

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

T +44 (0)13 1335 6600 E food@lr.org www.lr.org

# **MSC SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES CERTIFICATION**

On-Site Surveillance Visit - Report for Japanese Pole and Line skipjack and albacore tuna Fishery



2<sup>nd</sup> Surveillance stage

November 2018

Certificate Code:F-ACO-0111Prepared For:Meiho Gyogyo Co., LtdPrepared By:Lloyd's RegisterAuthors:Jo Akroyd, Kevin McLoughlin, and Kohei Nagano





#### **Assessment Data Sheet**

Fishery name	Japanese Pole and Line skipjack and albacore tuna		
Species and Stock	Skipjack tuna ( <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> ) Albacore tuna ( <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> ) North Pacific stock		
CAB name	LR		
CAB contact details	Address	6 Redheughs Rigg Edinburgh EH12 9DQ	
	Phone/Fax	0131 335 6662	
	Email	fisheries@acoura.com	
	Contact name(s)	Polly Burns	
Client contact details	Address	Meiho Gyogyo Co., Ltd 3-14-6 Shinhama-cho Shiogama-shi Miyagi 985-0001 Japan	
	Email	Kenji Matsunaga	
	Contact name(s)	C/o kohei.nagano@intertek.com	



# Contents

1	Int	roduc	ction	5
	1.1	Scop	be of Surveillance	5
	1.2	Aims	of the Surveillance	5
	1.3	Certi	ificate Holder Details	5
2	Su	rveilla	ance Process	7
	2.1	Findi	ings of the original assessment	7
	2.2	Surv	eillance Activity	7
	2.2	2.1	Surveillance team details	7
	2.2	2.2	Date & Location of surveillance audit	7
	2.2	2.3	Stakeholder consultation & meetings	7
	2.2	2.4	What was inspected	7
	2.2	2.5	Stakeholder Consultation	3
	2.3	Surv	eillance Standards	3
	2.3	8.1	MSC Standards, Requirements and Guidance used	3
	2.3 int	8.2 roduc	Confirmation that destructive fishing practices or controversial unilateral exemptions have not been	8
3	Up	dated	d Fishery Background	3
	3.1	Char	nges in the management system	3
	3.2	Char	nges in relevant regulations	3
	3.3	Char	nges to personnel involved in science, management or industry	Э
	3.4	Char	nges to scientific base of information including stock assessments	Э
	3.4	l.1	Skipjack tuna	Э
	3.4	l.2	North pacific albacore10	C
	3.5	WCP	FC harvest strategy	C
	3.5	5.1	Skipjack	C
	3.5	5.2	North Pacific albacore1	1
	3.6	Char	nges and updates on Ecosystem issues12	2
	3.7	Harn	nonisation1	3
	3.8	Trace	eability14	4
	3.9	TAC	and catch data14	4
	3.10	Sı	ummary of Assessment Conditions1	5
4	Re	sults.		5
	4.1	Conc	lition 1	5
	4.2	Conc	dition 2	Э
	4.3	Conc	dition 3	2
	4.4	Conc	dition 4	6
5	Со	nclusi	ion29	Э
	5.1	Sum	mary of findings	Э
	Appe	endix	1 – Re-scoring evaluation tables	С
	Appe	endix	2 - Stakeholder submissions	С
	Арре	endix	3 - Surveillance audit information	C





# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Scope of Surveillance

This report outlines the findings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Surveillance of the Japanese Pole and Line skipjack and albacore tuna fishery. The scope of the certified fishery and of this surveillance is specified in the Units of Certification set out below. **There are no other eligible fishers at the present time.** 

#### UoC 1:

Species	Skipjack tuna (Katsuwonus pelamis)	
Geographical range	0-40 degrees North and 140-170 degrees East.	
	Fishing operations are in three distinct zones:	
	<ol> <li>Southern quarter: 0- 25 degrees north in latitude, 145- 175 degrees east in longitude</li> <li>Eastern off shore: 35 -45 degrees north in latitude, 165-176 degrees east in longitude</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Adjacent Sea of Japan (from near Tanegashima to the southern quarter).</li> </ol>	
Fishing Method	Pole and Line	
Stocks	Western and Central Pacific Ocean	
Management System	Japan and Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)	
Client Group	Meiho Gyogyo Co. Ltd	
	Vessels: Meiho Maru 22, Toyokuni Maru 8, Shoki-maru 35, and Meihomaru 37 (from March 2018)	

#### UoC 2

Species	Albacore tuna (Thunnus alalunga)	
Geographical range	0-40 degrees North and 140-170 degrees East.	
	Fishing operations are in three distinct zones:	
	<ol> <li>Southern quarter: 0- 25 degrees north in latitude, 145- 175 degrees east in longitude</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Eastern off shore: 35 -45 degrees north in latitude, 165-176 degrees east in longitude</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Adjacent Sea of Japan (from near Tanegashima to the southern quarter).</li> </ol>	
Fishing Method	Pole and Line	
Stocks	Western Central and Eastern Pacific Ocean	
Management System	Japan, WCPFC and Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)	
Client Group	Meiho Gyogyo Co. Ltd	
	Vessels: Meiho Maru 22, Toyokuni Maru 8, Shoki-maru 35, and Meihomaru 37 (from March 2018)	

## 1.2 Aims of the Surveillance

The purpose of the annual Surveillance Report is fourfold:

1. to establish and report on whether or not there have been any material changes to the circumstances and practices affecting the original complying assessment of the fishery;



2. to monitor the progress made to improve those practices that have been scored as below "good practice" (a score of 80 or above) but above "minimum acceptable practice" (a score of 60 or above) – as captured in any "conditions" raised and described in the Public Report and in the corresponding Action Plan drawn up by the client;

3. to monitor any actions taken in response to any (non-binding) "recommendations" made in the Public Report;

4. to re-score any Performance Indicators (PIs) where practice or circumstances have materially changed during the intervening year, focusing on those PIs that form the basis of any "conditions" raised.

Please note: The primary focus of this surveillance audit is assess changes made in the previous year. For a complete picture, this report should be read in conjunction with the Public Certification Report for this fishery assessment and the first annual surveillance which can be found here:

https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/japanese-pole-and-line-skipjack-and-albacore-tuna-fishery/@@view

#### 1.3 Certificate Holder Details

The certificate holder is Meiho Gyogyo Co. Ltd.

The fishery was certified on 17th October 2016 and the expiry date is 16th October 2021.

This is the second annual surveillance. The first annual surveillance audit was undertaken in October 2017.

The fishery has two units of certification as defined in the tables above.

There are two designated ports for the client vessels to land in eastern Japan, Yaizu and Shiogama.

The certificate applies to four vessels: Meiho Maru 22, Toyokuni Maru 08, Shoki-maru 35 and Meiho Maru 37.



# 2 Surveillance Process

## 2.1 Findings of the original assessment

As a result of the MSC assessment for this fishery, four conditions of certification were raised by the assessment team. The maintenance of the MSC certificate is contingent on the Japanese Pole and Line skipjack and albacore tuna fishery moving to comply with these conditions within the time-scales set at the time the certificate was issued.

The four conditions relate to:

- 1. UoC 1 skipjack PI 1.2.1(a). Harvest strategy.
- 2. UoC 1 skipjack 1.2.2 (a) (b) and (c). Harvest control rules.
- 3. UoC 2 albacore PI 1.1.2 (b) and (c). Reference Points.
- 4. UoC2 albacore PI 1.2.2 (a), (b) and (c). Harvest control rules.

