

## **IFFO RS**Global Standard for Responsible Supply of Marine Ingredients



### **IFFO RS Limited**

T: +44 (0) 2030 539 195 E: Standards@iffors.com W: www.iffors.com

Unit C, Printworks | 22 Amelia Street London, SE17 3BZ | United Kingdom





Global Standard for Responsible Supply of Marine Ingredients Fishery Assessment

Fishery Assessment Methodology and Template Report V2.0



# **IFFO RS**Global Standard for Responsible Supply of Marine Ingredients



Fishery Under	Yellowfin tuna ( <i>Thunnus albacares</i> ), FAO fishing areas 61	
Assessment	(Pacific, Northwest) and 71 (Pacific, Western Central)	
Date	23 April 2020	
Report Code	2020-77	
Assessor	Sam Dignan	
Stock Pass	Yes	
Stock Fail		

Application details and summary of the assessment outcome						
Name:						
Address:						
Country:		Zip:				
Tel. No.:		Fax. No.:				
Email address:		Applicant Code:				
Key Contact:		Title:				
Certification Body Details						
Name of Certification	lame of Certification Body: SAI Global					
Assessor	Peer Reviewer	Assessment Days	Initial/Surveillance/ Re-approval	Whole fish/ By-product		
Sam Dignan	Virginia Polonio	0.5	Initial	By-product		
<b>Assessment Period</b>	To April 2020					

Scope Details				
<b>Management Authority</b>	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and relevant			
(Country/State)	National authorities of Spain and Portugal			
Main Species	Yellowfin tuna (Thunnus albacares)			
Stock:	Yellowfin tuna in the western central Pacific Ocean (west of 150°W).			
Fishery Location	FAO fishing areas 61 (Pacific, Northwest) and 71 (Pacific, Western Central)			
Gear Type(s)	All gears			
Outcome of Assessment				
Peer Review Evaluation	APPROVE			
Recommendation	APPROVE			

### **Assessment Determination**

If any species is categorised as Endangered or Critically Endangered on IUCN's Red List, or if it appears in the CITES appendices, it cannot be approved for use as IFFO RS raw material. Western central Pacific yellowfin tuna does not appear as Endangered or Critically Endangered on IUCN's Red List, nor does it appear in CITES appendices; therefore, product originating from this stock is eligible for approval for use as IFFO RS by-product raw material.

This assessment covers a single stock (i.e. Yellowfin tuna in the western central Pacific Ocean (west of 150°W)) when fished within FAO fishing areas 34 by Spanish or Portuguese vessels.

Fishery removals of the stock are considered in the WCPFC stock assessment process so the stock **PASSES** Clause C1.1.

The most recent stock assessment for this stock shows the stock to be to be above the limit reference point defined by management such that **the fishery achieves a PASS against C1.2**.

WCPFC does not employ an explicit limit reference point to manage this stock; however, given that the latest assessment estimated stock biomass to be above  $B_{MSY}$ , biomass can correspondingly be considered to be above any nominal limit reference point (or proxy); therefore, the stock **PASSES** Clause C1.2.

In order to be approved, the stock assessed must pass both Clause C1.1 and C1.2; therefore, as this is the case here, by-product covered by this report is **APPROVED** for the production of fishmeal and fish oil under the current IFFO RS v 2.0 by-product standard.

### **Peer Review Comments**

Although, WCPFC consider that measures to reduce fishing mortality from fisheries that take juveniles, with the goal to increase to maximum fishery yields and reduce any further impacts on the spawning potential for this stock in the tropical regions should be taken and an appropriate target reference point (TRP) should be defined, the stock is in good shape.

Therefore, the Peer Review agrees that Yellowfin tuna in the western central Pacific Ocean is approved under under the current IFFO RS v 2.0 by-product standard.

### **Notes for On-site Auditor**

### HOW TO COMPLETE THIS ASSESSMENT REPORT

### **By-products**

The process for completing the template for **by-product raw material** is as follows:

- 1. ALL ASSESSMENTS: Complete the Species Characterisation table with the names of the by-product species and stocks under assessment. The '% landings' column can be left empty; all by-products are considered as Category C and D.
- 2. IF THERE ARE CATEGORY C BYPRODUCTS UNDER ASSESSMENT: Complete clause C1 for **each** Category C by-product.
- 3. IF THERE ARE CATEGORY D BYPRODUCTS UNDER ASSESSMENT: Complete Section D.
- 4. ALL OTHER SECTIONS CAN BE DELETED. Clauses M1 M3, F1 F3, and Sections A and B do not need to be completed for a by-product assessment.

By-product approval is awarded on a species-by-species basis. Each by-product species scoring a pass under the appropriate section may be approved against the IFFO RS Standard.

