making its assessment, the team took its evidence from the Integrated Fishery Management Plan for Northern Shrimp SFA 0-7 and the Flemish Cap Section 1.1 Fishery Objectives. The team noted the suggested wording from the second annual audit now appears in the objectives for Conservation and Sustainable Harvest and also under Co-management of the Resource. The team also noted the plans, in 2012, to implement into management the recommendations of a major peer review workshop on conservation of sensitive habitat features (including sponges and corals).</p> <p>The audit team also noted science branch is looking at additional methods to deal with uncertainty including the application of a formal model-based Management Strategy Evaluation. A preliminary stock assessment for SFA 6 using a Bayesian framework has been carried out; while this preliminary version is not considered to represent stock status robustly at this point, the results were quite consistent with the existing stock assessment and the method shows promise for this SFA. The Bayesian framework provides an explicit assessment of the effects of uncertainties in various parameters on the assessment results.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The team considers both bullets of this condition to be met by virtue of two actions taken by the client and DFO: firstly, the amendments that now appear in the objectives of the Integrated Fisheries Management Plan for Northern Shrimp in SFA 0-7 and the Flemish Cap; and secondly, the plans to implement into management the recommendations of the 2010 workshop on sensitive habitat.</p> <p>The two related PI's of PI 3A.3.1 and PI 3A.3.3 are rescored at 80.</p>

5	Any complaints against the certified operation; recorded, reviewed and actioned
	There have been no complaints against the fishery certification.

6	Any relevant changes to legislation or regulation.
	There have been no changes to legislation or regulation for this fishery since the last audit.

7	Any relevant changes to management regime.
	<p>Several changes have been made to the Integrated Fisheries Management Plan (IFMP) since the last annual audit, including addition of objectives and management strategies (see under Item 4), and redrafting of Annex I on the precautionary harvest framework (this is no longer considered "provisional").</p> <p>While agreeing that these are improvements to the management plan and management regime, the Audit Team notes that the recommendation from Year 2 that such changes be documented in successive versions of the IFMP, has not yet been followed. These changes are not shown as changes in the IFMP, and there continues to be no date or version number on the IFMP.</p> <p>The Audit Team was advised that an overall revision of the IFMP will be undertaken in the coming year, and that the intent is to include a record of changes as part of the IFMP.</p> <p>Otherwise, there have been no changes to the fisheries management regime since the last audit.</p>

8	Overall Conclusions

	<p>No changes in management have taken place that would detrimentally affect the performance of this fishery against the MSC standard and the fishery continues to meet the requirements of the MSC Standard.</p> <p>MSC Certification should therefore continue with audits annually. One condition (Condition 2) remains open and the next audit should verify the completion of milestones for year three and initiate decertification action if these milestones are not met by the time of the fourth annual audit.</p>
--	--

Information Sources:

DFO 2010. OCCURRENCE, SENSITIVITY TO FISHING, AND ECOLOGICAL FUNCTION OF CORALS, SPONGES, AND HYDROTHERMAL VENTS IN CANADIAN WATERS. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Science Advisory Report 2010/041: 54 pp.

DFO 2011. Assessment of Divisions 2G-3K northern shrimp. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Science Advisory Report 2011/003: 22 pp.

DFO 2011. Zonal advisory process for the pre-COSEWIC Assessment of Atlantic, northern and spotted wolffish. September 14-15 2010. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings 2011/032: 37 pp.

Grant, S. M. and G. Bishop MS 2011. Work to date: trawling impacts on benthic habitats and communities in the northern shrimp fishery on the Newfoundland-Labrador Shelf (SFAs 5, 6, and 7) and eastern Scotian Shelf (SFAs 13, 14 and 15). 13 pp, 19 October 2011.

Hvingel, C. and D. Orr 2011. Construction of an assessment model for the shrimp (*Pandalus borealis*) stock off Newfoundland and Labrador using a Bayesian production model, first approach. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2011/12: iv + 21 pp.

Orr, D. C. and D. J. Sullivan. 2011. Divisions 3LNO northern shrimp (*Pandalus borealis*) – interim monitoring update. NAFO SCR Doc. 11/46: 20 pp

Meetings

Meeting with ASP at ASP Boardroom, St. John's Newfoundland, October 19, 2011.

Meeting with DFO and client, St. John's Newfoundland, October 19, 2011.

Meeting with David Orr, Halifax, Nova Scotia, October 20, 2011.

Reports etc

IFMP – Northern shrimp, Shrimp Fishing Areas (SFAs) 0-7 and Flemish Cap. DFO

ASP On-line Atlas. <http://geonl.net/mapguide/ASP/>

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

ASP Northern Prawn Trawl Fishery

MSC Certification

Certification Body: Intertek Moody Marine

Surveillance Audit

Following certification of this fishery, we are now continuing the process of annual surveillance audits of the fishery. 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 raised during the Main Assessment

During the audit, or at separate meetings, we shall be speaking with representatives of the fishery and fishery management organisations. We expect to carry out meetings on **October 19, 2011 in St. John's, Newfoundland and on October 20, 2011 in Halifax, Nova Scotia**

Should you have any information on this fishery that you feel should be considered in the assessment, please advise us. We may be available to meet with stakeholders as appropriate. If you would like to arrange a meeting, please advise us of:

- a) your name and contact details
- b) your association with the fishery
- c) the issues you would like to discuss (in order for us to arrange appropriate representation)
- d) where and when you would like to meet

Yours

Don Aldous
Lead Assessor

September 22, 2011

E-mail: don.aldous@gmail.com
Phone: 902-456-3512
Address: Intertek Moody Marine
815 - 99 Wyse Road,
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia,
B3A 4S5, Canada