

# MarinTrust Standard V2

# By-product Fishery Assessment Atlantic wolffish (ICES subareas 1 and 2)

# **MarinTrust Programme**

Unit C, Printworks 22 Amelia Street London SE17 3BZ

E: standards@marin-trust.com

T: +44 2039 780 819



# Table 1 Application details and summary of the assessment outcome

|   | Species:                          | Atlantic wolffish <i>Anarhichas lupus</i> |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
|   | Geographical area:                | FAO 27 Northeast Atlantic                 |  |
| Fishery Under<br>Assessment             | Country of origin of the product: | Norway                                    |  |
|   | Stock:                            | ICES Subareas 1 and 2 (Northeast Arctic)  |  |
| Date                                    | March 2022                        |   |  |
| Report Code                             | BP031                             |   |  |
| Assessor                                | Conor Donnelly                    |   |  |
| Country of origin of the product - PASS | Norway                            |   |  |
| Country of origin of the                |                                   |   |  |
| product - FAIL                          |                                   |   |  |

| Application details and summary of the assessment outcome |   |                    |                                      |  |  |  |
|---|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Company Name(s): No                                       | orway Seafood Federati                              | on, TripleNine,    | Vedde AS                             |  |  |  |
| Country: Norway   |   |                    |                                      |  |  |  |
| Email address:  |   | Applicant Code     | e:                                   |  |  |  |
| <b>Certification Body Deta</b>                            | ails  |                    |                                      |  |  |  |
| Name of Certification I                                   | Body:   | Global Trust Co    | ertification                         |  |  |  |
| Assessor Peer Reviewer                                    |   | Assessment<br>Days | Initial/Surveillance/<br>Re-approval |  |  |  |
| Conor Donnelly  | Conor Donnelly Geraldine Criquet 0.5 Surveillance 2 |                    |                                      |  |  |  |
| Assessment Period   |   |                    |                                      |  |  |  |

| Scope Details          |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Main Species           | Atlantic wolffish Anarhichas lupus       |
| Stock                  | ICES Subareas 1 and 2 (Northeast Arctic) |
| Fishery Location       | FAO 27 Northeast Atlantic                |
| Management Authority   | Norwegian Directorate of Fisheries (DoF) |
| (Country/ State)       |  |
| Gear Type(s)           | Bottom trawls                            |
| Outcome of Assessment  |  |
| Peer Review Evaluation | Agree with assessor's determination      |
| Recommendation         | APPROVE                                  |

# Table 2. Assessment Determination

# **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 MARINTRUST raw material Atlantic wolffish, *Anarhichas lupus* do not appear as Endangered or Critically Endangered on IUCN's Red List, nor do they appear in CITES appendices; therefore, Atlantic wolffish, *Anarhichas lupus* in ICES areas 1 and 2 is eligible for approval for use as MARINTRUST by-product raw material.

The species is not subject to a specific management regime and therefore it is categorised as Category D. The lack of scientific information on the stock status in the assessment area results in the use of the risk-assessment approach. The fishery was assessed using the risk-based Productivity, Susceptibility Analysis (PSA) as per Marin Trust Standard v. 2 procedures for Category D species.

The species has passed this risk-based assessment (Table D4 Clause D4.1 and D4.2). Atlantic wolffish is APPROVED in the assessment area by the assessors for the production of fishmeal and fish oil under the current MARINTRUST v 2.0 by-products standard.

#### **Fishery Assessment Peer Review Comments**

The assessor correctly classified Northeast Arctic Atlantic wolffish as category D, reference points are not defined to assess the stock status relative to.

A PSA was performed. With an average productivity score of 2.43 and an average susceptibility score of 3.00, which meant the stock required further assessment using Table D4. The fishery passes both Clauses D4.1 and D4.2.

Therefore, the peer reviewer agrees with the assessor's determination that the fishery passes Table D4 and Northeast Arctic Atlantic wolffish is thus approved.

| Notes for On-site Auditor |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| None.                     |  |  |
|                           |  |  |
|                           |  |  |
|                           |  |  |
|                           |  |  |
|                           |  |  |
|                           |  |  |
|                           |  |  |



# **Species Categorisation**

**NB:** If any species is categorised as Endangered or Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List, or if it appears in CITES Appendix 1, it **cannot** be approved for use as an MarinTrust raw material.

