

Lloyd's Register 6 Redheughs Rigg South Gyle Edinburgh, EH12 9DQ United Kingdom

SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring

Surveillance Report



Conformity Assessment Body (CAB)	Lloyd's Register
Assessment team	Tristan Southall & Max Cardinale
Fishery client	Swedish Pelagic Federation Producers Organisation (SPFPO)
Assessment Type	First Surveillance



Contents

1	Executive summary	3
2	Report details	4
	2.1 Surveillance information	4
	2.2 Background	6
	2.2.1 Changes in management system	6
	2.2.2 Changes in relevant regulations	6
	2.2.3 Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry	6
	2.2.4 Changes to scientific base of information, including stock assessments	6
	2.2.5 Management of stock	7
	2.2.6 Changes which impact traceability or the ability to segregate certified UoC catch.	7
	2.2.7 Fishery infringements / Penalties	7
	2.2.8 Fleet Changes	7
	2.3 Version details	8
3	Results	9
	3.1 Surveillance results overview	9
	3.1.1 Summary of conditions	9
	3.1.2 Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch data	9
	3.1.3 Recommendations	9
	3.2 Conditions	9
	3.3 Client Action Plan	10
	3.4 Re-scored Performance Indicators	12
	3.4.1 PI 1.2.2 Harvest Control Rules	12
	3.5 Revised Scores	13
4	Appendices	14
	4.1 Evaluation processes and techniques	14
	4.1.1 Site visits	14
	4.1.2 Stakeholder participation	14
	4.2 Stakeholder input	14
	4.3 Revised surveillance program	14
	4.4 Harmonised fishery assessments	15
	4.5 References	17



www.ir.org



1 Executive summary

This is the 1st annual surveillance audit for the MSC-Certified SPFPO North Sea herring fishery. The audit was remotely carried out in July 2019 by a team of two expert assessors from Lloyd's Register.

The Swedish pelagic herring fishery has been certified since June 2008¹. It was successfully recertified in 2018 and this report is for the 1st annual surveillance of this certification period. Full details about the fishery and an archive of all relevant certification documents over the fisheries certification period are available on the MSC website².

No conditions of certification were raised by the assessment team when the fishery was re-certified in 2018. However, a new condition of certification has been added in response to a change in the perception of stock status and the relationship between the harvest control rules and the TAC for this fishery. This condition is closely harmonised with conditions set on other North Sea herring fisheries. The condition aims to ensure that the annual TAC is set at a level that it consistent with the harvest control rules and that these HCRs are appropriate for the stock.

No other significant changes were identified at the time of this annual audit of operational practices, fleet characteristics, ecosystem interactions or management and regulatory regime. Furthermore, no changes which could impact on traceability within the fishery have been identified and there have been no fishery penalties or infringements during the period since certification.

As a result of the new condition, the score for Principle 1 is reduced and the level of surveillance as part of the annual audit cycle has been adjusted upwards. <u>Overall, we conclude that the fishery continues to remain within scope of the MSC certification scheme and continues to meet the requirements of the MSC Standard, and that MSC <u>Certification should therefore continue</u>.</u>

¹ Although under a different fishery name – Astrid Fiske

² https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/spfpo-swedish-north-sea-herring/@@view



2 Report details

2.1 Surveillance information

Table 1. Surveillance information

1	Fishery name			
	SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring			
2	Surveillance level and type			
	Level 1 – Off-site			
3	Surveillance number			
	1st Surveillance	✓		
	2nd Surveillance			
	3rd Surveillance			
	4th Surveillance			
	Other (expedited etc)			
4	Team leader			
	Tristan Southall (P2/P3)			
	Tristan Southall is an experienced fisheries assessor who has worked as both principles 2 and 3 expert on a number of previous MSC assessments, including the Scottish Pelagic assessments for both herring and mackerel. More recently Tristan led the IPSG Mackerel Assessment and has also been involved in the development and trialling of a new MSC assessment methodology, based on risk analysis, for use in data deficient situations.			
	When not assessing the sustainability of fisheries consultancy, combining detailed understanding of ma aquaculture industry systems, infrastructure and man which balances the needs of marine ecosystems, bioc of the industry operation. Bridging these two importa to interpret and advise upon the impacts of different r economics.	Tristan specialises in fishing and marine industry arine ecosystems with broad experience of fishing and agement. This provides him with an informed position liversity and wider environment with the practicalities nt areas enables sustainably-minded consultancy, able nanagement decisions on both marine ecosystems and		
	Tristan's professional experience also includes the eva of fishery and fleet performance, and a wide range of studies, all of which seek to combine both socio-ec recently coordinated EU fisheries training and prom fisheries management and control.	aluation of fisheries on sub-sea environments, analysis f fisheries and aquaculture planning and management onomic and environmental perspectives. Tristan has notion activities – covering all aspects of sustainable		
5	Additional team members			