For each condition, by the fourth annual surveillance, the Client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met for each scoring issue.

## 2.2 Surveillance Activity

#### 2.2.1 Surveillance team details

This surveillance visit was carried out by Jo Akroyd (onsite) and Kevin McLoughlin (offsite) and supported by Kohei Nagano (Intertek Japan). The Team Leader was Jo Akroyd. Jo Akroyd and Kohei Nagano were on the original assessment team for the fishery and were on-site for the surveillance visit. Mr Nagano acted as facilitator and translator. Kevin McLoughlin participated by way of email and a telephone conference on 8 November 2018.

#### 2.2.2 Date & Location of surveillance audit

The audit took place in Shiogama and Tokyo from 7-8th November 2018.

#### 2.2.3 Stakeholder consultation & meetings

Meetings took place with the client at Mehio Gyogyo Head office in Shiogama and with the Fisheries Agency of Japan, at their offices in Tokyo.

Kenji Matsunaga	President	Meiho Gyogyo Co. Ltd
Kensuke Goto	Company Representative	Meiho Gyogyo Co. Ltd
Teruo Kitade	Assistant Director, Fisheries	Fisheries Management Divn
	Management Division	Fisheries Agency of Japan
Takatsugu Kudoh	Staff, Fisheries Management	Fisheries Management Divn
	Division	Fisheries Agency of Japan
Kohei Nagano	Translator/Interpreter and	Intertek Certification Japan Ltd.
	Coordinator	
Jo Akroyd	Team Leader and P3	Lloyd's Register
Kevin McLoughlin	Team Member P1 and P2	Lloyd's Register (off-site)

A list of meeting attendees is given below:

#### 2.2.4 What was inspected

- Review of general information about the fishery.
- Review of target species skipjack and albacore (northern Pacific) stock status;
- Review of the Japan anchovy bait fishery;
- Review of fishing operations, including fishing areas, fishing effort, reporting and new vessel;
- Review of impacts on the ecosystem;
- Compliance with rules and regulations;
- Main markets and traceability;



• Progress on conditions.

#### 2.2.5 Stakeholder Consultation

Stakeholder organisations and individuals having relevant interest in the assessment were identified and consulted during this surveillance audit. The interest of others was solicited through the postings on the MSC website.

#### 2.3 Surveillance Standards

#### 2.3.1 MSC Standards, Requirements and Guidance used

This surveillance audit was carried out according to the MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements V1.3 and V2.0 was used for process.

# 2.3.2 Confirmation that destructive fishing practices or controversial unilateral exemptions have not been introduced

No indication was given or suggested during the surveillance audit to suggest that either of these practices is in evidence for this fishery. The client and Fishery agency of Japan confirmed that no such practices are used and that no controversial unilateral exemptions have been introduced.

# 3 Updated Fishery Background

No changes have been identified in the operation of the existing three vessels (Toyokuni-maru, Maihomaru and Shoki-maru). A fourth vessel (Meiho-Maru 37) was added to the certificate in 2018. Catch data by trip for 2015 and 2016, and 2017, suggest similar fishing patterns and catches as in previous years. The combined catch of skipjack and albacore has been approximately 98–99% of the total catch over this period (across all vessels operating). There has been some variation in the relative percentage of these two species (skipjack tuna catch was 89.6% of the total in 2016, 76.5% in 2017 and 83.9% to September 2018. Landings to the two ports (Yaizu and Shiogama) and flow of products as described at the PCR section 3.2 have also been similar.

As noted at section 3.6, below, catch and bait usage data by trip provided by the client suggest no change in operations or fishing outcomes.

Meiho-Maru 37 was added to the certificate in March 2018. The vessel is of a similar length and capacity as the existing three vessels and is expected to fish in the same areas and with similar provisioning and operations. Catch information by trip to September 2018 provided by the client, confirms this.

At this stage there are no plans for additional vessels to fish under the certificate.

#### 3.1 Changes in the management system

There were no changes to the overall structure of the management systems. The organisations and agencies involved in the regional and domestic management of tuna fisheries in the Western central Pacific Ocean and Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and in Japan continue to be structured and to operate in the same fashion as described in the Public Certification Report.

#### 3.2 Changes in relevant regulations

#### National

In August 2017, licenses for pelagic pole and line and longline vessels were renewed. This renewal is carried out every 5 years. Five years ago, there were 313 pelagic pole and line and longline vessels, now there are 240. As for pole and line vessels only, 5 years ago there were 43 vessels, whereas now there are 41 vessels. The reasons for this are economic and an ageing fishermen profile.

#### Regional



The WCPFC adopted eight Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) at its 2017 annual meeting (WCPFC 2018). Of these, CMM 2017-01 has direct impact on the management of the skipjack tuna stocks (see Results, Section 4):

**CMM 2017-01 Conservation and Management Measure for Bigeye, Yellowfin and Skipjack Tuna in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean** (replaced CMM 2012-01, CMM 2013-01, CMM 2014-01, CMM 2015-01, and CMM 2016-01). Pending the establishment of harvest strategies, and any implementing CMM, the purpose of this measure is to provide for a robust transitional management regime that ensures the sustainability of bigeye, skipjack and yellowfin tuna stocks.

Other CMMs adopted at the 2017 WCPFC Commission Meeting were:

CMM 2017-02 Conservation and Management Measure on Minimum standards for Port State measures.

CMM 2017-03 Conservation and Management Measure for the Protection of WCPFC Regional Observer Programme Observers (replaced CMM 2016-03).

CMM 2017-04 Conservation and Management Measure on Marine Pollution.

**CMM 2017-05 WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels and Authorisation to fish** (replaced CMM 2013-10, CMM 2004-01 and CMM 2009-01).

CMM 2017-06 Conservation and Management Measure for Mitigating Impacts of Fishing on Seabirds (replaced CMM 2015-03 and CMM 2012-07).

CMM 2017-07 Conservation and Management Measure for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (replaced CMM 2015-07 and prior CMMs).

**CMM 2017-08 Conservation and Management Measure for Pacific Bluefin Tuna** (replaced CMM 2016-04 and prior CMMs).

For North Pacific albacore, the major regional management measures (harmonised between WCPFC and IATTC) are **CMM 2005-03 (WCPFC)** and **Resolution C-05-02 (IATTC).** No changes have been made to these regulations since the certification of the fishery. See discussion below.

None of the regulation changes impact the status of this fishery's certification.

#### 3.3 Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry

No significant changes were identified.

#### 3.4 Changes to scientific base of information including stock assessments

#### 3.4.1 Skipjack tuna

As indicated at the 1<sup>st</sup> surveillance audit, skipjack tuna stock assessments have been considered in a large number of recent assessments, reassessments and surveillances, and several additional client fisheries are *in assessment* (see:

https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/@@search?q=skipjack&search). Two of the most recent are: the Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin purse seine (see:

https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/wpsta-western-and-central-pacific-skipjack-and-yellowfin-freeschool-purse-seine/@@view) and the PNA Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin, unassociated / non FAD set, tuna purse seine (see: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/pna-westernand-central-pacific-skipjack-and-yellowfin-unassociated-non-fad-set-tuna-purse-seine/). These

assessments reflect the currently harmonised Principle 1 assessment for skipjack tuna in the WCPFC. The harmonised scoring for skipjack reflected in these assessments is the same as in the assessment of the client fishery being audited here. Conditions are also compatible.



The skipjack stock assessment has not been updated since the certification of the client fishery and management advice from the WCPFC Scientific Committee has not changed. An updated stock assessment for skipjack tuna is to be undertaken in 2019.

