



Establishing best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance

Consultation Summary Report

October 2020

Table of Contents

Purpose and scope of this report	3
Background.....	4
Participation	6
Next steps.....	8
Annex I: Participation	9

Glossary of abbreviations and technical terms

PI – Performance Indicator

This is a working paper, and hence it represents work in progress. This report is part of ongoing policy development.

The views and opinions expressed in parts of this report are those of stakeholders and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Marine Stewardship Council.

Marine Stewardship Council, 2020. Consultation Summary Report: Establishing best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance. Published by the Marine Stewardship Council [www.msc.org]. This work is licensed under Creative Commons BY 4.0 to view a copy of this license, visit (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

Purpose and scope of this report

Every five years, the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) initiates a [Fisheries Standard Review](#) to help ensure our assessment and certification system remains the leading measure of fisheries sustainability. The current review began in 2018 and will conclude in 2022.

Stakeholders from all sectors are at the heart of our review, helping identify issues, develop solutions and test proposed changes. We have completed research into the topics identified in the Terms of Reference, and will next develop potential options for revisions. One of the topics identified is *Establishing best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance*. We are holding a series of consultations throughout 2020 and 2021 for stakeholders to take part in the development of the Fisheries Standard.

This report details the following for the 2020 consultations on the topic of Establishing best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance:

- Background to topics discussed
- Participation data
- Next steps in the review process
- Full transcripts and feedback tables

It is the goal of MSC consultations to value authenticity, fairness and inclusiveness, secure strategic insight and build consensus and credibility. Our core principle is that consultations should be useful to the MSC in achieving its mission and useful to the participants in seeing how their views are considered. To achieve this, the MSC's processes for consultation follow the [ISEAL Standard Setting Code of Good Practice](#) and the [FAO Guidelines for the Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine Capture Fisheries](#).

ISEAL requires that participation is open to all stakeholders, and that the standard setter proactively seeks contributions from disadvantaged stakeholder groups. This is to ensure that contributors represent a balance of interests in the subject matter and in the geographical scope to which the standard applies. Publishing raw consultation feedback is considered 'aspirational good practice' by ISEAL. We publish this feedback as part of our commitment to transparency in our consultation process.

Background

The project *Establishing best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance* is a work package of the wider [Fisheries Standard Review](#) project [Ensuring effective fisheries management systems are in place](#), which aims to strengthen how the MSC program drives improvements in fisheries management through its certification requirements. This includes setting clearer expectations on the monitoring, control and surveillance systems that a fishery must have in place, and ensuring that compliance with management rules is evaluated in a consistent way.

Compliance and enforcement are assessed as a performance indicator (PI) under Principle 3 of the [MSC Fisheries Standard](#). To be certified, a fishery must have effective monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms in place that are able to ensure management measures are enforced and complied with. This PI is divided into four scoring issues that consider:

- The effectiveness of monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms,
- The use of sanctions and their effectiveness,
- The extent to which authorities are able to detect non-compliance, and
- Whether there is evidence of systematic rule-breaking.

This part of the Fisheries Standard was last updated in 2008. Since that time, best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance has developed, and challenges with how the Standard is applied have been identified. This has highlighted two areas for review:

1. The clarity with which best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance is expressed within the requirements.
2. The intent and application of compliance scoring issues.

As part of the review, the MSC has consulted stakeholders through the activities detailed below.

Consultation launch conference

On 13 May 2020, the MSC held an online conference hosted on WorkCast to launch the Fisheries Standard Review. The conference was open to all and advertised via the MSC website and media channels including *Undercurrent News*, *IntraFish* and *Seafood Source*. Stakeholders who had subscribed to receive updates on the MSC program were directly informed. At the conference, the MSC provided information on all topics under review and upcoming consultation events, and participants had the opportunity to direct questions to the MSC project leads.