Max Cardinale (P1)

Dr. Cardinale has an excellent experience in marine fisheries stock assessment and management, with more than 15 years of professional experience in fisheries ecology and more than 10 years in the field of management of fisheries at national, regional and global levels. Particularly significant is his 15 year's experience at the Swedish National Board of Fisheries and Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences in charge for the assessment of the most important stocks of the North and Baltic Sea. His activities include modelling, statistical analysis, stock assessment and advice. Also significant is his several years experience in Asia and in Africa under different SIDA projects. He is currently a nominated member of ACOM (under ICES) and STECF (under DG-MARE at EU commission) committees for fisheries and marine resource management since 2002. He has participated in more than 40 different working groups under ICES and more than 20 under DG MARE. He has been chairman of more than 10 different working groups under ICES and DG MARE umbrella, particularly SGMED, which is responsible since 2008 for stock assessment of Mediterranean stocks. In 2011, he has been invited as reviewer at the STAR panel of the Joint US-Canada Technical Review Panel for the Pacific Hake/Whiting Stock Assessment by the Center for Independent Expert (CIE). Dr. Cardinale has been recently nominated official member of the Editorial Board of the International Journal of Applied Ichthyology and ISRN Oceanography. He has produced more than 70 publications in international journals and more than 50 working reports, presented more than 30 lectures and has more than 100 hours of academic activity in different universities.

Max has passed MSC training and has no Conflict of Interest in relation to this fishery. Full CV available upon request

6 Audit/review time and location Off-site (remote) meetings were undertaken week commencing 15th July 2019 7

Assessment and review activities

All relevant information



2.2 Background

2.2.1 Changes in management system

No significant³ changes have been identified in the fishery management system, since the time of the assessment. The description provided in the original assessment report (Southall & Cardinale 2017) remains valid.

2.2.2 Changes in relevant regulations

No significant changes have been identified in the fishery regulations, since the time of the assessment. The description provided in the original assessment report (Southall & Cardinale 2018) remains valid.

2.2.3 Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry

Although the client contact remains unchanged, Malin Skog in undertaking more of the MSC related work for the client fishery, including the stakeholder consultation meetings. Malin Skog is an independent Marine Biological Consultant. It was also reported that the Head of the Fisheries Management Department at the Swedish agency for Marine and Water Management is no longer in post and that the post is currently temporarily filled, whilst the recruitment process is on-going. No other changes in personnel are reported.

2.2.4 Changes to scientific base of information, including stock assessments

a. Stock Status

Since the time of the 2018 re-assessment report, ICES have published an updated stock assessment (ICES 2019a) and stock annex (ICES 2019b). In addition, the stock was benchmarked in 2018 (ICES, 2018c) and reference points (B_{lim} , F_{pa} , F_{MSY} , and MSY _{Btrigger}) were updated. This resulted in more precise stock estimates and reduced assessment bias and the stock trend did not change substantially compared to the 2017 assessment.

Table x: Herring in Subarea 4 and divisions 3.a and 7.d, autumn spawners. State of the stock and fishery relative to reference points (ICES 2019a).