At this stage, there is no need to update scoring. Progress against the conditions is discussed in the tables at *Section 4 Results*.

#### 3.4.2 North pacific albacore

The Northern Committee of the WCPFC reassessed the stock of north Pacific albacore in 2017. This audit does not consider the stock assessment in detail. A summary of the findings is given in the WCPFC14 Commission summary report (<u>https://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/wcpfc14</u>):

"The North Pacific albacore stock was likely not overfished and overfishing was likely not occurring. If constant fishing intensity was applied to the stock, median female spawning biomass was expected to undergo a moderate decline with a <0.01% probability of falling below the WCPFC established LRP by 2025. However, expected catches in this scenario would be below the recent average catch level for this stock."

The most recent MSC assessment of north Pacific albacore, released in June 2018, is for AAFA and WFOA North and South Pacific albacore (see: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/wpsta-westernand-central-pacific-skipjack-and-yellowfin-free-school-purse-seine/@@view). In scoring the AAFA/WFOA client fishery, the assessors concluded the PI 1.1.1 should be given a score of 90, whereas for the Japanese Pole and Line Fishery examined here, a score of 100 was achieved. The difference is based on the AAFA/WFOA assessors finding for PI 1.1.1b (noting that there is slightly different in this scoring issue to that of the client fishery audited here because the AAFA/WFOA fishery was assessed under MSC Fishery Certification Requirement v2.0 rather than V1.3). The AAFA/WFOA assessors found that, based on the recent stock assessment, there may not be a high degree of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY or has been above this level over recent years (hence scored 80 for this scoring issue).

The auditors conclude that, given it does not involve the introduction of a new condition, there is no need to update the scoring for this PI at this stage and that it should be further considered at a future re-assessment of the fishery.

The harmonised scoring for north Pacific albacore for other PIs reflected in the AAFA/WFOA assessment is consistent with that for the Japanese Pole and Line Fishery. Conditions are also compatible (again noting that the AAFA/WFOA fishery is assessed against MSC Fishery Certification Requirement v2.0).

Overall, taking account of the recent stock assessment and the AAFA/WFOA certification, the audit team concluded there to be no need to update the stock status scoring for north Pacific albacore.

Progress against the conditions is discussed in the tables at Section 4 Results.

## 3.5 WCPFC harvest strategy

#### 3.5.1 Skipjack

WCPFC CMM 2014-06 was adopted to develop and implement a harvest strategy approach for key fish stocks in the WCPO. The CMM identifies the elements that harvest strategies are to contain (including defined operational objectives, target and limit reference points for each stock, acceptable levels of risk of not breaching limit reference points (LRPs), a monitoring strategy, decision rules that aim to achieve the target reference point (TRP) and avoid the limit reference point, and management strategy evaluation). The CMM required the development of a workplan for its implementation, first adopted at WCPFC12 (WCPFC, 2015; Attachment Y). A LRP for skipjack of 0.2 SB F=0, was adopted in 2012 and an interim TRP (0.5 SBF=0) was adopted in 2015.

The harvest strategy workplan has been amended at subsequent Commission meetings and a number of the required outcomes have been delayed. In 2017 the Commission adopted an updated harvest strategy workplan (WCPFC, 2018; Attachment L; https://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/wcpfc14) extending out to 2021 to allow for the ongoing work towards adoption of harvest strategies for the four key stocks (skipjack, yellowfin, bigeye and south pacific albacore). The Secretariat was tasked with



including text to document progress achieved in 2017 under the WCPFC14 Harvest Strategies agenda items. Work Plan items (2018 to 2021) specific for skipjack are shown in the table below. The Commission agreed to reprioritise the annual agenda of the Commission and Scientific Committee as needed to allow sufficient additional time for consideration of harvest strategy issues. In addition, WCPFC14 recognised that there may also be a need for a dedicated science/management dialogue. Progress on aspects of the workplan is shown in the WCPFC14 Summary Report (WCPFC, 2018; Attachment L).

Updated harvest strategy workplan items for skipjack (WCPFC, 2018; Attachment L)

	Skipjack
2018	Develop harvest control rules (e) and Management strategy evaluation (f)
	<ul> <li>SC provide advice on performance of candidate harvest control rules. (ongoing).</li> </ul>
	TCC consider the implications of candidate harvest control rules. (ongoing).
	Commission consider advice on progress towards harvest control rules. (ongoing).
2019	Develop harvest control rules (e) and Management strategy evaluation (f)
	<ul> <li>SC provide advice on performance of candidate harvest control rules. (ongoing).</li> </ul>
	TCC consider the implications of candidate harvest control rules. (ongoing).
	Commission consider advice on progress towards harvest control rules. (ongoing).
	["TRP shall be reviewed by the Commission no later than 2019" – CMM 2015-06]
2020	Develop harvest control rules (e) and Management strategy evaluation (f)
	<ul> <li>SC provide advice on performance of candidate harvest control rules.</li> </ul>
	TCC consider the implications of candidate harvest control rules.
	Commission consider advice on progress towards harvest control rules.
	Adopt a Harvest Control Rule
2021	Harvest Strategy for skipjack in place

Although preparations for the implementation by the Commission of a harvest strategy for skipjack tuna are well advanced through the holding of Management Objectives Workshops, research presented at SC meetings and discussions at Commission meetings, it remains for CCMs to agree on several important components for implementation by the Commission.

At the 2017 Commission meeting a CMM (Tropical Tuna CMM 2017-01) for tropical tunas (skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna) was adopted "...to provide for a robust transitional management regime...", pending the establishment of harvest strategies. This CMM requires that the spawning biomass of skipjack tuna be maintained on average at a level consistent with the interim target reference point of 50% of the spawning biomass in the absence of fishing.

#### 3.5.2 North Pacific albacore

As indicated above, for North Pacific albacore the major regional management measures (harmonised between WCPFC and IATTC) are CMM 2005-03 (WCPFC) and Resolution C-05-02 (IATTC) which have the same requirements; i.e. that fishing effort should not be increased above current levels.

WCPFC14 considered an update on the status of the harvest strategy work plan for north Pacific albacore provided by the Northern Committee:

NC13 recommends that the Commission adopt the attached revision to the title of the previously adopted Precautionary Management Framework for North Pacific albacore (Attachment H), so that it may be recognized as a Harvest Strategy. In addition, NC13 recommends that the Commission direct the Secretariat to make this harvest strategy available, as a stand-alone harvest strategy document, on a web page dedicated to this and other harvest strategies, including interim harvest strategies, adopted by the Commission."

The Commission adopted the Interim Harvest Strategy for north Pacific Albacore Fisheries (NC13 Summary Report, Attachment H, Attachment I, <u>https://www.wcpfc.int/node/29863</u>), noting that it



modifies and replaces the previously adopted precautionary management framework for North Pacific albacore and is to be recognised as a harvest strategy.

At WCPFC14, the Secretariat provided WCPFC14-2017-14 (Rev1) Reference Document for Review of CMM 2005-03 and for the Development of Harvest Strategies under CMM 2014-06 North Pacific albacore, but no regulation changes were introduced.

WCPFC has adopted an LRP for north Pacific albacore (20%SSB<sub>current, F=0)</sub>. No Target Reference Points have been set for north Pacific albacore. One of the goals of the north Pacific albacore Management Strategy Evaluation currently underway is to advise the Northern Committee on a TRP for north Pacific albacore. LRPs for fishing intensity or F-based reference points for north Pacific albacore have not been adopted by either the IATTC or WCPFC.