# **IUCN Red list Category**

By-product material from a species listed by IUCN (the International Union for Conservation of Nature) under the Red List for the following categories shall immediately fail the assessment;

- EXTINCT (E) AND EXTINCT IN THE WILD (EW)
- CRITICALLY ENDANGERED (CR) facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild.
- ENDANGERED (EN) facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild.

By-product material may be used from the following categories provided that all clauses in the MarinTrust standard are passed.

- VULNERABLE (VU) facing a high risk of extinction in the wild.
- NEAR THREATENED (NT) does not qualify for above now, but is close or is likely to qualify for, a threatened category in the near future.
- LEAST CONCERN (LC) Widespread and abundant.
- DATA DEFICIENT (DD) and NOT EVALUATED (NE)

# Table 3 Species Categorisation Table

| Common name | Latin name | Stock        | Management     | Category | IUCN Red List<br>Category <sup>1</sup> | CITES Appendix 1 <sup>2</sup> |
|-------------|------------|--------------|----------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| Atlantic    | Anarhichas | ICES Subarea | Norway         | D        | DD                                     | No                            |
| wolffish    | lupus      | 1 and 2      | Directorate of |          |  |                               |
|             |            |              | Fisheries      |          |  |                               |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://www.iucnredlist.org/</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> https://cites.org/eng/app/appendices.php

# **CATEGORY C SPECIES**

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. Where a species fails this Clause, it should be assessed as a Category D species instead.

| Spe  | ecies             | Name           |  |           |  |  |
|--|-------------------|----------------|--|-----------|--|--|
| C1 Category C Stock Status - Minimum Requirements  |                   |                |  |           |  |  |
| CI   | C1.1              | Fishery remo   | wals of the species in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment |           |  |  |
|  |                   | process, OR a  | are considered by scientific authorities to be negligible.                               |           |  |  |
|  | C1.2              | The species is | s considered, in its most recent stock assessment, to have a biomass above the limit     |           |  |  |
|  |                   | reference po   | int (or proxy), OR removals by the fishery under assessment are considered by scientific |           |  |  |
|  |                   | authorities to | be negligible.   |           |  |  |
|  |                   |                | Clause outcome:  |           |  |  |
| proxy), OR removals by the fishery under assessment are considered by scientific authorities to be negligible. |                   |                |  |           |  |  |
| Pofor  |                   | movals by the  |  | point (or |  |  |
|  | ences             | movals by the  |  |           |  |  |
| Links  | ences             |                |  |           |  |  |
| Links<br>Marii   | ences<br>nTrust S | tandard clause | 1.3.2.2  |           |  |  |
| Links  | ences<br>nTrust S |                |  |           |  |  |



# **CATEGORY D SPECIES**

Category D species are those which are not subject to a species-specific management regime. In the case of mixed trawl fisheries, Category D species may make up the majority of landings. The comparative lack of scientific information on the status of the population of the species means that a risk-assessment style approach must be taken.

| D1 | Species Name                            | Atlantic wolffish |                                   |                |
|----|---|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
|    | Productivity Attribut                   | e                 | Value                             | Score          |
|    | Average age at maturity (years)         |                   | 6.5                               | 3              |
|    | Average maximum age (years)             |                   | 22                                | 2              |
|    | Fecundity (eggs/spawning)               |                   | 12,740                            | 1              |
|    | Average maximum size (cm)               |                   | 151                               | 3              |
|    | Average size at maturity (cm)           |                   | 55                                | 2              |
|    | Reproductive strategy                   |                   | Guarders / clutch tenders         | 3              |
|    | Mean trophic level                      |                   | 3.6 ±0.0 se                       | 3              |
|    |   |                   | <b>Average Productivity Score</b> | 2.43           |
|    | Susceptibility Attribut                 | te                | Value                             | Score          |
|    | Availability (area overlap)             |                   | >50% of stock (Subarea 1 & 2)     | 3              |
|    |   |                   | occurs in area fished             | 3              |
|    | Encounterability (the position of the s | tock/species      | Species is demersal & gear        |                |
|    | within the water column relative to the | e fishing gear)   | used is bottom trawl.             | 3              |
|    |   |                   | Therefore, highly likely to       | 3              |
|    |   |                   | encounter gear                    |                |
|    | Selectivity of gear type                |                   | Up to 4m length                   | 3              |
|    | Post-capture mortality                  |                   | Most dead or retained             | 3              |
|    |   |                   | Average Susceptibility Score      | 3.00           |
|    |   | F                 | PSA Risk Rating (From Table D3)   | Go to Table D4 |
|    |   |                   | Compliance rating                 |                |

#### Further justification for susceptibility scoring (where relevant)

In the absence of information on where fishing occurs relative to this stock, a precautionary approach was taken to scoring of the availability attribute.