	Fishing pressure				Stock size					
		2016	2017		2018			2016	2017	2018
Maximum sustainable yield	F _{MSY}	0	0	0	Appropriate		MSY B _{trigger}	0	0	Above trigger
Precautionary approach	F _{pa} ,F _{lim}	0	0	⊘	Harvested sustainably		B _{pa} ,B _{lim}	0	0	Full reproductive capacity
Management plan	F _{MGT}	_	_	-	Not applicable		B _{MGT}	-	-	 Not applicable

Although this latest assessment shows a declining spawning stock biomass and continuing low levels of recruitment (particularly in 2015 and 2017), "ICES assesses that fishing pressure on the stock is below F_{MSY} , F_{pa} and F_{lim} ; and spawning stock size is above MSY _{Btrigger}, B_{pa} , and B_{lim} ". However, the stock is expected to be below MSY_{Btrigger} in 2020, as a consequence of fishing at F_{MSY} .

³ 'Significant' changes would be any which would be deemed likely to effect MSC scoring or change the MSC scoring justifications.



1st Surveillance Report

SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring

Figure x: Herring in Subarea 4 and divisions 3.a and 7.d, autumn spawners. Summary of stock assessment, showing 95% confidence intervals (ICES 2019a).



2.2.5 Management of stock

The annual catch of North Sea autumn spawners has been consistently above the ICES advised catch and the agreed TAC for several years. In 2017 the eventual agreed TAC was 5% above the ICES advised catch based on the management plan and this TAC was itself exceeded by 3.5%. For 2018, the EU and Norway delegations (December 2017) agreed to follow the ICES advice pertaining at that time (the revised Fmsy of 0.33 rather an F of 0.26 as specified in the agreed management strategy). As an earlier MSC surveillance audit for another North Sea herring fishery (with which this fishery must harmonise) noted: "This decision on the part of the Delegates to the EU Norway Fisheries Consultations is difficult to understand or justify in the context of sustainable management of a fishery. This 25% increase in the TAC comes at a time of poor recruitment to the stock with two of the weakest year classes (2014 and 2016) since 1980" (Andrews & Nichols 2018).

The following year, when ICES subsequently revised the F_{MSY} value back 0.26, its advised catch for 2019 went down to 311,572t, whereas the EU-Norway adopted TAC was set at a higher value of 385,008t without providing any justification. These abrupt inter-annual changes in the TAC values (+25% and -36% respectively) are not in accordance with the EU-Norway rule n° 5 of the management plan which sets a 15% constraint on the interannual variation of the TAC. As a result, a new harmonised condition is added to all North Sea herring fisheries (see section 3.2). This followed a harmonisation meeting in 2018 (described in section 4.4)⁴.

2.2.6 Changes which impact traceability or the ability to segregate certified UoC catch.

No information was presented at this audit to indicate that have been any developments or changes within the fishery which impact traceability. The description provided in the original assessment report (Southall & Cardinale 2018) remains valid.

2.2.7 Fishery infringements / Penalties

There have been no infringements or penalties since the scoring exercise was undertaken and no court cases are pending.

2.2.8 Fleet Changes

⁴ It is noted that although the level of exploitation associated with the latest (2019) TAC is in line with the overarching objectives of the CFP (i.e. MSY), the condition raised in 2018 remains binding on the fishery.

Lloyd's Register 1st Surveillance Report SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring



There have been no operational changes or changes to fishing gear. The description provided in the assessment report therefore remains valid. There have been minor changes to the vessel list. An updated vessel list has been provided and was uploaded on the MSC website on 14th May 2019: <u>https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/spfpo-swedish-north-sea-herring/@@assessments</u>

2.3 Version details

Table 2. Fisheries program documents versions

Document	Version number
MSC Fisheries Certification Process	Version 2.1
MSC Fisheries Standard	Version 1.3
MSC General Certification Requirements	Version 2.3
MSC Surveillance Reporting Template	Version 2.0



3 Results

3.1 Surveillance results overview

3.1.1 Summary of conditions

Table 3. Summary of conditions

Condition number	Condition	Performance Indicator (PI)	Status	PI original score	PI revised score
1 (NEW)	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the harvest control tools in place are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.	1.2.2(c)	New	80	75

3.1.2 Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch data

 Table 4. Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch data

TAC	Year		Amount	600,588t
UoA share of TAC	Year	2018	Amount	17,866t (after swaps etc.)
Total green weight catch by UoC	Year (most recent)		Amount	16,354t
Total green weight catch by UoC	Year (second most recent)	2017	Amount	18,803t

3.1.3 Recommendations

There were no recommendations at the time of the 2018 re-assessment and no new recommendations are added as a result of this surveillance audit.

