



Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request

Date submitted to MSC	19 th January 2017
Name of CAB	Acoura Marine
Fishery Name	PNA Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin, unassociated / non FAD set, tuna purse seine fishery
Lead Auditor/Programme Manager	Dr. Rob Blyth-Skyrme / Polly Burns
Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested	SA3.1.2: The team shall consider each P2 species within only one of the primary species, secondary species or ETP species components.
Is this variation sought in order to fulfil IPI requirements (FCR 7.4.14)?	No

1. Proposed variation
This variation request is to allow for shark finning for silky shark to be considered under PI 2.2.2 (SI, shark finning).
2. Rationale/Justification
<p>This Variation Request is against SA3.1.2, which requires that <i>“The team shall consider each P2 species within only one of the primary species, secondary species or ETP species components.”</i> (CRv2.0, MSC 2014). It is for the same reason and follows a similar approach as the Variation Request submitted by SCS Global Services for the assessment of the Tri Marine Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin tuna fishery (see https://cert.msc.org/FileLoader/FileLinkDownload.aspx/GetFile?encryptedKey=c6YV+tkLKzVao8UgB0aYW/vh3cfWvAr5nSRwprwMsctdcl6/F2iZwL9B7FQC5vXH). For both fisheries, the Variation Requests intend to ensure that shark finning is considered appropriately within the respective assessments.</p> <p>For the Tri Marine fishery (assessed against CR v1.3), silky shark was assessed as a retained species (i.e., against PI 2.1.x), but there is no ‘shark finning’ SI in PI 2.1.2 under CR v1.3, and so a Variation was sought by the SCS Global Services Assessment Team to assess finning issues for silky shark against PI 2.2.2 (SI, shark finning).</p> <p>For the PNA fishery, silky shark is being assessed as an ETP species (i.e., scored under PI 2.3.x, following the rationale of the MSC Interpretations Log, where it has been clarified that ‘national ETP legislation’</p>

Fisheries Department
6 Redheughs Rigg
South Gyle
Edinburgh, EH12 9DQ



T: 0131 335 6662
E: fisheries@acoura.com

can also mean binding fisheries legislation where the intent is to protect vulnerable species¹). However, silky shark is also the shark species that has, historically, been the focus of some finning activity. There is no 'finning' Si within the ETP species PIs, and so the proposed approach of scoring finning in PI 2.2.2, SI d, and otherwise score silky sharks under PI 2.3.x, would account appropriately for two separate issues related to scoring silky sharks – management of a mandatory discard species that is considered to be ETP, and isolated records of finning of this species.

3. Implications for assessment (required for fisheries assessment variations only)

None, other than ensuring that shark finning is considered appropriately within the assessment. Scoring of silky shark as an ETP species within the ETP species PIs (2.3.x) would not be affected.

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

No, as this Variation Request will have no impact on the outcome of the assessment.

5. Further Comments

None, thank you.

¹ <http://msc-info.accreditation-services.com/questions/should-species-that-are-listed-under-the-prohibitions-set-out-in-eu-fisheries-regulations-be-regarded-as-etp-species/>