

Meeting notes

Page 1 of 4

Subject: Governing Board Meeting: Moody Marine Ltd	
Location: ERC, University of Liverpool, Vanguard Way, Birkenhead	Date: 09/09/02
Recorded by: Erica Mason	
<p>The Moody Marine Governing Board (GB) comprises representatives with backgrounds in areas relating to certification, fish/marine biology, fishery management, the fishing industry and processing industry.</p> <p>Seven members of the GB were present, including the Chair. The meeting was quorate.</p> <p>The assessment team was represented by Dr Andrew Hough and Dr Terry Holt (the latter by telephone link).</p> <p>Information provided to the Governing Board comprised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moody Marine Certification Report • Full IUU Analysis report and associated papers presented to CCAMLR • Peer Review Comments (Dr Kevin Stokes, Dr Edith Fanta, Dr Euan Dunn, Dr Arthur De Vries) • Stakeholder Comments (WWF, ASOC, NET) 	

Item no.	Notes	Due Date:	Action by:
1	<p>Introduction</p> <p>AH provided update on Moody Marine activities and MSC progress to date including a review of recent MSC objections procedures.</p>		
2	<p>Third Party Certification of Patagonian Toothfish</p> <p>AH introduced the fishery recommended for certification and stressed the requirement for third party certification to be fully objective in order for the MSC certification process to have credibility.</p> <p>a) Main Assessment</p> <p>At the Boards request, AH reviewed milestones in the progress of the certification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main assessment commenced in March 2001 with pre assessment reports distributed to relevant stakeholders. • The assessment team was assembled, comprising Dr. Terry Holt and Dr. Andrew Hough from Moody Marine Limited, Dr Paul Medley (to provide stock assessment and Southern Ocean experience), Dr Jake Rice (to provide management and ecosystem assessment expertise), John Cooper (Birdlife International, to provide experience on seabird interactions and CCAMLR) • Drs Holt and Medley undertook field assessment visit in May 2001. • Subsequent scoring assessment identified that insufficient information was available on IUU fishing and a request was issued to the client to evaluate this in greater detail • MRAG subsequently supplied information on IUU fishing. This was considered adequate by the team and the fishery was assessed on this basis. <p>The GB questioned if the assessment team felt it necessary to re-visit the fishery between the original visit and the final scoring. AH confirmed that updated information on all aspect of the fishery management was collected prior to the final scoring and this was considered adequate and consistent with existing information. No requirements to re-visit the fishery were identified by the assessment team.</p> <p>c) Client review</p> <p>AH outlined that the assessment followed latest guidance from the MSC, even where this has not yet been formally adopted, in order to make the assessment as open and</p>		

	<p>transparent as possible. This includes the client receiving their copy of the report without scoring details. This procedure is adopted so as to concentrate the client review on the factual basis of the report, without introducing bias through the scores and weights.</p> <p>d) Peer review and stakeholder review The process of selecting peer reviewers was outlined, including comments received, particularly from ASOC, on the potential peer reviewers. Subsequent to ASOC comments, an additional reviewer was added (recommended by ASOC) to ensure balance in the peer review panel.</p> <p>Final peer reviewers were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Kevin Stokes (Chief Scientist with the New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC) Ltd.,) • Dr Euan Dunn (Senior Marine Policy Officer at the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds - the UK partner of BirdLife International) • Dr. Edith Fanta (Associate Professor at the Universidade Federal do Parana, Brazil and member of CCAMLR scientific committee). • Professor Art L. DeVries (Professor of Animal Biology and Molecular and Integrative Physiology, University of Illinois, USA and ASOC nominee) <p>AH outlined that the report (without scores) had also been made available on the MSC website for stakeholder comment. Stakeholder comments had been received from WWF, ASOC and NET.</p> <p>The GB questioned the lack of scoring details on the report available to stakeholders. AH confirmed that this process was adopted to ensure the same review of the factual content of the report (i.e. without bias due to influence of scores and weights) as had been carried out with the client. To date, only the peer reviewers and Governing Board members had had sight of weights and scores.</p> <p>f) Objections Procedure AH detailed the newly implemented MSC objections procedure and in particular that following the Governing Board meeting there would be a period of 21 days for registering of an objection.</p>		
3	<p>Issues relating to fishery under consideration</p> <p>a) Geopolitical considerations Due consideration was made to the point raised by the Argentine Government and ASOC regarding compliance of the fishery with International agreements (CCAMLR). The board agreed with the conclusions of the assessment team in this regard, that the fishery was fully compliant with relevant CCAMLR conservation measures and that CCAMLR allows for the implementation of additional measures where state sovereignty exists.</p> <p>b) Discrete nature of stock The GB raised particular concerns over the discrete nature of the stock. After deliberation the governing board supported the view of the assessment team that for management purposes this is a discrete stock. It was agreed that there is sufficient evidence to show that migration of adults or in/outflow of larvae was sufficiently restricted. This is reflected in peer review comments and WWF stakeholder comments.</p>		