3.2 Conditions

Table 5. Condition 1 NEW

Performance Indicator	1.2.2 Slc.
Score	75
	Total Allowable Catch (TAC) is the main tool used to achieve the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rule (HCR) for the North Sea herring fishery. This is agreed annually between the EU and Norway.
Justification	The HCR for North Sea herring fisheries is contained within the Long-Term Management Strategy which was agreed between the EU and Norway on 1st January 2015. This contains a requirement that the TAC shall be determined using a value of F of no more than 0.26 (or a lower value if the stock is under 1.5Mt). It also contains a requirement that the inter-annual variation of TAC is no more than 15% from the TAC of the preceding year.
	At the meeting of the EU and Norway delegations in December 2017 the parties agreed to follow the ICES advice pertaining at that time (which was that F_{msy} was 0.33 rather than the previous estimate of 0.26). This was based on changes in the time series of natural mortality



	made by the ICES assessment working group. The meeting concluded that "it would be appropriate to follow the ICES MSY advice rather than the management strategy. The TAC of 600,588t represents a 25% increase compared to 2017."
	The TAC set for 2018 therefore exceeds the inter-annual constraints set out in the harvest control rules, and was based on a value of F that exceeds the value set out in the harvest control rules.
	The continued existence of the TAC and the fact that this has effectively controlled exploitation rates in the past, means that SG60 is met. However, as the this is not controlling exploitation rates to the level required under the HCR, SG80 is not met.
Condition	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the harvest control tools in place are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
	This is a harmonised condition. Other harmonised fisheries are at a later stage in their certification period. Given the substantial reduction in TAC that is likely to be required to restore fishing mortality to the level specified in the Harvest Control Rules the CABs have agreed on a series of milestones that conclude in 2022. It is appropriate for the milestones for this fishery to be aligned with those of the harmonised fisheries.
	Year 1 (2019): Condition newly applied at the Year 1 surveillance
	Year 2 (2020): Evidence shall be presented to demonstrate that the harvest control tools are being used to restore fishing mortality to a level that is closer to the value set out in the harvest control rules in force.
Milestones	Resulting Score: 75
	Year 3 (2021): Evidence shall be presented to demonstrate that the harvest control tools are being used to restore fishing mortality to a level that is closer to the value set out in the harvest control rules in force.
	Resulting Score: 75
	Year 4 (2022): Evidence shall be presented to demonstrate that the harvest control tools are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the Harvest Control Rules in place.
	Resulting Score: 80
Consultation on condition	Swedish Pelagic Federation are active participants in the Pelagic Advisory Council, who are the key player in achieving the outcomes of the condition. The Swedish Pelagic Federation are particularly closely aligned with their Danish counterparts, who have already begun work on the Client Action Plan related to this condition and the Swedish Pelagic Federation will align with these on-going actions. Although the final success of the client action-plan relies to some extent on high-level politics, there is optimism that it should be achievable and that the condition is therefore reasonable.
Progress on Condition (Year 1)	This condition has been added as a result of harmonisation at the time of this first surveillance audit (2019). There is therefore no need to report on progress against the condition at this time.
Status	This condition has been added as a result of harmonisation at the time of this first surveillance audit (2019). There is therefore no need to report on status of the condition at this time.

3.3 Client Action Plan

Client action plan	In June 2018, EU and Norway met to discuss long term management strategies for the jointly
Introducton	managed stocks, including North Sea herring. An advice request was drafted and sent to ICES