At the end of 2017, formal harvest control rules had not yet been defined for north Pacific albacore by WCPFC or IATTC.

The audit team concluded that the WCPFC and IATTC are moving forward with harvest strategies and harvest control rules for tuna species. However, the ongoing revision of the workplan timelines jeopardizes the ability of MSC certified fisheries to close Principle 1 conditions.

#### 3.6 Changes and updates on Ecosystem issues

The original assessment overall Principle 2 score was 97.0. The pole and line fishery is highly selective and has little or very low impact. However, the fishery does take some species other than skipjack tuna and north Pacific albacore. Species caught include bigeye tuna, yellowfin tuna, dolphin fish, and yellowtail amberjack. Japanese anchovy caught in Japanese coastal waters is used as live bait. All species are retained and are scored at PI 2.1. None were identified in the PCR as "main" species using the definitions at CR v1.3 CB3.5 and GCB3.5.2.

For the 2<sup>nd</sup> surveillance, the client provided updated records of all catches, by species, for each vessel and trip. In the PCR it was reported that bigeye tuna catch is typically less than 1% of the total. In 2017, bigeye comprised 1.6% of the total catch of the three vessels fishing but to September 2018 was 0.72% of the total. Retained catch of other species was generally a small fraction of one per cent in any year for any vessel.

The audit team did not reclassify any primary species caught in the pole and line operations as main. No rescoring is necessary for these species.

The fishery uses live bait, collected in Japanese waters. Nearly all bait is Japanese anchovy, purchased from a large, industrial small pelagic fishery. Bait usage was estimated at original assessment at about 2.5% of the total catch and anchovy was treated as a minor, retained species. For the audit, the client provided updated bait purchase estimates for each vessel and trip. Bait usage as a percentage of total catch was 2.7% in 2015 and 2.6% in 2016. For both vessels, from 2011-2016, bait usage varies from 2.0-3.0% of total catch. In both 2017 and 2018 (to September), bait usage was 3.1% of the total catch.

Based only on percentage usage, the audit team did not reclassify Japanese anchovy as a main species under CR V1.3. No rescoring is necessary. Based on percentage criteria, no species are classified as main under CR V1.3. For completeness, however, the team did check on stock status of retained species and considered FCR V2.0 provisions at GSA3.4.2.2 (*Designating less resilient species as 'main' at 2%*).

As reported at the 1<sup>st</sup> surveillance audit, it was reported that there was a stock assessment update for bigeye tuna in 2017 (WCPFC-SC13-2017/SA-WP-05 Rev1) whereby the stock was estimated above 20%B0. The assessment can be found at <u>https://www.wcpfc.int/node/29518</u>.

In 2018, there was a re-evaluation of bigeye tuna status, incorporating an updated growth curve (<u>https://www.wcpfc.int/node/31024</u>). Based on this update, WCPFC-SC14 (<u>https://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/14th-regular-session-scientific-committee</u>) concluded that:



"...the WCPO bigeye tuna spawning biomass is above the biomass LRP and recent F is very likely below  $F_{MSY}$ . The stock is not experiencing overfishing (94% probability  $F < F_{MSY}$ ) and it is not in an overfished condition (0% probability  $BB/SB_{F=0} < LRP$ )".

Japan provided an updated assessment of yellowtail amberjack. The original paper, in Japanese (<u>http://www.abchan.fra.go.jp/digests2017/details/201742.pdf</u>), was summarised in English for the audit. The summary indicates that status of the species remains high and that there has been an upward trend in biomass for the last 5 years (from 2012 to 2016), calculated by virtual population analysis.

The 1<sup>st</sup> surveillance audit reported that a 2016 assessment of Japanese anchovy indicated that the stock had declined markedly from when previously assessed (as reported in the fishery's certification assessment PCR). The agreed spawning biomass limit is 130,000 tonnes, based on a low value observed in 1988. An updated assessment was provided by Japan based on data to 2017 (http://abchan.fra.go.jp/digests2017/html/2017\_24.html). The spawning stock biomass has been on a downward trend since 2004. The 2017 assessment indicates a spawning stock biomass of 108,000 tonnes for 2016. This continues to be below the limit but is higher than reported at the 1<sup>st</sup> audit. Discussion at the 1<sup>st</sup> audit suggested that recruitment fluctuations are driven by environmental conditions and that there is a history of cyclic, multi-decadal fluctuation for pelagic stocks, including sardines and anchovy. The client indicated at the current audit site meeting that when anchovy is in short supply the sardines tends to be more abundant and is used as bait.

Data provided to date on bait usage has not been split to separate anchovy/sardine but indicated that those data are available and will be provided in future.

Overall, the audit team was satisfied that i) using CR V1.3 definitions of main species, all retained species are currently not defined as main and there is no need to rescore, and ii) even considering criteria on FCR V2.0, all species would remain classified as not being main.

## 3.7 Harmonisation

Harmonisation of overlapping fisheries has taken place continuously since soon after the assessment site visit in 2015. Currently, the following fisheries overlap with the client fishery because they target (as a P1 stock) either skipjack tuna or north Pacific albacore:

Fishery	Species	Status
Talley's New Zealand Skipjack Tuna Purse Seine	Skipjack	Certified
Japanese Pole and Line skipjack and albacore tuna fishery (this fishery)	Skipjack N Pacific albacore	Certified
PNA Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin, unassociated / non FAD set, tuna purse seine	Skipjack Yellowfin	Certified
Solomon Islands skipjack and yellowfin tuna purse seine and pole and line	Skipjack Yellowfin	Certified
Tri Marine Western and Central Pacific Skipjack and Yellowfin Tuna	Skipjack Yellowfin	Certified
AAFA and WFOA North Pacific albacore tuna	N Pacific albacore	Certified
Northeastern Tropical Pacific Purse Seine yellowfin and skipjack tuna fishery	Skipjack Yellowfin	Certified
WPSTA Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin free school purse seine	Skipjack Yellowfin	Certified



PT Citraraja Ampat, Sorong pole and line Skipjack and Yellowfin Tuna	Skipjack Yellowfin	In Assessment
Ishihara Marine Products albacore and skipjack pole and line fishery	Skipjack N Pacific albacore	In Assessment

All assessment, surveillance, and reassessment files for these fisheries are available at the MSC Track a Fishery pages (<u>https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/</u>).

Harmonisation for fisheries catching skipjack tuna, yellowfin tuna, north Pacific albacore, and south Pacific albacore took place continuously during 2015, 2016, and is ongoing. Harmonisation was carried out between assessment teams/CABs and during a pilot, dedicated harmonisation meeting in Hong Kong in March 2016. That meeting led to agreement on scoring and conditions for all species at Principle 1, including for skipjack tuna and north Pacific albacore. There are ongoing discussions between assessment teams and CBAs with the entry of new client fisheries for assessment and reassessment of previously certified fisheries. Note the comments above in section 3.4.2 relations to the recent AAFA/WFOA scoring of PI 1.1.1 for north Pacific albacore.

We note that for this surveillance, there have been no inputs from any overlapping client fisheries.

