

MSC Variation Request Form



Version 2.0, 8 October 2014

MSC Variation Request Form v2.

Marine Stewardship Council - Variation Request

Date submitted to MSC	08 Feb 216
Name of CAB	Acoura
Fishery Name	MINSAs NEA mackerel https://www.msc.org/track-a-fishery/fisheries-in-the-program/in-assessment/north-east-atlantic/minsa-north-east-atlantic-mackerel
Lead Auditor/Programme Manager	Gudrun Gaudian (MINSAs) Jason Combes
Scheme requirement(s) for which variation requested	CR 1.3: 24.2.3.3 b. Review the outcomes of any scoring of the fishery previously undertaken against the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements . c. Assess new information following all steps from scoring the fishery (27.10) to peer review (27.14) against the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements . i. The team may limit the scope of this assessment to the re-scoring of those PIs for which there is new information and for which the requirements have changed in the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements .
Is this variation sought in order to fulfil IPI requirements (FCR 7.4.14)?	No

1. Proposed variation

Requirements for sub sections of CR 1.3: A24.2.3 will not be applied

2. Rationale/Justification

The MINSA fishery assessment has encountered delays resulting from extensive and protracted harmonisation discussions in 2015.

More than 9 months elapsed between the site visit and the publication of the PCDR out of compliance with CR V1.3 A24.2.3 (same as CR2.0 7.3.4.3). Acoura accept responsibility for this oversight. As a corrective action Acoura has followed the procedural steps of CR V1.3 A24.2.3

This variation requests that MSC permit the assessment to proceed without following the sub requirements within CR V1.3 A24.2.3 (highlighted in bold, above) namely the need to apply the most recent version of the MSC Certification Requirements (CR2.0) and submit the new scoring for Peer Review.

Given that the changes to the scoring do not have a significant impact, we propose to use only one of the original Peer Reviewers.

The clauses that we seek to vary from add, unintended consequences as opposed to adding robustness in this assessment. Instead, the rescore would be limited to the CR1.3 tree. The justification is as follows:

Responsibility

- The critical stage in the timeline was missed by the CAB (although it is noted that the delays were incurred as a result of internal and external factors). It is not reasonable for the fishery clients to bear the brunt of the consequences

Time

- The client, stakeholders and the MSC would rather avoid further delay
- The client has made provision for a Target Eligibility Date dependent on the PCDR being published by the end of February

Cost

- Additional cost to the client

Complexity

- A provisional rescoring has been undertaken using CR1.3 with no significant impact on the outcome. An additional round of scoring to elements of the CR2.0 tree adds complexity especially in relation to the new PI 1.2.1 and particularly 1.2.1f
- If carried out then the assessment reports will contain a CR1.3 and CR2.0 hybrid scoring tree resulting in an additional level of complexity for future surveillances and harmonisation with, and against, other fisheries. Acoura believe this will prove detrimental to the clients (and other fisheries) on an ongoing basis

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

MINSA are a pioneering group of MSC certificate holders that recognised the merits of adopting a collaborative shared MSC assessment. The MINSA NEA mackerel fishery commenced (re) assessment in July 2014 and inherited protracted suspension negotiations from the previous fishery certificates. Clients, stakeholders and the MSC are keen to see the MINSA fishery assessment continue to make progress. The error made by Acoura in not following CR V1.3 A24.2.3 should not disadvantage the client.

4. Have the stakeholders of this fishery assessment been informed of this request? (required for fisheries assessment variations only)	Stakeholders will be informed through the publication of this variation request and MSC response on MSC.org. Acoura will also inform the identified stakeholder community via email of the variation
5. Further Comments	
Nil	