	seeking options for revised long- term management strategies, this included North Sea herring.
	The key component embedded in the long- term management strategy will be a precautionary harvest control rule. On receiving the request, ICES notified EU and Norway that given the extensive scope of work involved the advice could not be delivered before the first quarter of 2019. EU and Norway accepted this timeframe.
	The advice from ICES to this request was published in April 2019 and EU and Norway met in May 2019 for initial discussion on the continued work on management strategies. No decisions were reached at this meeting ang the work on LTMS will continue under the autumn 2019. Once this has been agreed ICES will be asked to provide the 2020 TAC advice based on the new LTMS (until then MSY principles are used by ICES in their TAC advice).
	SPFPO works closely with DPPO: DFPO. PFA and SPSG. In particular, SPFPO and DPPO have a very close collaboration. When DPPO attends e.g. ICES meetings or other meetings where SPFPO does not attend, they carry a SPFPO mandate and also report back to SPFPO from the meetings.
Client action plan	Year 2 (2020): SPFPO will be represented in EU-Norway and North Sea member states (coastal states) meetings and negotiations including EU-Norway meetings where the ICES LTMS options are discussed.
	SPFPO will lobby the EU Commission and North Sea Member States to set each TAC based on the harvest control rule in place at the time the TAC is determined.
	Through DPPO industry scientists, SPFPO will be represented in ICES meetings and groups (the Herring Assessment Working Group (HAWG) and the ICES Baltic Ecoregion Advice Drafting Group (BSADG)). This ADG drafts the herring advice for both the North Sea and Skagerrak, Kattegat and Western Baltic herring stocks, given there is distribution overlap.
	Year 3 (2021): SPFPO will continue to be represented in EU-Norway and North Sea member states (coastal states) meetings and negotiations.
	SPFPO will continue to lobby the EU Commission and North Sea Member States to set each TAC based on the harvest control rule in place at the time the TAC is determined.
	Through DPPO industry scientists, SPFPO will continue to be be represented in ICES meetings and groups (the Herring Assessment Working Group (HAWG) and the ICES Baltic Ecoregion Advice Drafting Group (BSADG)).
	Year 4 (2022): SPFPO will continue to be represented in EU-Norway and North Sea member states (coastal states) meetings and negotiations.
	SPFPO will continue to lobby the EU Commission and North Sea Member States to set each TAC based on the harvest control rule in place at the time the TAC is determined.



	Through DPPO industry scientists, SPFPO will continue to be be represented in ICES meetings and groups (the Herring Assessment Working Group (HAWG) and the ICES Baltic Ecoregion Advice Drafting Group (BSADG)).
Consultation on condition	Consultations as necessary with DPPO, DFPO, PFA and SPSG client groups for overlapping MSCfisheries.

3.4 Re-scored Performance Indicators

3.4.1 PI 1.2.2 Harvest Control Rules

a. Original score & justification

The justifications and scores for scoring issue a and b or performance indicator 1.2.2 are unchanged. However, both the scoring justification and score for SI c is changed. This results in a reduction in score for the PI from 90 to 75. Below the original justification is presented, followed by a revised justification, with *red italicised* text used to illustrate significant changes in the text.

1.2.2 Harvest Control Rules There is some Available evidence С Evidence clearly shows that the tools in evidence that tools indicates that the tools use are effective in achieving the used to implement in use are appropriate exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules and effective in harvest control rules. Guidepost are appropriate and achieving the effective in controlling exploitation levels exploitation. required under the harvest control rules. Met? Υ Y Y The assessment team notes that between 2012 and 2017, the TAC has been set equal or less than the scientific advice provided by ICES in 2014 and in 2016. It is important to note that the TAC corresponds to the A fleet only while the ICES advice corresponds to the total catch. Further, the ICES catch of autumn spawners includes the transfer from 3a into the North Sea (agreed TAC-setting procedure, EU-Norway 2016). The transfer is substracted from the spring spawners TAC and effectively results in an increase in autumn spawners Justification catch above the ICES catch advice (ICES Advice 2017 her 27.20-24). Fishing mortality has been smaller than the F_{MGT} (since 2006) and F_{MSY} (since 1996). Therefore, the team considers that evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules and thus SG 100 is met.

b. Revised Score & Justification

1.2.2 Harvest Control Rules					
C	Guidepost	There is some evidence that tools used to implement harvest control rules are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation.	Available evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.	Evidence clearly shows that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.	
	Met?	Y	N	Ν	

