

## **Control Union (UK) Limited**

### **French Polynesia albacore and yellowfin longline fishery**

### **MSC Variation Request**

Control Union (UK) Limited

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

Tel: +44 (0)1590 613007

Email: [infofishuk@controlunion.com](mailto:infofishuk@controlunion.com)

Website: [uk.controlunion.com](http://uk.controlunion.com)

# 1 Marine Stewardship Council variation request

Table 1 – Variation request

<b>1</b>	<b>Date submitted to MSC</b>
	21/04/2022
<b>2</b>	<b>CAB</b>
	Control Union (UK) Limited
<b>3</b>	<b>Fishery name and certificate number</b>
	French Polynesia albacore and yellowfin longline fishery
<b>4</b>	<b>Lead auditor or program manager</b>
	Chrissie Sieben (TL) / Mathias Deleau (PM)
<b>5</b>	<b>Request prepared by</b>
	Mathias Deleau
<b>6</b>	<b>Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested</b>
	“Annex PE: Scope extensions”
<b>7</b>	<b>How many times has a variation for this requirement been accepted for the same assessment of the same fishery?</b>
	0

Table 2 – Variation justification

<b>1</b>	<b>Proposed variation</b>													
	The CAB suggests that for the future addition of vessels on the client certificate, a Gap Analysis is run with potential additional impacts to be assessed at the next surveillance audit. This Variation Request is for the rest of this certification cycle (until 18 <sup>th</sup> December 2023).													
<b>2</b>	<b>Additional time requested</b>													
	<b>Original deadline date</b>	N/A												
	<b>Modified deadline date requested</b>	N/A												
	<b>Length of additional time requested</b>	N/A												
<b>3</b>	<b>Justification</b>													
	<p>The UoAs are structured as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Species</b></td> <td>UoA1: Albacore tuna (<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>) UoA2 and 3: Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Stock</b></td> <td>UoA1: South Pacific albacore, UoA2: Western Central Pacific Ocean yellowfin UoA3: Eastern Pacific Ocean yellowfin</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Geographical range of fishery</b></td> <td>French Polynesia Exclusive Economic Zone</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Harvest method / gear</b></td> <td>Pelagic longline</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Client group</b></td> <td>French Polynesia (DRM) licensed vessels fishing in the EEZ of French Polynesia for albacore and yellowfin using pelagic longline</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Other eligible fishers</b></td> <td>None</td> </tr> </table> <p>The client's fleet is currently composed of 86 vessels. The fleet will be gradually replaced by newer vessels. It is expected that ~5 new vessels per year, all of which will be licensed under the DRM, will be replacement or potentially additional vessels. This is part of the DRM sectoral policy aiming for the development of the fishery and its fleet and which has the stated goal that "the expansion of the fleet must be controlled" and "that incremental fleet expansion shall be such to ensure the resilience of the fishery resource" (see. Sieben et al. 2018 – PCR and Sieben et al. 2020 – Y2S report, also reviewed in upcoming Y3S report from Sieben et al. 2022).</p> <p>The replacement or addition of 5 vessels per year is highly unlikely to constitute any significant impact against the current scoring of the fishery and will not lead to any 'material change'. This is based on the following factors: the limited additions to the fishery as they represent a small proportion of the overall number of vessels and the limited time the vessels will have fished as part of the UoA. The addition /replacement of the vessels has no change to the UoA description and all vessels will follow the existing management structure. As the vessels are new there will be no available data to evaluate against P2 impacts initially but given the structure / scale of the UoA and its management system, even if data were to be available it is highly unlikely that any change would be detectable against the scale of the existing fleet. It is clear to the CAB that a scope extension (ANNEX PE) would not be necessary nor an appropriate process under these proposed changes as the new/replacing vessels will be already part of the UoA.</p>		<b>Species</b>	UoA1: Albacore tuna ( <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> ) UoA2 and 3: Yellowfin tuna ( <i>Thunnus albacares</i> )	<b>Stock</b>	UoA1: South Pacific albacore, UoA2: Western Central Pacific Ocean yellowfin UoA3: Eastern Pacific Ocean yellowfin	<b>Geographical range of fishery</b>	French Polynesia Exclusive Economic Zone	<b>Harvest method / gear</b>	Pelagic longline	<b>Client group</b>	French Polynesia (DRM) licensed vessels fishing in the EEZ of French Polynesia for albacore and yellowfin using pelagic longline	<b>Other eligible fishers</b>	None
<b>Species</b>	UoA1: Albacore tuna ( <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> ) UoA2 and 3: Yellowfin tuna ( <i>Thunnus albacares</i> )													
<b>Stock</b>	UoA1: South Pacific albacore, UoA2: Western Central Pacific Ocean yellowfin UoA3: Eastern Pacific Ocean yellowfin													
<b>Geographical range of fishery</b>	French Polynesia Exclusive Economic Zone													
<b>Harvest method / gear</b>	Pelagic longline													
<b>Client group</b>	French Polynesia (DRM) licensed vessels fishing in the EEZ of French Polynesia for albacore and yellowfin using pelagic longline													
<b>Other eligible fishers</b>	None													

	As detailed above, the management system has clearly stated objectives and limits to the expansion/renewal of the fleet. The client (DRM – Direction des Ressources Marine) is directly issuing new licenses and authorisations and therefore has a tight control on the fleet expansion and subsequent impacts. The changes in vessels will be assessed along with a gap analysis as part of the regular surveillance audit.
<b>4</b>	<b>Implications for assessment</b>
	N/A
<b>5</b>	<b>Mitigation of the implication for assessment</b>
	There is no change in the definition of the UoA or UoC as the new vessels are part of the UoA. The addition of new vessels will potentially result in more data being brought in regarding Principle 2 species and extended impact to be assessed. Pending the data availability, this will be addressed at the next surveillance audit and rescoring applied if needed.
<b>6</b>	<b>How many conditions does the fishery have and will their progress be affected (positive or negative)?</b>
	Currently 10 opened conditions (progress “On Target”). None of these will be impacted by this VR.
<b>7</b>	<b>What is the status of the current assessment?</b>
	Year 3 surveillance site visit has just been completed. Surveillance report is due for the 23 <sup>rd</sup> of May 2022.
<b>8</b>	<b>Further comments</b>
	N/A
<b>9</b>	<b>If applicable, additional information added after MSC’s request</b>
	Clarity provided on replacement/additional vessels and end date added.