There were 11 sessions, one of which was titled *Principle 3: Effective fisheries management - Improving fisheries management*. MSC staff gave a presentation and then conference participants were invited to submit questions in a live Q&A. The Q&A session was recorded and subsequently transcribed using a third-party transcription service operating under a confidentiality agreement with the MSC. The full transcript and all questions submitted in the chat box, with any information that could potentially identify an individual, organisation or fishery removed, can be found in [Annex II: Transcript of Q&A session](#).

Online survey

A [survey on establishing best practice in monitoring, control and surveillance](#) was open to all on the MSC website between 26 June and 29 July 2020.

The survey was advertised at the [consultation launch conference](#), on the MSC website, and to stakeholders subscribed to receive updates on the MSC program. Stakeholders were invited to register their interest through a registration portal. Some respondents were recruited through targeted communications.

The survey was seeking feedback on two alternative approaches for how Principle 3 could be revised to achieve the MSC's objectives:

- [Option A](#) would retain the existing structure of scoring issues under PI 3.2.3¹, but rewrite some of the scoring guideposts.
- [Option B](#) would create two separate PIs to assess the monitoring, control and surveillance system and compliance with management rules, respectively.

Feedback was submitted both through the survey and via email during the consultation period. This feedback, with any information that could potentially identify an individual, organisation or fishery removed, can be found in [Annex III: Survey feedback tables](#).

The MSC also held a series of workshops on the topic of *Introducing requirements on the type and quality of evidence needed for scoring fisheries*, where the topic of compliance was discussed. See the separate [Consultation Summary Report](#) for more information about these consultation events.

¹ PI 3.2.3 – Monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms ensure the management measures in the fishery and associated enhancement activities are enforced and complied with.

Participation

This section presents participation data for the consultation activities detailed above.

Consultation launch conference Q&A participation

The consultation launch conference session on *Principle 3: Effective fisheries management - Improving fisheries management* had 125 external participants that attended live, 15 of whom asked questions. Later, 39 more watched the recording online, and therefore could not participate in the live Q&A.

Table 1: Number of external participants that attended the live Q&A session representing each stakeholder group.

Stakeholder group	Number
Academic/scientific	18
Commercial wild harvest fisheries/aquaculture	26
Comms/media	1
Conformity assessment/accreditation	17
Governance/management	7
Non-governmental organisation	34
Seafood supply chain	8
Other	14
Total	125

Table 2: Number of external participants that attended the live Q&A session representing each geographical region.

Geographical region	Number
Africa	6
Asia	7
Europe	53
Latin America	22
Middle East/North Africa	1
North America	23
Oceania	2
Russia	0
South Asia	11
Total	125

There was broad sectoral representation ([Table 1](#)). Most participants were based in Europe, North America or Latin America ([Table 2](#)). The lower numbers of participants from Asia, South Asia and Oceania could be explained by time differences. Recordings of the conference sessions were made available online to accommodate stakeholders in other time zones.

Online survey participation

There were 37 respondents to the survey. The full list of respondents, their organisations, stakeholder groups and country of work can be found in [Table 5](#) in [Annex I: Participation](#). For respondents that did not consent to their names being published, only stakeholder group and country is available.

Table 3: Number of individual respondents representing each stakeholder group.

Stakeholder group	Number
Academic/scientific	3
Commercial wild harvest fisheries	6
Conformity assessment/accreditation	2
Governance/management	1
Non-governmental organisation	11
Other	6
Seafood supply chain	8
Total	37

Table 4: Number of individual respondents representing each geographical region.

Geographical regions	Number
Africa	1
Asia	2
Europe	24
Latin America	1
Middle East/North Africa	0
North America	7
Oceania	1
Russia	0
South Asia	1
Total	37

The greatest number of respondents were from non-governmental organisations, followed by seafood supply chain and commercial wild harvest fisheries ([Table 3](#)).

The geographical representation ([Table 4](#)) is dominated by respondents based in Europe. The low representation of stakeholders from certain regions might be explained by a number of factors, most importantly language barriers, rate of certifications in relevant countries/regions and general interest in the topic. The MSC offered translated versions of the online survey on request.