Lloyd's Register

1st Surveillance Report

SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring



	TAC is the main tool used to achieve the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rule (HCR) for the North Sea herring fishery. This is agreed annually between the EU and Norway.
	The assessment team noted at the time of the 2017 scoring exercise that between 2012 and 2016, the TAC was set equal to or less than the scientific advice provided by ICES. It is important to note that the TAC corresponds to the A fleet only while the ICES advice corresponds to the total catch. Further, the ICES catch of autumn spawners includes the transfer from 3a into the North Sea (agreed TAC-setting procedure, EU-Norway 2016). The transfer is substracted from the spring spawners TAC and effectively results in an increase in autumn spawners catch above the ICES catch advice (ICES Advice 2017 her 27.20-24).
	As fishing mortality was smaller than the F_{MGT} (since 2006) and F_{MSY} (since 1996) the team concluded (<i>at the time of the 2017 scoring exercise</i>) that evidence indicated that the tools in use were appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules. <i>However, this conclusion was revised due to new information available at the time of the first annual surveillance in 2019</i> :
	The HCR for North Sea herring fisheries is contained within the Long-Term Management Strategy which was agreed between the EU and Norway on 1st January 2015. This contains a requirement that the TAC shall be determined using a value of F of no more than 0.26 (or a lower value if the stock is under 1.5Mt). It also contains a requirement that the inter-annual variation of TAC is no more than 15% from the TAC of the preceding year.
	At the meeting of the EU and Norway delegations in December 2017 the parties agreed to follow the ICES advice pertaining at that time (which was that F_{msy} was 0.33 rather than the previous estimate of 0.26). This was based on changes in the time series of natural mortality made by the ICES assessment working group. The meeting concluded that "it would be appropriate to follow the ICES MSY advice rather than the management strategy. The TAC of 600,588t represents a 25% increase compared to 2017."
Justification	The TAC set for 2018 therefore exceeded the inter-annual constraints set out in the harvest control rules, and was based on a value of F that exceeds the value set out in the harvest control rules. At the level at which it was set, TAC is therefore not controlling exploitation rates to the level required under the HCR, so SG80 is not met and a condition (Condition 1) is added. However, the continued existence of the TAC, which (when set according to the HCR) is an effective means of controlling exploitation rate and the fact that this has effectively controlled exploitation rates in the past, means that SG60 is met.

3.5 Revised Scores

As a result of PI 1.2.2 changing from 90 to 75 as a result of the condition above the overall score for Principle 1 is reduced. This change applies to both UoAs

	Principle 1	Principle 2	Principle 3
Original Score (2018)	91.9	90.0	89.9
Revised Score (2019)	90	90.0	89.9

This does not change the overall conclusion of the assessment.



4 Appendices

4.1 Evaluation processes and techniques

4.1.1 Site visits

In 2019, this first annual surveillance, during this certification period, was carried out remotely.

4.1.2 Stakeholder participation

A total of 48 stakeholder organisations and individuals with a relevant interest in the fishery were identified at the time of the original assessment and alerted to this surveillance, by means of e-mail, and given the opportunity to either request a meeting with the assessment team or submit information for their consideration. The interest of others not appearing on this list was solicited through the postings on the MSC website. The use of e-mail and website was deemed to be the most effective means of reaching relevant stakeholders. No organisations or individuals came forward to request a meeting with the surveillance team. The assessment team arranged a remote meeting with the client representative, Malin Skog on 16th July 2019. This provided the opportunity to discuss with the client all relevant details about the fishery, including any changes since the original assessment and the requirements which result from the harmonisation with other North Sea herring fisheries.

4.2 Stakeholder input

No written comments from stakeholders were received during this surveillance audit.

Verbal comments were made by the client representative. The comments have informed the relevant sections of this report. In addition, a summary of the meeting is held on record with the CAB. No verbal comments or queries were made to the audit team which required a formal or written response.

4.3 Revised surveillance program

As a result of the new harmonised condition (Condition 1) and the resulting reduction of the Principle 1 score it is appropriate to amend the surveillance level from Level 1 (1 off-site, 1 on-site and 2 review of information) to Level 3 (3 off-site and 1 on-site).

Surveillance levelYear 1Year 2Year 3Year 4Level 3Off-siteOff-siteOff-siteOn-sight surveillance
audit & re-certification
site visit

Table 6. Fishery surveillance program

 Table 7. Timing of surveillance audit

Year	Anniversary date of certificate	Proposed date of surveillance audit	Rationale
1-4	July 2018	July 2019 - 2022	It is proposed that the surveillance audit should be maintained on the usual annual timing synchronised with the anniversary of the certificate issue date. No clear reason to deviate from this is foreseen, other than potentially to harmonise with the timings of other North Sea Pelagic fisheries. This timing also coincides with the annual publication of the ICES advice.