	<p>c) IUU fishing The GB recognised with concern the global issues surrounding IUU fishing, particularly in the Indian Ocean.</p> <p>For the South Georgia fishery, however, the levels of control, and the developed modelling of the extent and implications of IUU fishing were considered sufficient for certification purposes. The GB note that many stakeholder comments were directed at toothfish fishing generally whereas certification relates only to the South Georgia fishery under assessment.</p> <p>d) Incidental mortality of seabirds It was recognised that, with implementation of mitigation measures, seabird mortality associated with the legal fishery is negligible. Estimation of IUU is considered sufficient to provide confidence in estimation of the effects of IUU fishing within the South Georgia fishery. Peer review comments by Dr Euan Dunn were particularly considered in this respect.</p> <p>e) Other by-catch/Ecosystem Impacts The GB discussed concerns over estimation and effects of by-catch, particularly of rajids, and general ecosystem impacts. Issues considered included actual levels of by-catch, conservation measures developed in South Georgia and adopted by CCAMLR (eg moving the position of the catching vessel if its by-catch reaches critical levels), benthic impacts and relevant conditions attached to certification. On balance of the above, the recommendation of the assessment team was upheld. The board did, however, request that their concern be recognised in a recommendation to the client – set out below.</p> <p>f) Chain of Custody/Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) Chain of Custody, with associated issues such as the Catch Documentation Scheme and possible CITES listing of toothfish were considered. The board recognise that these are issues not directly related to the fishery certification process except in so far as they would help to eliminate trade in IUU catch. As the certification decision was made on the basis of other controls over IUU, however, these are not considered relevant to this assessment.</p> <p>Stakeholder comments that it would not be possible to undertake COC were deemed not relevant to this deliberation as it was the fishery that is under consideration and not a COC assessment. These matters must be dealt with as a separate certification.</p> <p>The GB Recommended that this be made clear in the final report.</p>		
4	<p>Other Issues Raised by Governing Board</p> <p>Issues raised by the Governing Board, and discussed with the assessment team representatives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability of stock assessment information to the assessment team. (It was confirmed that this information was made fully available.) • The inter-annual variation in TAC • The specific relationship of stock assessment to the targeted components of the stock • The level of scientific investigation into stock status and toothfish biology. • The procedure over the issuing of licences to fishing vessels • The procedures over removal of hooks from toothfish on landing and subsequent monitoring and removal of hooks from heads prior to discarding. • The recent trend towards increased fishing in shallow areas. (It was confirmed that this trend has been reversed in the last year) • The information collected during the observer programme. 		

	These questions were resolved to the satisfaction of the Governing Board.		
6	<p>Weighting and Scoring</p> <p>The method used in scoring was confirmed with the board, i.e. that the assessment team discuss at length the score for each indicator and that a consensus is reached among the team, considering the overall performance of the fishery in relation to that indicator.</p> <p>It was noted that of four peer reviewers, two agreed with weights and scores and two questioned scores over particular indicators. AH stated that during scoring of the fishery by the assessment team, different members of a team may have different perspectives (and so scores) which are then discussed and agreed. He suggested that peer reviewers had similarly different perspectives, reflected in the fact that several different indicators were questioned by different reviewers.</p> <p>This was generally accepted by the GB although scores for Principle 2 Indicators (particularly 2E.5) were investigated further.</p> <p>Some scores were questioned by members, particularly related to the level of knowledge of the ecosystem relationships of toothfish. Relevant issues considered in this respect were the current status of the stock versus the virgin biomass, the level of existing knowledge in relation to the nature of the fishery and existing conservation measures and conditions for certification. It was found that some modification to these scores would not affect the final outcome for Principle 2. The GB requested, however, that a recommendation be put forward to the client from the Board to the effect:</p> <p><i>“The board has reservations over the knowledge of wider ecosystem effects of the fishery, but accepts that these are justifiably considered to be minor in this particular case. It is recommended, however, that greater consideration be given in research programmes to identifying the ecosystem relations of toothfish and the overall impacts of toothfish fishing.”</i> This is considered to be less stringent than the assessment team recommendation that an ecosystem model be developed and is considered more in line with the WWF recommendation of developing terms of reference for an ecosystem impact assessment.</p>		
7	<p>Conditions and Recommendations</p> <p>It was noted that Peer review and Stakeholder comment varied on the Conditions and Recommendations. The GB expressed concern that Condition 6 may be penalising the legal fishery, but this was accepted as a recommendation to CCAMLR by the GSGSSI.</p> <p>Conditions and Recommendations were supported by the board.</p>		
8	<p>Certification Determination</p> <p>The evidence presented and deliberations of the day led the Governing Board to unanimously support the recommendation of the assessment team.</p> <p><i>Moody Marine therefore determines that the South Georgia Long Line Toothfish Fishery should be certified against the Marine Stewardship Council Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing.</i></p> <p>The GB wished it to be made clear, however, that certification relates only to the South Georgia fishery. Also that this certification extends only to the point of landing on licensed vessels within the maritime zone stipulated as detailed in the report, and therefore does not include further Chain of Custody considerations.</p>		

