



Surveillance Report
Hastings Fleet Dover Sole Trammel Net Fishery

Certificate No.: **MML-FC-008**

Moody Marine Ltd.
August 2007

Author(s): A Hough

Moody Marine Ltd.
Merlin House
Stanier Way
Wyvern Business Park
Derby DE21 6BF
UK

Tel: +44 (0) 1332 544663
Fax: +44 (0) 1332 675020

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

Scope against which the surveillance is undertaken: MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing as applied to the Hastings Fleet Dover Sole Trammel Net Fishery

Species: Dover sole *Solea solea*

Area: Within the Eastern English Channel (ICES Division VIIId) and specifically between Beachy Head and Dungeness and offshore to the six mile limit

Method of capture: Trammel Net

Date of Surveillance Visit:	24-25 July 2007			
Initial Certification	Date: 16 September 2005		Certificate Ref: MM-FC-008	
Surveillance stage	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Surveillance team:	Lead Assessor: Andrew Hough Assessor(s):			
Company Name: Address:	Hastings Fishery Management Group c/o Hastings Borough Council 3rd Floor Aquila House Breeds Place Hastings East Sussex TN34 3UY			
Contact 1	Stephen Potter			
Tel No:	01424 451759			
Fax No:	01424 451401			
E-mail address:	STPotter@hastings.gov.uk			

2.0 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first surveillance audit of this fishery (carried out in November 2006) reported the following conclusions:

“The actions taken by Hastings Fishery Management Group in meeting Conditions of Certification is judged to be insufficient. However, some actions have been taken and measures are currently being taken to address the conditions raised. To ensure that conditions are met, an expedited audit shall take place in June 2007.”

This present report therefore contains the findings of the expedited audit (the timing of which was delayed slightly) in relation to the two Conditions raised.

The HFMG response to Conditions of Certification is set out in the client Action Plan and this has been reproduced below as appropriate. For each condition, the report sets out progress to date. This progress has now been evaluated by the Moody Marine assessment team (‘Observations’ and ‘Conclusion’) against the commitments made in the Action Plan. This evaluation includes a re-evaluation of the scoring allocated to the relevant Performance Indicators in the original MSC assessment. Where the requirements of a condition are met, the Performance Indicators are re-scored and if the score is 80 or more, then the condition is closed.

Item	Comments
1	Condition of Certification 1: Recording of catches
Activity assessed	<p>Misreporting in the offshore fishery and under-reporting in the inshore fisheries has been identified as a significant potential source of uncertainty in the stock assessment and in forecasts for this stock. Whilst it is recognised that the Hastings fishery does not now appear to contribute to such under-reporting, it is important that accurate reporting of all catches (including by-catch), discards and landings take place to the relevant scientific agency, in this case CEFAS.</p> <p>Accordingly, the data requirements of the relevant scientific agency (CEFAS) should be determined and these requirements should be met from within the fishery.</p> <p>Timescale: Contact with CEFAS should be initiated within three months of certification and data collection underway within 3 months of specification by CEFAS. This would then be an ongoing condition of certification.</p> <p>Relevant Scoring Indicators: 1.1.2.1, 1.1.2.5, 1.1.5.6</p>
HFMG Action Plan	<p><i>Contact will be made with CEFAS immediately upon Certification, and their requirements for data recording will be met within 3 months of specification. Their requirements will also be made known to the certification body as will the relevant contact details, in order that the certification body may be satisfied that condition 1 is being met.</i></p>
Observations	<p>The first surveillance audit reported that “<i>At the time of the first surveillance audit, Initial contact had been made with CEFAS as required by the Condition and Action Plan (19/20 October 2005). However, this was not followed up and no data requirements have been confirmed or met. This represents a non-compliance with this Condition which is therefore behind target</i>”.</p> <p>However, on identification of this issue during the surveillance audit, contact with CEFAS was immediately initiated. A response from CEFAS has been received which indicates that they are content with current recording of landings of commercial species and estimates of discarding. Some data requests have been made by CEFAS, however and these requests have now been met by HFMG and appropriate data recording is ongoing.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The requirements of this Condition have now been met.</p> <p>Three Performance Indicators (PI) related to this Condition. These, and related 80 and 100 Scoring Guideposts (SG) are presented below.</p> <p>PI 1.1.2.1. <i>Are all major sources of fishery related mortality recorded/estimated, including landings, discards, incidental mortality and mortality of juveniles?</i> SG 80: Landings are accurately recorded. Discards and incidental mortality are well estimated. Mortality on juveniles is monitored and recorded separately. SG 100: Landings, discards and incidental mortality are accurately recorded and monitored. Mortality on juveniles is monitored and recorded separately.</p> <p>As reported in the original assessment, all landings are recorded nationally at all landings ports and reported to the EU. The ICES assessment working group is also able to obtain unofficial estimates of additional fishing mortality, for example discarding and misreporting (particularly from the offshore fishery) and under reporting (particularly from some inshore fisheries).</p> <p>Whilst the score for the fishery as a whole would be considered less than 80, actions taken by HFMG to accurately record landings and estimate discarding lead the score for the HFMG fishery ONLY being raised. This score would therefore not necessarily apply to other fisheries.</p> <p>The score for this PI is now revised to 80, and would be higher if HFMG actions were mirrored in other fleets.</p>