There is evidence of high post-capture survival of Atlantic wolffish captured by bottom trawl (92-100%; Grant & Hiscock, 2014) but the assessor could not find information on whether fish are released so on a precautionary basis it is assumed most are retained.

# References

 $Fishbase. \ \ \, \underline{https://www.fishbase.se/summary/2501?msclkid=a61d3399abaf11eca64d7680dffd6109}$ 

Grant & Hiscock (2014). Post-capture survival of Atlantic wolffish (*Anarhichas lupus*) captured by bottom otter trawl: Can live release programs contribute to the recovery of species at risk? Fisheries Research, 151, 169-176.

Standard clauses 1.3.2.2



# Table D2 - Productivity / Susceptibility attributes and scores.

| Productivity attributes         | Low productivity/<br>High risk   | Medium productivity/<br>Medium risk | High productivity<br>Low risk |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                                 | Score 3  | Score 2                             | Score 1                       |
| Average age at maturity (years) | >4   | 2 to 4                              | <2                            |
| Average maximum age (years)     | >30  | 10 to 30                            | <10                           |
| Fecundity (eggs/spawning)       | <1 000   | 1 000 to 10 000                     | >10 000                       |
| Average maximum size (cm)       | >150   | 60 to 150                           | <60                           |
| Average size at maturity (cm)   | >150   | 30 to 150                           | <30                           |
| Reproductive strategy           | Live bearer, mouth<br>brooder or<br>significant parental<br>investment | Demersal spawner<br>"berried"       | Broadcast spawner             |
| Mean trophic level              | >3.25  | 2.5-3.25                            | <2.5                          |

| Susceptibility attributes |  | High susceptibility/<br>High risk | Medium susceptibility/<br>Medium risk   | Low susceptibility/<br>Low risk   |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
|                           |  |                                   | Score 3   | Score 2   | Score 1  |  |
| Availability              | Overlap of<br>adult species<br>range with<br>fishery |                                   | >50% of stock occurs in the area fished   | Between 25% and 50%<br>of the stock occurs in<br>the area fished  | <25% of stock occurs in<br>the area fished   |  |
|                           | 2)   | Distribution                      | Only in the country/<br>fishery   | Limited range in the region   | Throughout region/<br>global distribution  |  |
| Encounterability          | 1)   | Habitat                           | Habitat preference of<br>species make it highly<br>likely to encounter trawl<br>gear (e.g. demersal,<br>muddy/sandy bottom) | Habitat preference of<br>species make it<br>moderately likely to<br>encounter trawl gear<br>(e.g. rocky bottom/reefs) | Depth or distribution of<br>species make it unlikely<br>to encounter trawl gear<br>(e.g. epi-pelagic or<br>meso-pelagic) |  |
|                           | 2)   | Depth range                       | High overlap with trawl<br>fishing gear (20 to 60 m<br>depth)   | Medium overlap with<br>trawl fishing gear<br>(10 to 20 m depth)   | Low overlap with trawl<br>fishing gear (0 to 10 m,<br>>70 m depth)   |  |
| Selectivity               |  |                                   | Species >2 times mesh<br>size or up to 4 m<br>length  | Species 1 to 2 times<br>mesh size or 4 to 5 m<br>length   | Species <mesh or<br="" size="">&gt;5 m length</mesh>   |  |
| Post capture<br>mortality |  |                                   | Most dead or retained<br>Trawl tow >3 hours   | Alive after net hauled<br>Trawl tow 0.5 to 3 hours  | Released alive<br>Trawl tow <0.5 hours   |  |

**Note:** Availability 2 is only used when there is no information for Availability 1; the most conservative score between Encounterability 1 and 2 is used.