## 3.8 Traceability

There are no changes since previous audit. The client company does operate two purse seine vessels fishing for the same species which are not part of the MSC certificate. These vessels land at different times to the pole and line vessels and catch cannot be mixed on landing. At the client premises the MSC and non-MSC species are kept separately. This is audited under their Chain of Custody certificate audited by Intertek Japan

## 3.9 TAC and catch data

There is no total allowable catch set for skipjack or north Pacific albacore tuna in the WCPFC. Catches in tonnes by the UoC in recent years are shown in the table, below. Also shown are the total estimated WCPFC catches for skipjack as reported to the Scientific Committee in paper WCPFC-SC14-2017/ST-IP-1 (https://www.wcpfc.int/node/30995). North Pacific albacore catch estimates for the entire WCPFC are not readily available, and it is necessary to make assumptions on the split of north and south Pacific stocks as noted in the PCR.

YEAR	UoC Skipjack	UoC NP Albacore	WCPFC skipjack
2011	1,135	592	1,536,151
2012	751	567	1,753,571
2013	1,376	1,228	1,838,434
2014	2,308	942	2,000,608
2015	2,541	659	1,795,524
2016	2,801	303	1,790,620
2017	3,061	841	1,624,162

Unit: tonnes (or metric tons)

Total UoC catches have been around 3,000 tonnes per year in recent years but were higher at about 3,900 tonnes in 2017. There has been some variation in the relative percentage of these two species in client fishery catches (skipjack tuna catch was 89.6% of the total in 2016, 76.5% in 2017 and 83.9% to September 2018. Total WCPFC skipjack catches remained high in 2015 and 2016 at around 1.8 million tonnes but were somewhat lower in 2017 at around 1.6 million tonnes. The UoC percentage of the total WCPFC skipjack catch remains very low (approximately 0.15% in 2016 and 0.19% in 2017. According to the client, the change in proportion of skipjack and albacore catch in recent years is not due to changes in fishery practice or targeting but is a reflection of species availability during operations.



# 3.10 Summary of Assessment Conditions

Condition number	Performance indicator (PI)	Status	PI original score	PI revised score
1	Skipjack 1.2.1	On target	70	Not revised
2	Skipjack 1.2.2	On target	60	Not revised
3	Albacore 1.1.2	On target	70	Not revised
4	Albacore 1.2.2	On target	60	Not revised

# 4 Results



## 4.1 Condition 1

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Skipjack 1.2.1 Scoring Issue a	<ul> <li>a) There are no formally agreed harvest control rules yet in place. The primary intended control on fishing mortality is through effort and capacity limitation, with the key constraints imposed through the PNA VDS. The processes for determining VDS Total Allowable Effort (TAE) and Party Allocations of Effort (PAE) are not transparent. More importantly, it is unclear how the TAE are determined, based on stock status advice. There is no clear linkage between potential catch and allocated effort. It is therefore not clear that the harvest strategy, utilizing high quality science and compliance information, and founded on high quality scientific advice, is responsive to the state of the skipjack stock; SG80 requirements are not met.</li> </ul>	70
Condition	By the fourth annual surveillance, the client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: a) The harvest strategy is responsive to the state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy work together towards achieving management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points.		
Milestones	It is recognized that the Client has limited ability directly to ensure the SG80 are met at each scoring issue. The Client will need to work through the FAJ and the JTFCA. The key issue is transparency of the linkage between catching opportunity (informed by scientific assessments) and the primary control in the fishery (the use of effort controls by the PNA). Milestone 1: By the first annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of advocacy within Japan for support of the WCPFC-agreed work plan for harvest control rules, adopted at WCPFC12 in support of WCPFC CMM 2014-06. Advocacy is also required that the linkage between catching opportunity and effort limitations are made explicit. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60. Milestone 2: By the second annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of continued advocacy within Japan for participation in and support of the WCPFC-agreed work plan for harvest control rules, adopted at WCPFC12 in support of WCPFC. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score 60.		



	The gist
	Milestone 3: By third annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of continued advocacy within Japan for participation in and support of the WCPFC-agreed work plan for harvest control rules, adopted at WCPFC12 in support of WCPFC CMM 2014-06, and any modifications to that work plan agreed by the WCPFC. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60. Milestone 4: By the fourth annual surveillance, the client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: a) The harvest strategy is responsive to the state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy work together towards achieving management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points.
	We have established our action plan to get the following done to meet the SG80 requirements by the fourth annual surveillance:
	Voor 1
	We will work to ensure that the harvest strategy for skipjack tunas is adopted at WCPFC annual meetings. As a first step, we will actively push the FAJ to let the Japanese delegation to the WCPFC establish a basis on which the awareness of the necessity to limit the catch of skipjack can be boosted at meetings of the commission in the foreseeable future and the development and adoption of appropriate harvest control rules can be encouraged there as outlined in CMM 2014-06 and the Commission work plan agreed in 2015.
	Action plans established by the FAJ and relevant organizations such as the JTFA include examination of harvest strategies necessary to achieve their management objectives, which is necessary for appropriate management strategy to be created and submitted to WCPFC annual meetings in line with the agreed work plan. This examination will expressly demonstrate that such organizations in Japan support the process for the development of harvest strategies and harvest control rules.
Client action plan	
	Year 2 and onwards
	Text as in Public Certification Report:
	We will assess each year progress of the WCPFC and PNA towards meeting the condition and will continue to seek dialogue with FAJ and JTFA to ensure Japanese involvement in and advocacy for development and implementation of a clear harvest strategy involving target and limit reference points (already set), harvest control rules (as in CMM 2014-06), and clear linkage between catch and effort.
	Revision of Client Action Plant following the 1 <sup>st</sup> surveillance audit:
	Noting the difficulty in developing milestones and a CAP when the small scale UoC can have no direct influence on international fisheries bodies, the audit team at the 1st audit accepted a revision to the CAP. The following text was adopted:
	<i>Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that the harvest strategy for skipjack tuna is responsive to the state of the stock and the</i>



	<i>elements of the harvest strategy work together towards achieving management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points.</i>
	It is noted that the client can have no direct influence on the international bodies which will need to act to close the condition. The CAP in the PCR therefore requires the client to advocate to the FAJ and other relevant organisations for progress towards meeting the condition. Evaluation of progress must therefore consider how the client has advocated for progress rather than measuring actual progress of work against the final condition outcome.
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ representatives were very positive about the certification and recognised the need for its support. Recollecting that the Ministry cannot provide a formal letter of support for reasons covered in the PCR, FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the condition is closed.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI1.2.1.
Progress on Condition [2017]	The audit team notes the difficulty in developing milestones and a CAP when the small scale UoC can have no direct influence on international fisheries bodies. Milestones and the CAP need to be realistic. The client proposed a simplification of the CAP for year 2 onwards to reflect i) its lack of ability directly to influence progress, ii) the need for it to try to promote progress by asking relevant Japanese agencies (FAJ) to promote progress on its behalf. A revised CAP was proposed and accepted by the audit team.
	The revised CAP for Year 2 onwards is as follows: <i>Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However,</i> <i>Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence</i> <i>the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask</i> <i>FAJ to promote that for skipjack tuna a) The harvest strategy is responsive to the</i> <i>state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy work together towards</i> <i>achieving management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference</i> <i>points.</i>
	Meiho Gyogyo also noted that it would keep a record of all communications related to progress against the condition.
	As indicated in the report of the 1 <sup>st</sup> surveillance audit (and above), a decision was made to revise the CAP to more appropriately reflect the role of the client in pursuing the closure of this condition (as above).
	The client indicated that they participated in the following industry meetings since the previous surveillance audit:
Progress on Condition [2018]	• Distant Water Tuna Fishery Meeting (2nd session) held on February 23, 2018 (attendees included FAJ and the client representative, Kazuki Yoshida, Yaizu Branch Head. At this meeting, Mr Yoshida advocated to the agency for progress towards achieving the fishery conditions.
	<ul> <li>Distant Water Pole and Line Tuna Fishery Vessel Owner Meeting (1st and 2nd sessions) on May 16 and August 30, 2018</li> </ul>
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the conditions are



	closed. Unfortunately, documentation on Meiho Gyogyo's interactions with the Ministry and FAJ was not available at the audit but they have indicated that that it would keep a record of all communications related to progress against the condition in future.
	FAJ indicated that they participate proactively at WCPFC meetings, including promoting development of the harvest strategy and harvest control rules. They have discussions prior to these meetings with the Tuna association and individual companies, including Meiho Gyogyo.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.2.1 for skipjack tuna.
Status of condition	On target