Next steps

We are currently reviewing all feedback received from the consultation survey as well as independent research and our own internal data analysis. This will inform our decisions on proposed changes to the MSC Fisheries Standard. We will carry out an impact assessment on the proposed changes considering, among other things, the feasibility for fisheries to make the changes and the impact on the accessibility of the MSC program to existing and prospective fisheries. We will also seek the advice of our governance bodies on the proposed changes.

In making changes to the MSC Fisheries Standard, we need to consider the following:

- a) Do proposed changes meet [strategic objectives](#)?
- b) Do proposed changes affect the ability to deliver on the [MSC's Theory of Change](#)?
- c) Do proposed changes to the Standard align with the [MSC's three Principles](#)?

We will engage with stakeholders in early 2021 to share any potential changes to the Standard and explain how we developed these changes. We will hold further consultations in 2021 and the revised Standard will be publicly reviewed in early 2022 to ensure changes are clear and that the new Standard delivers the intentions of our program.

To be notified of future activities and developments, [sign up to our Fisheries Standard Review update](#).

Annex I: Participation

Table 5: List of respondents to the online survey. For those respondents who consented to this, their names and organisations are included.

Name	Organisation	Stakeholder group	Country
Kun Xing	Dalian Ocean University	Academic/scientific	China
Mustafa Md Golam	Ecosystem Conservation Society	Academic/scientific	Bangladesh
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Academic/scientific	Germany
Christina Burridge & Andrew Hough	Association of Sustainable Fisheries (ASF)	Commercial wild harvest fisheries	UK
Tor B. Larsen	Norwegian Fishermen's Association	Commercial wild harvest fisheries	Norway
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Commercial wild harvest fisheries	Argentina
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Commercial wild harvest fisheries	Canada
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Commercial wild harvest fisheries	Canada
Mark Fina & Chris Oliver	United States Seafoods & Alaska Seafood Co-op	Commercial wild harvest fisheries	USA
Richard Banks	MRAG Americas	Conformity assessment/accreditation	Australia
Samuel Dignan	SAI Global (MSC CAB)	Conformity assessment/accreditation	Ireland
William Galbraith	Fisheries First Ltd.	Governance/management	Canada
David Wiedenfeld	American Bird Conservancy	Non-governmental organisation	USA
Kate O'Connell	AWI	Non-governmental organisation	USA
Daniel Steadman	Fauna & Flora International	Non-governmental organisation	UK
Susan Jackson	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)	Non-governmental organisation	USA

Samuel Stone	Marine Conservation Society	Non-governmental organisation	UK
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Non-governmental organisation	Germany
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Non-governmental organisation	Germany
Tomoaki Nishihara	Seisa University	Non-governmental organisation	Japan
Dr. Iris Ziegler	Sharkproject International	Non-governmental organisation	Germany
Alex Hofford	WildAid	Non-governmental organisation	UK
Karin Bilo	WWF	Non-governmental organisation	Netherlands
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Other	Germany
Edward Willsteed	MacAlister Elliott & Partners	Other: Fisheries and marine environment consultancy	UK
Craig Turley	For the purpose of this questionnaire I am an independent consultant and do not represent any organisation that I may consult for.	Other: I have been an observer and worked in community fisheries programs.	UK
Amy Hammond	On the Hook	Other: Public Affairs/ consultancy	UK
Stewart Norman	CapMarine	Other: Scientific Fishery Observer Program manager and MSC auditor	South Africa
Kathryn Gavira O'Neill	Satlink S.L.U.	Other: Technological support for resource management	Spain
Christopher Rohrer	Denner AG	Seafood supply chain	Switzerland
Florian Rohner	Migros	Seafood supply chain	Switzerland
Sandra Hinni	Migros Genossenschafts Bund	Seafood supply chain	Switzerland
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Seafood supply chain	UK
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Seafood supply chain	UK

Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Seafood supply chain	UK
Redacted at request of individual	Redacted at request of individual	Seafood supply chain	UK
Christina Weisbeck	tegut... gute Lebensmittel GmbH & Co. KG	Seafood supply chain	Germany