 Table 8. Surveillance level rationale

Year	Surveillance activity	Number of auditors	Rationale



1,2 3	&	Off-site	1 auditor with remote support / review from 1 auditor	The off-sight surveillance in Years 1-3 can be carried out by 1 assessor as only 1 principle has a condition. This would be expected to review the latest HAWG stock annex, plus latest relevant ICES working Group Reports, plus review the status of the other North Sea herring fisheries. Stakeholder interviews may also be drawn upon. This can reliably be done by a single assessor. It may also be beneficial to draw on expertise across all 3 Principles, as required. This may necessitate having 2 assessors available.
4		On-site surveillance & Re-assessment	2 auditors on-site	For the 4th surveillance, which will coincide with the recertification, 2 assessors should attend the site visit.

4.4 Harmonised fishery assessments

Table 9. Overlapping fisheries

Fishery name	Certification status and date	Performance Indicators to harmonise
PFA & SPSG North Sea Herring	Certified April 2017. Certificate expires April 2022	
Northern Ireland Pelagic Sustainability Group (NIPSG) Irish Sea-Atlantic mackerel & North Sea herring	Certified Dec 2016 Certificate expires Dec 2021	
Norway North Sea herring	Certified Apr 2009 Certificate expires Jul 2019	Principle 1. Condition applied on: PI 1.2.2
FROM Nord North Sea and Eastern Channel pelagic trawl herring	Certified Apr 2015 Certificate expires Apr 2020	
DPPO and DFPO North Sea herring	Certified Jun 2009 Certificate expires Jul 2020	

Table 10. Overlapping fisheries

Supporting information

During the surveillance for the PFA and SPSG North Sea herring fishery in the autumn of 2018 (Andrews & Nichols 2018) it was concluded that the allocation of a TAC for North Sea herring in 2018 deviated from the management plan such that a significant change of MSC score may result. As a result, Lloyd's Register contacted the CABs responsible for the other North Sea herring fisheries and initiated harmonisation proceedings.

Was either FCP v2.1 Annex PB1.3.3.4 or PB1.3.4.5 applied when harmonising?	Yes
Date of harmonisation meeting	12th September 2018
If applicable, describe the meeting outcome	
It was agreed during these proceedings that:	



a) The 2018 TAC for North Sea Autumn Spawning herring was not set in accordance with the harvest control rules in the long-term management plan for this fishery. In particular the 25% increase in TAC for 2018 was in excess of the 15% inter-annual TAC constraint set out in the HCRs.

b) In response to this finding, a harmonised condition should be raised for PI1.2.2(c), reflecting concern that the 2018 TAC was not set in accordance with the HCRs for this fishery.

The assessment teams have agreed a harmonised re-scoring of PI1.2.2 and a condition of certification. This should apply to all North Sea Herring fisheries.



4.5 References

Andrews. J & Nichols. J (2018). MSC Off-Site Surveillance Report for PFA & SPSG North Sea Herring Fishery. Lloyd's Register on behalf of Pelagic Freezer-Trawler Association & Scottish Pelagic Sustainability Group Ltd. Available to download at: <u>https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/pfa-spsg-north-sea-herring/@@assessments</u>

Chaudhury S. & Lassen H (2019). EXPEDITED AUDIT REPORT Norway North Sea and Skagerrak herring fishery. Prepared by DNV GL on behalf of Norges Fiskarlag.