## 4.2 Condition 2

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
		<ul> <li>There are not yet any well-defined harvest control rules in place and SG80 is not met.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>b) HCR are still under development and neither SG80 nor SG100 is met.</li> </ul>	
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Skipjack 1.2.2 Scoring Issue a, b and c	ci) CR v2.0 SA2.5.6 requires that as part of the evidence that tools are working, "teams should include current levels of exploitation in the UoA, as measured by fishing mortality rate where available"	60
		cii) MSC CR v2.0 SA2.5.5b, related to when HCRs are recognized as being available at SI(a) at the SG60 level (see above), requires "a description of a formal or legal agreement to trigger the development of HCR".	
Condition	By the fourth annual surveillance, the client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: a) Well defined harvest control rules shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) The selection of the harvest control rules shall take into account the main uncertainties; c) Evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules		
	Milestones: It is recognised SG80 are met at each sco FAJ and the JTFCA.	d the Client has limited ability directly to en ring issue. The Client will need to work thre	sure the ough the
Milestones	Milestones for Condition 2 of harvest control rules be	parallel those for Condition 1, with the deving a subset of harvest strategy development	velopment ent.
	It is recognised the Client at each scoring issue. The	has limited ability directly to ensure the SG Client will need to work through the FAJ a	80 are met nd the



	JTFCA. The key issue is transparency of the linkage between catching opportunity (informed by scientific assessments) and the primary control in the fishery (the use of effort controls by the PNA).
	<b>Milestone 1:</b> By the first annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of advocacy within Japan for support of the WCPFC-agreed work plan for harvest control rules, adopted at WCPFC12 in support of WCPFC CMM 2014-06. Advocacy is also required that the linkage between catching opportunity and effort limitations are made explicit. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60.
	<b>Milestone 2</b> : By the second annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of continued advocacy within Japan for participation in and support of the WCPFC-agreed work plan for harvest control rules, adopted at WCPFC12 in support of WCPFC CMM 2014-06, and any modifications to that work plan agreed by the WCPFC. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60.
	<b>Milestone 3</b> : By third annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of continued advocacy within Japan for participation in and support of the WCPFC-agreed work plan for harvest control rules, adopted at WCPFC12 in support of WCPFC CMM 2014-06, and any modifications to that work plan agreed by the WCPFC. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60.
	<b>Milestone 4</b> : By the fourth annual surveillance, the client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: a) Well defined harvest control rules shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) The selection of the harvest control rules shall take into account the main uncertainties; c) Evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
	Consistent with (the same as) the CAP for Condition 1, we have established our action plan to get the following done to meet the SG80 requirements by the fourth annual surveillance:
	Year 1
Client action plan	We will work to ensure that the harvest strategy for skipjack tunas is adopted at WCPFC annual meetings. As a first step, we will actively push the FAJ to let the Japanese delegation to the WCPFC found a basis on which the awareness of the necessity to limit the catch of skipjack can be boosted at meetings of the commission in the foreseeable future and the development and adoption of appropriate harvest control rules as outlined in CMM 2014-06 and the Commission work plan agreed in 2015
	Action plans established by the FAJ and relevant organizations such as the JTFA include examination of harvest strategies necessary to achieve their management objectives, which is necessary for appropriate management strategy to be created and submitted to WCPFC annual meetings in line with the agreed work plan. This examination will expressly demonstrate that such organizations in Japan support the process for the development of harvest strategies and harvest control rules.
	Year 2 and onwards



	Text as in Public Certification Report:
	We will assess each year progress of the WCPFC and PNA towards meeting the condition and will continue to seek dialogue with FAJ and JTFA to ensure Japanese involvement in and advocacy for development and implementation of a clear harvest strategy involving target and limit reference points (already set), harvest control rules (as in CMM 2014-06), and clear linkage between catch and effort.
	<b>Revision of Client Action Plant following the 1</b> <sup>st</sup> <b>surveillance audit:</b> <i>Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that for skipjack tuna a) well defined harvest control rules for skipjack tuna shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) the selection of the harvest control rules for skipjack shall take into account the main uncertainties; and c) evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.</i>
	It is noted that the client can have no direct influence on the international bodies which will need to act to close the condition. The CAP in the PCR therefore requires the client to advocate to the FAJ and other relevant organisations for progress towards meeting the condition. Evaluation of progress must therefore consider how the client has advocated for progress rather than measuring actual progress of work against the final condition outcome.
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ representatives were very positive about the certification and recognised the need for its support. Recollecting that the Ministry cannot provide a formal letter of support for reasons covered in the PCR, FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the condition is closed.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.2.2.
Progress on Condition [2017]	The audit team notes the difficulty in developing milestones and a CAP when the small scale UoC can have no direct influence on international fisheries bodies. Milestones and the CAP need to be realistic. The client proposed a simplification of the CAP for year 2 onwards to reflect i) its lack of ability directly to influence progress, ii) the need for it to try to promote progress by asking relevant Japanese agencies (FAJ) to promote progress on its behalf. A revised CAP was proposed and accepted by the audit team.
	The revised CAP for Year 2 onwards is as follows: Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that for skipjack tuna a) well defined harvest control rules for skipjack tuna shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) the selection of the harvest control rules for skipjack shall take into account the main uncertainties; and c) evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
Progress on Condition [2018]	The client indicated that they participated in the following industry meetings since the previous surveillance audit:



	<ul> <li>Distant Water Tuna Fishery Meeting (2nd session) held on February 23, 2018 (attendees included FAJ and the client representative, Kazuki Yoshida, Yaizu Branch Head. At this meeting, Mr Yoshida advocated to the agency for progress towards achieving the fishery conditions.</li> <li>Distant Water Pole and Line Tuna Fishery Vessel Owner Meeting (1st and 2nd sessions) on May 16 and August 30, 2018</li> </ul>
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the conditions are closed. Unfortunately, documentation on Meiho Gyogyo's interactions with the Ministry and FAJ was not available at the audit but they have indicated that that it would keep a record of all communications related to progress against the condition in future.
	FAJ indicated that they participate proactively at WCPFC meetings, including promoting development of the harvest strategy and harvest control rules. They have discussions prior to these meetings with the Tuna association and individual companies, including Meiho Gyogyo.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.2.2 for skipjack tuna.
Status of condition	On target

# 4.3 Condition 3

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Albacore 1.1.2 Scoring Issue b and c	Scoring Issue (b): The WCPFC LRP of 20%SBF=0 is arguably set by default following adoption of a hierarchical approach at the 8th Annual Session of the Commission. No equivalent exists as yet for the IATTC. Fmsy is an implicit LRP in both the WCPFC and IATTC, by Convention. However, while the WCPFC has explicitly agreed to use Fmsy as a LRP for skipjack tuna, it has not done so for North Pacific albacore. The ISC has adopted a working LRP of FSSB-ATHL but this has not been adopted in any formal sense by WCPFC or IATTC, though neither RFMO has rejected repeated advice based upon it.	70
		The SG requires that LRPs be 'set' rather than as at SI1.1.2c, where the language of requirement is more relaxed. As only one of the two RFMOs has in any sense 'set' an LRP (and acknowledging that the setting followed meta-analyses to ensure it was precautionary) and noting the need to harmonise assessments with CHMSF	



