

Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request Form V1.2

Date submitted to MSC	03/01/13
Conformity Assessment Body	Food Certification International Ltd
Fishery Name/CoC Certificate Number	Suriname Atlantic Seabob Shrimp F-FCI-0019
Lead Auditor/Programme Manager	Tristan Southall / Melissa McFadden
Scheme requirement(s) to vary from	CR 27.22.2

Proposed variation
To facilitate offsite surveillance for the 2 nd Annual surveillance audit of this fishery.

Rationale/Justification
<p>There have been no significant changes to operational practices in this fishery - in terms of gear or area of fishing - and the fishery remains within scope.</p> <p>This application for remote surveillance for the 2nd surveillance audit reflects the excellent and committed progress made by the fishery (both the client and the government) in addressing the conditions of certification. At the time of the 1st surveillance half of the 6 conditions already met the requirements of the 2 year milestone.</p> <p>Were the 2nd surveillance carried out remotely then it is intended that a site visit would be required for the 3rd surveillance audit. A remote surveillance would still include a series of pre-arranged stakeholder conference calls, in particular with the client, the scientist addressing 3 of the conditions, and perhaps also a government representative and another member of the seabob working group (the stakeholder body). In addition, the client would be requested to provide full written justification for all of the conditions, prior to these calls and any supporting evidence – in the form of data.</p> <p>Providing detail for each of the 6 conditions in turn:</p> <p>Condition 1: Good Information on all other fishery removals from the stock. At the time of the 1st surveillance, this condition was on target. The 2nd year milestones requires that the fishery demonstrate that sampling and estimation work both for artisanal and IUU is underway. This work was already in the final stages of planning at the 1st annual surveillance. Details of the programme can be provided to the assessors remotely and there is no requirement to provide results of this work until the 3rd annual surveillance (which would be expected to be on-site).</p> <p>Condition 2: Ensure main bycatch species are within biologically based limits. At the time of the 1st surveillance, this condition was on target. The 2nd year milestone requires that the fishery provides summary data in relation to elasmobranch bycatch including data in relation to the effectiveness of BRDs and TEDs in releasing elasmobranch species. Much of this data collection is already underway and a summary of the data collected can be provided to the team</p>

remotely. There is no requirement to provide results of this work until the 3rd annual surveillance (which would be expected to be on-site).

Condition 3: Nature, distribution and vulnerability of main seabed habitats.

At the time of the 1st surveillance, this condition was ahead of target, already at the 2nd surveillance audit milestone, therefore at the next surveillance, this condition will be at least “on target”.

Discussions with the scientist engaged in the research would still be an important part of a remote surveillance – albeit this could be done by telephone and email.

Condition 4: Main functions of the components of the ecosystem are known.

At the time of the 1st surveillance, this condition was ahead of target, already at the 2nd surveillance audit milestone, therefore at the next surveillance, this condition will be at least “on target”.

Discussions with the scientist engaged in the research would still be an important part of a future remote surveillance – albeit this could be done by telephone and email.

Condition 5: Explanations for management action.

At the time of the 1st surveillance, this condition was on target. For the 2nd surveillance milestone the fishery must show evidence that clear and transparent explanation supporting significant management action is being provided to stakeholders. During a remote surveillance, we would expect to speak to a representative of the Seabob Working Group to confirm this – again, this can be conducted remotely by conference call with no loss of integrity.

Condition 6: Consistent application of sanctions to deal with non-compliance.

At the time of the 1st surveillance, this condition was ahead of target, already at the 2nd surveillance audit milestone; therefore at the next surveillance, this condition will be at least “on target”. Again, this can be discussed remotely with a representative of the Seabob Working Group to confirm this.

We will contact all stakeholders to inform them that the surveillance will be carried out remotely. They will still be given the opportunity to request an onsite meeting with a locally based member of the original team if necessary.

Implications for assessment (required for fisheries assessment variations only)

There will be no impact on the on-going surveillance programme or on timelines. Impact on stakeholder input will be minimised by ensuring that all stakeholders are fully aware of the variation and still have ample opportunity to contribute.

Have the stakeholders of this fishery assessment been informed of this request? (required for fisheries assessment variations only)

No