### SPECIES CATEGORISATION

The following table should be completed as fully as the available information permits. Any species representing more than 0.1% of the annual catch should be listed, along with an estimate of the proportion of the catch each species represents. The species should then be divided into Type 1 and Type 2 as follows:

- **Type 1 Species** can be considered the 'target' or 'main' species in the fishery. They make up the bulk of annual landings and are subjected to a detailed assessment.
- **Type 2 Species** can be considered the 'bycatch' or 'minor' species in the fishery. They make up a small proportion of the annual landings and are subjected to relatively high-level assessment.

### Type 1 Species must represent 95% of the total annual catch. Type 2 Species may represent a maximum of 5% of the annual catch (see Appendix B).

Species which make up less than 0.1% of landings do not need to be listed (NOTE: ETP species are considered separately). The table should be extended if more space is needed. Discarded species should be included when known.

The 'stock' column should be used to differentiate when there are multiple biological or management stocks of one species captured by the fishery. The 'management' column should be used to indicate whether there is an adequate management regime specifically aimed at the individual species/stock. In some cases it will be immediately clear whether there is a species-specific management regime in place (for example, if there is an annual TAC). In less clear circumstances, the rule of thumb should be that if the species meets the minimum requirements of clauses A1-A4, an adequate species-specific management regime is in place.

NOTE: If any species is categorised as Endangered or Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List, or if it appears in the CITES appendices, it **cannot** be approved for use as an IFFO RS raw material. This applied to whole fish as well as by-products.

### **TYPE 1 SPECIES (Representing 95% of the catch or more)**

**Category A:** Species-specific management regime in place. **Category B:** No species-specific management regime in place.

### TYPE 2 SPECIES (Representing 5% OF THE CATCH OR LESS)

**Category C:** Species-specific management regime in place. **Category D:** No species-specific management regime in place.

Common name	Latin name	Stock	% of landings	Management	Category
Yellowfin	Thunnus albacares	Yellowfin tuna in the	Unknown	WCPFC	С
tuna		western central Pacific			
		Ocean (west of 150°W).			

### CATEGORY C SPECIES

In a whole fish assessment, Category C species are those which make up less than 5% of landings, but which are subject to a species-specific management regime. In most cases this will be because they are a commercial target in a fishery other than the one under assessment. In a by-product assessment, Category C species are those which are subject to a species-specific management regime and are usually targeted species in fisheries for human consumption.

Clause C1 should be completed for **each** Category C species. If there are no Category C species in the fishery under assessment, this section can be deleted. A Category C species does not meet the minimum requirements of clause C1 should be re-assessed as a Category D species.

Species Name Yellowfin tuna in the west			Yellowfin tuna in the western central Pacific Ocean (wes	st of 150°W).	
C1	Category C Stock Status - Minimum Requirements				
C1		included in scientific au The species a biomass	ry removals of the species in the fishery under assessment are ded in the stock assessment process OR are considered by tific authorities to be negligible.  Species is considered, in its most recent stock assessment, to have mass above the limit reference point (or proxy), OR removals by shery under assessment are considered by scientific authorities to		
Clause outcome:				See above	

### C1.1

### **Evidence**

Fishery removals of the species in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment process via Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) processes. Yellowfin catch in 2017 was a record 670,890 mt, a 4% increase from 2016 and a 12% increase from the average over the period 2012 – 2016. In the last stock assessment from 2017 catches were reported as follows:

- Purse seine catch in 2017 (472,279 mt) was a 22% increase from 2016 and a 33% increase from the 2012-2016 average.
- Longline catch in 2017 (83,399 mt) was a 6% decrease from 2016 and a 9% decrease from the 2012-2016 average.
- Pole and line catch (12,219 mt) was a 48% decrease from 2016 and a 56% decrease from the average 2012-2016 catch.
- Catch by other gear (102,993 mt) was a 28% decrease from 2016 and 17% decrease from the average catch in 2012-2016.

Therefore, fishery removals from different gear types are included in the stock assessment process such that **the fishery achieves a PASS against C1.1**.

#### C1.2

### **Evidence**

The most recent stock assessment for WCPO yellowfin was carried out in 2017 (Tremblay-Boyer et al. 2017a). The WCPFC has adopted 20% of the unfished spawning potential (20%SB<sub>F=0</sub>) as a LRP for this stock; therefore, despite it being quite high at ~77% of the median estimate of  $B_{MSY}$ , this is the considered here. Stock status is evaluated by estimating  $SB_{recent}/SB_{F=0}$  and  $SB_{latest}/SB_{F=0}$ , where  $SB_{latest}$  and  $SB_{recent}$  are the estimated spawning potential in 2015 and the mean over 2011-2014, respectively.

Majuro plots presented in Tremblay-Boyer et al. (2017a), show that there are only two scenarios for 'latest' and three for 'recent' which fall below the defined LRP; therefore, the stock is considered, in its most recent stock assessment, to be above the limit reference point defined by management such that **the fishery achieves a PASS against C1.2**.

### References

Tremblay-Boyer, S., McKechnie, S., Pilling, G., Hampton, J., 2017a. Stock assessment of yellowfin tuna in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. WCPFC-SC13-2017/SA-WP-06.

Standard clauses 1.3.2.2