		(2015), it is considered the SG80 requirements are not met.	
		(NB CR v1.30 CB2.3.2.1 can be read to allow wider use of implicit reference points. However, the paragraph refers to usage within management procedures, management strategies or decision rules, and is therefore deemed not relevant here.)	
		Scoring Issue (c):	
		Both the WCPFC and IATTC Conventions use language suggesting all fish stocks covered by their Conventions should maintain or restore populations of harvested species at levels of abundance which can produce the MSY, inter alia, through the setting of the total allowable catch and/or the total allowable level of fishing capacity and/or level of fishing effort. Arguably, this creates an implicit MSY-related target.	
		However, this argument, akin to that used above to support implicit LRPs, is not well-tested. Also, given the MSC requirement to harmonise assessments with CHMSF (2015), it is considered the SG80 requirements are not met.	
Condition	By the fourth annual surveithat the SG80 requirement above the level at which th capacity; c) The target reference level consistent with BMSY outcome.	illance, the client must be in a position to d s have been met: b) The limit reference po ere is an appreciable risk of impairing repr prence point is such that the stock is mainta ' or some measure or surrogate with simila	lemonstrate bint is set oductive ained at a ar intent or
	Milestones: It is recognised SG80 are met at each scor FAJ and the JTFCA.	d the Client has limited ability directly to en ring issue. The Client will need to work thro	sure the ough the
	Milestone 1:		
Milestones	By the first annual surveilla advocacy within Japan for adoption of limit and target already agreed under harv and IATTC, 2014). The mil been defined as a means to likely not result in a change Note that unlike skipjack, N WCPFC-agreed work plan the Northern Committee (s	ance, the Client should show clear evidence adoption of a clear and time bound plan to reference points, for North Pacific albacor est strategy development in WCPFC CMM estone associated with this surveillance au o monitor progress. Meeting this milestone in score at this surveillance audit - Interin North Pacific albacore is not included explic agreed in December 2015 and will rely on ee footnote 1 of CMM 2014-06).	e of e enable re tuna (as 1 2014-06 udit has e would n score 60. citly in the i input by
	Milestone 2:		
	By the second annual surv continued advocacy within IATTC processes (as alrea WCPFC CMM 2014-06 and Committee. The milestone	eillance, the Client should show clear evid Japan for participation in and support of W dy agreed under harvest strategy develop d IATTC, 2014), and advice from the North associated with this surveillance audit has	ence of VCPFC and ment in hern s been



	defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60.	
	Milestone 3:	
	By third annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of continued advocacy within Japan for participation in and support of WCPFC and IATTC processes (as already agreed under harvest strategy development in WCPFC CMM 2014-06 and IATTC, 2014), and advice from the Northern Committee. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit - Interim score 60.	
	Milestone 4:	
	By the fourth annual surveillance, the Client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: b) The limit reference point is set above the level at which there is an appreciable risk of impairing reproductive capacity; c) The target reference point is such that the stock is maintained at a level consistent with BMSY or some measure or surrogate with similar intent or outcome.	
	We've established our action plan to get the following done to meet the SG80 requirements within 4 years.	
	Year 1	
	By way of the JTFA, we will actively push the FAJ as the Japanese delegation to the WCPFC and IATTC to encourage each commission to develop and decide appropriate target reference points and limit reference points for the albacore stock in the North Pacific Ocean as required under WCPFC CMM 2014-06. This work will expressly demonstrate that there is support from Japanese organizations toward the commission's development of albacore harvest strategies.	
	Year 2 and onwards	
Client action plan	Text as in Public Certification Report:	
	We will assess each year progress of the WCPFC and PNA towards meeting the condition and will continue to seek dialogue with FAJ and JTFA to ensure Japanese involvement in and advocacy for development and implementation of a clear harvest strategy involving target and limit reference points (already set), harvest control rules (as in CMM 2014-06), and clear linkage between catch and effort.	
	Revision of Client Action Plant following the 1 <sup>st</sup> surveillance audit:	
	Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that for north Pacific albacore b) the limit reference point for albacore is set above the level at which there is an appropriate risk of impairing reproductive capacity; and c) the target reference point for albacore is such that the stock is maintained at a level consistent with $B_{MSY}$ or some measure or surrogate with similar intent or outcome.	
Progress on Condition [2017]	It is noted that the client can have no direct influence on the international bodies which will need to act to close the condition. The CAP in the PCR therefore requires the client to advocate to the FAJ and other relevant organisations for progress towards meeting the condition. Evaluation of progress must therefore	



	consider how the client has advocated for progress rather than measuring actual progress of work against the final condition outcome.
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ representatives were very positive about the certification and recognised the need for its support. Recollecting that the Ministry cannot provide a formal letter of support for reasons covered in the PCR, FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the condition is closed.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.1.2.
	The audit team notes the difficulty in developing milestones and a CAP when the small scale UoC can have no direct influence on international fisheries bodies. Milestones and the CAP need to be realistic. The client proposed a simplification of the CAP for year 2 onwards to reflect i) its lack of ability directly to influence progress, ii) the need for it to try to promote progress by asking relevant Japanese agencies (FAJ) to promote progress on its behalf. A revised CAP was proposed and accepted by the audit team.
	The revised CAP for Year 2 onwards is as follows: Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that for north Pacific albacore a) the limit reference point for albacore is set above the level at which there is an appropriate risk of impairing reproductive capacity; and b) the target reference point for albacore is such that the stock is maintained at a level consistent with BMSY or some measure or surrogate with similar intent or outcome.
	The client indicated that they participated in the following industry meetings since the previous surveillance audit:
	• Distant Water Tuna Fishery Meeting (2nd session) held on February 23, 2018 (attendees included FAJ and the client representative, Kazuki Yoshida, Yaizu Branch Head. At this meeting, Mr Yoshida advocated to the agency for progress towards achieving the fishery conditions.
	<ul> <li>Distant Water Pole and Line Tuna Fishery Vessel Owner Meeting (1st and 2nd sessions) on May 16 and August 30, 2018</li> </ul>
Progress on Condition [2018]	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the conditions are closed. Unfortunately, documentation on Meiho Gyogyo's interactions with the Ministry and FAJ was not available at the audit but they have indicated that that it would keep a record of all communications related to progress against the condition in future.
	FAJ indicated that they participate proactively at WCPFC meetings, including promoting development of the harvest strategy and harvest control rules. They have discussions prior to these meetings with the Tuna association and individual companies, including Meiho Gyogyo.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.1.2 for north Pacific albacore tuna.
Status of condition	On target