| D3                   |             | Average Susceptibility Score |             |          |  |
|----------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|----------|--|
|                      |             | 1 - 1.75                     | 1.76 - 2.24 | 2.25 - 3 |  |
| Average Productivity | 1 - 1.75    | PASS                         | PASS        | PASS     |  |
| Score                | 1.76 - 2.24 | PASS                         | PASS        | TABLE D4 |  |
|                      | 2.25 - 3    | PASS                         | TABLE D4    | TABLE D4 |  |

| <b>D4</b> | 4 Species Name  |                       | Atlantic wolffish   |     |  |  |
|-----------|---|-----------------------|---|-----|--|--|
|           | Impacts On Species Categorised as Vulnerable by D1-D3 - Minimum Requirements                    |                       |   |     |  |  |
|           | D4.1  | The potential impacts | of the fishery on this species are considered during the management | Yes |  |  |
|           | process, and reasonable measures are taken to minimise these impacts.                           |                       |   |     |  |  |
|           | D4.2 There is no substantial evidence that the fishery has a significant negative impact on the |                       |   | Yes |  |  |
|           | species.  |                       |   |     |  |  |
|           | Outcome: P.   |                       |   |     |  |  |
|           |   |                       |   |     |  |  |

#### **Evidence**

D4.1: The potential impacts of the fishery on this species are considered during the management process, and reasonable measures are taken to minimise these impacts.

Norway has a well-established system for fisheries management, which has evolved over more than a century and is now codified in the 2008 Marine Resources Act and secondary legislation. The Act applies to all marine catches and sets out principles for management including *inter alia*, a precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach. It provides powers to set quotas, imposes a discard ban which requires that all catches of fish must be landed, including bycatches, and that harvesting is carried out in such a way as to minimise impact. It provides for the establishment of MPAs where harvesting may be excluded and prohibits trawling inside the territorial limit around the Norwegian mainland.

Technical measures in force designed to reduce potential impacts of the fishery on this species including measures to improve selectivity such as sorting grids that minimize catches of juveniles and there are also move-on rules that protect juvenile target species (demersal stocks). The management system includes measures to close fishing areas which has evolved from 1984 onwards. Area closures now comprise both permanently closed areas (can be closed year-round or seasonally for all or specific gears and for specific reasons e.g. nursery areas, sensitive habitats) and real-time closures (temporary closures where the number of fish below the minimum legal size or the level of bycatches of protected species exceeds permitted limits) (Gullestad, Blom, Bakke & Bogstad, 2015).

There is clear evidence that the potential impacts of the fishery on this species are considered during the management process, and reasonable measures are taken to minimise these impacts.

D4.2 There is no substantial evidence that the fishery has a significant negative impact on the species.

As noted above, fisheries are regulated in Norway, with a range of measures in place to minimise the impact of the fishery on this species including the requirement to land all catches including bycatches and use of closed areas and gear technology to reduce unwanted catches. Catches of this species are relatively low (e.g. they do not appear on the 30+ list of species for which catch data is available on the Fisheries Directorate website. There is no substantial evidence that the fishery has a significant negative impact on the species.



#### References

Gullestad, Abotnes, Bakke, Skern-Mauritzen, Nedreaas, Søvik (2017). Towards ecosystem-based fisheries management in Norway – Practical tools for keeping track of relevant issues and prioritising management efforts. Marine Policy, 77, 104-110. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X16305383

Gullestad, Blom, Bakke & Bogstad (2015). The "Discard Ban Package": Experiences in efforts to improve the exploitation patterns in Norwegian fisheries. Marine Policy, 54, 1-9.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X14002589

https://www.fiskeridir.no/English/Fisheries/Norwegian-Fisheries-Management/Norwegian-efforts-to-improve-fisheries-exploitation-patterns

https://www.fiskeridir.no/English/Fisheries/Norwegian-Fisheries-Management/Ecosystem-based-fisheries-management-in-Norway

The marine resources act (fiskeridir.no)

#### Catch statistics:

https://www.fiskeridir.no/Yrkesfiske/Tall-og-analyse/Fangst-og-kvoter/Fangst/Fangst-fordelt-paa-art

| Links                      |                |  |  |
|----------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| MarinTrust Standard clause | 1.3.2.2, 4.1.4 |  |  |
| FAO CCRF                   | 7.5.1          |  |  |
| GSSI                       | D.5.01         |  |  |