	<p>PI 1.1.2.5. <i>Are there robust systems to monitor any area misreporting and landings under-reporting?</i></p> <p>SG 80: Enforcement systems include measures to control misreporting Where it occurs, it is carefully evaluated and taken into account in the stock assessment.</p> <p>SG 100: Robust enforcement systems are in place to control misreporting. Where it occurs, reliable estimates are made and used in the stock assessment.</p> <p>There is reported to be considerable under-reporting by the small inshore vessels, in the eastern Channel, although this is not considered a problem for the Hastings Fleet. To date it has not been possible to quantify the level of this misreporting for inclusion in the assessment. Whilst the score for the fishery as a whole would be considered less than 80, actions taken by HFMD to accurately record landings and estimate discarding lead the score for the HFMD fishery ONLY being raised. This score would therefore not necessarily apply to other fisheries.</p> <p>The score for this PI is now revised to 80, and would be higher if HFMD actions were mirrored in other fleets.</p> <p>PI 1.1.5.6. <i>How reliable has the stock assessment been historically using retrospective analysis?</i></p> <p>SG 80: Uncertainty in the estimates of SSB and F are known to occur and are regularly reviewed and corrected. Investigation of the associated problems has led to significant improvement.</p> <p>SG 100: Retrospective analysis shows excellent agreement historically for the assessment of both SSB and F.</p> <p>A detailed retrospective analysis of the performance of SSB and F estimates is produced by the WG each year. In 2003 ACFM commented that the past performance of this assessment for estimating this stock has been poor, due primarily to under and misreporting. These issues have not appeared to caused major problems in relation to the management of the fishery and the SSB has remained above the biomass precautionary level of 8,000t for many years.</p> <p>Whilst the score for the fishery as a whole would be considered less than 80, actions taken by HFMD to accurately record landings and estimate discarding lead the score for the HFMD fishery ONLY being raised. This score would therefore not necessarily apply to other fisheries.</p> <p>The score for this PI is now revised to 80, and would be higher if HFMD actions were mirrored in other fleets.</p>
--	---

Item	Comments
2	Condition of Certification 2: Interactions with endangered, threatened or protected species
Activity assessed	<p>Interactions of the fishery with endangered, threatened or protected species appear limited but are not formally quantified. Such interactions may be with groups such as seabirds, sea mammals and shad (<i>Alosa</i> spp).</p> <p>Records of incidental catches (of sea birds, sea mammals etc) should be maintained and made available through an appropriate body such as the Sea Fisheries Committee.</p> <p>Shad are currently caught and landed by the trammel-net fishery and this may include both Allis and Twaite shad. This should be raised with the relevant agency (DEFRA and/or English Nature) with a view to establishing or confirming the conservation significance of catches within the certified fishery. If necessary, any required modifications to fishing practices should be implemented as soon as practically possible.</p> <p>Timescale: This issue should be raised immediately upon certification.</p> <p>Relevant Scoring Indicators: 2.2.1.2, 2.2.1.3</p>
HFMG Action Plan	<p><i>Records of all by-catches shall be made on the relevant form as approved by the certification body. These data shall be made available for inspection through the Sea Fisheries Committee. Contact will be established with DEFRA and EN immediately on certification, in order that the conservation significance of catches within the fishery can be established. If any modifications are necessary, this shall be communicated to the certification body forthwith.</i></p>
Observations	<p>The first surveillance audit reported that “<i>Recording of such by-catches is addressed under Condition 1. Landings of shad are recorded through normal landings data, however. At the time of this surveillance audit, no formal contact had been made. This represents a non-compliance with this Condition which is therefore behind target</i>”.</p> <p>However, on identification of this issue during the surveillance audit, contact with English Nature was immediately initiated. Response from English Nature have been received which confirm no immediate conservation concerns in this regard with the Hastings fishery. Future data provision is available if required.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The requirements of this Condition have now been met.</p> <p>Two Performance Indicators (PI) related to this Condition. These, and related 80 and 100 Scoring Guideposts (SG) are presented below.</p> <p>PI 2.2.1.2. <i>Are interactions of the fishery with Protected, endangered and threatened species adequately determined?</i></p> <p>SG 80: Quantitative estimates are made of the effects of interactions directly related to the fishery. There is a requirement to record and report all incidental mortalities.</p> <p>SG 100: Reliable quantitative estimates are made of the interactions of all populations directly related to the fishery, and qualitative information is available on indirect impacts. Incidental mortalities are recorded and reported.</p> <p>Landing and discard data are now available as detailed under item 1 above. Mortalities can now be voluntarily reported. The score for this PI is now revised to 85.</p> <p>PI 2.2.1.3. <i>Do interactions pose an unacceptable risk to such species?</i></p> <p>SG 80: Critical interactions are well estimated and do not threaten protected species.</p> <p>SG 100: It is known that the direct and indirect effects of fishing on threatened and endangered species are within acceptable limits.</p> <p>Following discussions with English Nature, interactions with shad are estimated and considered not to threaten populations of either shad species. The score for this PI is now revised to 80.</p>

3	Overall Conclusions
	The actions taken by Hastings Fishery Management Group in meeting Conditions of Certification are now judged to be sufficient and both conditions are closed. MSC Certification shall now continue at least until the next annual audit.

Information Sources:**Meetings**

1. 24/7/07. Hastings Fishery Management Group, Hastings.

Standards and Guidelines used:

1. MSC Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing
2. MSC Fishery Certification Methodology Version 6. September 2006
3. TAB Directives - all