# 4.4 Condition 4

	Insert relevant Pl number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score
		<ul> <li>There are not yet any well-defined harvest control rules in place and SG80 is not met.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>b) HCR are still under development and neither SG80 nor SG100 is met.</li> </ul>	
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	Albacore PI 1.2.2 Scoring Issues a, b and c	ci) CR v2.0 SA2.5.6 requires that as part of the evidence that tools are working, "teams should include current levels of exploitation in the UoA, as measured by fishing mortality rate where available"	60
		cii) MSC CR v2.0 SA2.5.5b, related to when HCRs are recognized as being available at si(a) at the SG60 level (see above), requires "a description of a formal or legal agreement to trigger the development of HCR".	
Condition	By the fourth annual surveillance, the client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: a) Well defined harvest control rules shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) The selection of the harvest control rules shall take into account the main uncertainties; c) Evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.		
	Milestones: It is recognised t SG80 are met at each scorir FAJ and the JTFCA.	he Client has limited ability directly to ensu ng issue. The Client will need to work throu	ure the ıgh the
Milestones	<b>Milestone 1</b> : By the first ann evidence of advocacy within to enable adoption of a harve points and harvest control ru agreed under harvest strateg IATTC, 2014). The milestone defined as a means to monit result in a change in score a unlike skipjack, North Pacific agreed work plan agreed in Northern Committee (see for	Japan for adoption of a clear and timebour est strategy (including limit and target refer les) for North Pacific albacore tuna (as alr gy development in WCPFC CMM 2014-06 e associated with this surveillance audit has or progress. Meeting this milestone would t this surveillance audit - Interim score 60. e albacore is not included explicitly in the W December 2015 and will rely on input by the panote 1 of CMM 2014-06).	lear ind plan rence eady and is been likely not Note that VCPFC- ne
	<b>Milestone 2</b> : By the second annual surveillance, the Client should show clear evidence of continued advocacy within Japan for participation in and support of WCPFC and IATTC processes (as already agreed under harvest strategy development in WCPFC CMM 2014-06 and IATTC, 2014), and advice from the Northern Committee. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit Interim score 60.		
	Milestone 3: By third annua evidence of continued advoc WCPFC and IATTC process	l surveillance, the Client should show clea acy within Japan for participation in and s es (as already agreed under harvest strate	r upport of egy



	development in WCPFC CMM 2014-06 and IATTC, 2014), and advice from the Northern Committee. The milestone associated with this surveillance audit has been defined as a means to monitor progress. Meeting this milestone would likely not result in a change in score at this surveillance audit – Interim score 60. <b>Milestone 4:</b> By the fourth annual surveillance, the Client must be in a position to demonstrate that the SG80 requirements have been met: b) The limit reference point is set above the level at which there is an appreciable risk of impairing reproductive capacity; c) The target reference point is such that the stock is maintained at a level consistent with BMSY or some measure or surrogate with similar intent or outcome.
	Consistent with (the same as) the CAP for Condition 1, we have established our action plan to get the following done to meet the SG80 requirements by the fourth annual surveillance:
	Year 1
	We will work to ensure that the harvest strategy for albacore tuna in the North Pacific is adopted at WCPFC and IATTC annual meetings. As a first step, we will actively push the FAJ to let the Japanese delegation to the WCPFC found a basis on which the awareness of the necessity to limit the catch of albacore tuna can be boosted at meetings of the commission in the foreseeable future and the development and adoption of appropriate harvest control rules as outlined in CMM 2014-06. We will push in the first year for the FAJ to propose adding a specific work plan for albacore in the North Pacific (as it was not included in December 2015).
	Action plans established by the FAJ and relevant organizations such as the JTFA include examination of harvest strategies necessary to achieve their management objectives, which is necessary for appropriate management strategy to be created and submitted to WCPFC annual meetings in line with the agreed work plan. This examination will expressly demonstrate that such organizations in Japan support the process for the development of harvest strategies and harvest control rules.
	Year 2 and onwards
	Text as in Public Certification Report:
	We will assess each year progress of the WCPFC and PNA towards meeting the condition and will continue to seek dialogue with FAJ and JTFA to ensure Japanese involvement in and advocacy for development and implementation of a clear harvest strategy involving target and limit reference points (already set), harvest control rules (as in CMM 2014-06), and clear linkage between catch and effort.
	Revision of Client Action Plant following the 1 <sup>st</sup> surveillance audit:
	Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that for north Pacific albacore a) well defined harvest control rules for albacore shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) the selection of the harvest control rules for albacore shall take into account the main uncertainties; and c) evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
Progress on Condition [2017]	It is noted that the client can have no direct influence on the international bodies which will need to act to close the condition. The CAP in the PCR therefore requires the client to advocate to the FAJ and other relevant organisations for progress towards meeting the condition. Evaluation of progress must therefore



	consider how the client has advocated for progress rather than measuring actual progress of work against the final condition outcome.
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ representatives were very positive about the certification and recognised the need for its support. Recollecting that the Ministry cannot provide a formal letter of support for reasons covered in the PCR, FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the condition is closed.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.2.2.
	The audit team notes the difficulty in developing milestones and a CAP when the small scale UoC can have no direct influence on international fisheries bodies. Milestones and the CAP need to be realistic. The client proposed a simplification of the CAP for year 2 onwards to reflect i) its lack of ability directly to influence progress, ii) the need for it to try to promote progress by asking relevant Japanese agencies (FAJ) to promote progress on its behalf. A revised CAP was proposed and accepted by the audit team.
	The revised CAP for Year 2 onwards is as follows: Meiho Gyogyo cannot directly influence progress against this condition. However, Meiho Gyogyo will use all available mechanisms and relationships to influence the Fisheries Agency of Japan (FAJ) to promote progress. Meiho Gyogyo will ask FAJ to promote that for north Pacific albacore a) well defined harvest control rules for albacore shall be in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached; b) the selection of the harvest control rules for albacore shall take into account the main uncertainties; and c) evidence shall be available that indicates that tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.
	The client indicated that they participated in the following industry meetings since the previous surveillance audit:
Progress on Condition [2018]	• Distant Water Tuna Fishery Meeting (2nd session) held on February 23, 2018 (attendees included FAJ and the client representative, Kazuki Yoshida, Yaizu Branch Head. At this meeting, Mr Yoshida advocated to the agency for progress towards achieving the fishery conditions.
	<ul> <li>Distant Water Pole and Line Tuna Fishery Vessel Owner Meeting (1st and 2nd sessions) on May 16 and August 30, 2018</li> </ul>
	During discussions, the FAJ confirmed that the client has participated in industry meetings to put forward views and that the client has additionally approached FAJ through phone calls. FAJ (as part of the Ministry) pointed out its strong, continuing support and desire to see progress in ensuring the conditions are closed. Unfortunately, documentation on Meiho Gyogyo's interactions with the Ministry and FAJ was not available at the audit but they have indicated that that it would keep a record of all communications related to progress against the condition in future.
	FAJ indicated that they participate proactively at WCPFC meetings, including promoting development of the harvest strategy and harvest control rules. They have discussions prior to these meetings with the Tuna association and individual companies, including Meiho Gyogyo.
	It is concluded that the client has acted in good faith to advocate for progress against the MSC requirements at PI 1.2.2 for north Pacific albacore tuna.
Status of condition	On target



# 5 Conclusion

## 5.1 Summary of findings

In this 2nd annual surveillance

- There were no material changes to the circumstances and practices affecting the original complying assessment of the fishery;
- This fishery continues to meet the MSC Standard
- Progress on conditions is on target

Lloyd's Register confirms that the Japanese Pole and Line skipjack and albacore fishery remain certified following the completion of this surveillance. No changes occurred in this fishery that would result in a change to the surveillance schedule.



#### Appendix 1 – Re-scoring evaluation tables

None

Appendix 2 - Stakeholder submissions

None received

Appendix 3 - Surveillance audit information N/A

Appendix 4 - Additional detail on conditions/ actions/ results N/A

#### Appendix 5 - Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary)

None proposed.