Chaudhury S., Lassen H., Huntington T. & Hønneland G. (2019). MSC Public Comment Draft Report for the Reassessment of the Norway North Sea herring fishery. Prepared by DNV GL on behalf of Norges Fiskarlag. Available for download at: <u>https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/norway-north-sea-herring/@@assessments</u>

Collinson K., Hønneland G. & Borges L (2018). MSC Year 3 Annual Surveillance Report for DPPO and DFPO North Sea herring fishery. Prepared by Control Union Pesca Ltd on behalf of Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation (DPPO) and Danish Fishermen Producer Organisation (DFPO). Available to download at: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/dppo-and-dfpo-north-sea-herring/@@assessments

EU (2019). COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) 2019/124 of 30 January 2019 fixing for 2019 the fishing opportunities for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks, applicable in Union waters and, for Union fishing vessels, in certain non-Union waters. Available on-line at: <u>https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019R0124&from=EN</u>

EU-Norway Joint Delegation (2018a). Agreed Record of Consultations on Long-Term Management Strategies Between Norway and the European Union. London, 7th June 2018. Pages 1–5. London. <u>https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/2018-sweden-norway-06-2018.pdf</u>.

EU-Norway Joint Delegation (2018b). Agreed record of consultations on long-term management on joint stocks between Norway and the European Union. London, 7th June 2018. <u>https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/2018-sweden-norway-06-2018.pdf</u>.

Hough A., Nichols J. & Carleton C (2018). MSC Off-Site Surveillance Report for Northern Ireland Pelagic Sustainability Sea herring fishery Group (NIPSG) Irish Sea-Atlantic mackerel & North Sea herring. Prepared by Lloyd's Register on behalf of Northern Ireland Pelagic Sustainability Group. Available for download at: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/northern-ireland-pelagic-sustainability-group-nipsg-irish-sea-atlantic-mackerelnorth-sea-herring/@@assessments

ICES (2018a). Advice Herring (Clupea harengus) in Subarea 4 and divisions 3.a and 7.d, autumn spawners (North Sea, Skagerrak and Kattegat, eastern English Channel). In: Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort: Greater North Sea Ecoregion. Published 31 May 2018. her.27.3a47d Version 2: 24 October 2018. Available on-line at: https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.4387

ICES (2018b). Stock Annex: Herring (Clupea harengus) in Subarea 4 and divisions 3.a and 7.d, autumn spawners. In Herring Assessment Working Group (HAWG) Report. pp. 38-214. Available on-line at: http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/acom/2018/HAWG/04%20HAWG%20Report%202018%20-

%20Sec%2002%20Herring%20in%20Subarea%204%20and%20divisions%203.a%20and%207.d,%20autumn%20sp awners.pdf

ICES (2018c). Report of the Benchmark Workshop on Pelagic Stocks (WKPELA, 2018) ICES CM 2018/ ACOM: 32. 12-16 February, 2018. ICES HQ, Copenhagen, Denmark. 42pp. Available on-line at: http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/acom/2018/WKPELA/WKPELA%202018 %20Report.pdf

ICES (2019a). Advice Herring (Clupea harengus) in Subarea 4 and divisions 3.a and 7.d, autumn spawners (North Sea, Skagerrak and Kattegat, eastern English Channel). In: Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort: Greater North Sea Ecoregion. In Report of the ICES Advisory Committee, 2019. ICES Advice 2019, her.27.3a47d. Published 29 May 2019. Available on-line at: https://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2019/2019/her.27.3a47d.pdf

ICES (2019b). Stock Annex: Herring (Clupea harengus) in Subarea 4 and divisions 3.a and 7.d, autumn spawners. In Herring Assessment Working Group (HAWG) Report. pp. 38-234. Available on-line at: https://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/Fisheries%20Resources%20Steering%20Group/2019/HAWG/04%20HAWG%20Report%202019%20-%20Sec%2002%20North%20Sea%20Herring.pdf

ICES (2019c). EU and Norway request concerning the long-term management strategy of cod, saithe, and whiting, and of North Sea autumn-spawning herring. In Report of the ICES Advisory Committee, 2019. ICES Advice 2019, sr.2019.06, <u>https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.advice.4895</u>.



SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring



"Sieben C & Freon P (2019). Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Year 4 Surveillance Report. FROM Nord North Sea and Eastern Channel pelagic trawl herring fishery. Prepared by Control Union Pesca Ltd on behalf of FROM Nord.

"Southall T & Cardinale M (2018). MSC Public Certification Report of SPFPO Swedish North Sea herring fishery. Prepared by Acoura Ltd on behalf of Swedish Pelagic Federation Producers Organisation (SPFPO). Available for download at: <u>https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/spfpo-swedish-north-sea-herring/@@assessments</u>