

IFFO RS V2.0



FISHERY ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND TEMPLATE REPORT

Fishery Under Assessment	European pilchard (<i>Sardina Pilchardus</i>) FAO area 34
Date	July 2017
Assessor	Deirdre Hoare

Application details and summary of the assessment outcome				
Name: T. C. Union				
Address:				
Country: Thailand		Zip:		
Tel. No.		Fax. No.		
Email address:		Applicant Code		
Key Contact:		Title:		
Certification Body Details				
Name of Certification Body:		SAI Global Ireland		
Assessor Name	Peer Reviewer	Assessment Days	Initial/Surveillance/ Re-approval	Whole fish / By-product
Deirdre Hoare	Virginia Polonio	1	Surveillance	By-product
Assessment Period	2016-2017			
Scope Details				
Management Authority (Country/State)		Morocco, Mauritania, Senegal		
Main Species		European pilchard (<i>Sardina Pilchardus</i>)		
Fishery Location		FAO area 34		
Gear Type(s)		Pelagic gears		
Outcome of Assessment				
Overall Outcome		Pass		
Clauses Failed		None		
Peer Review Evaluation		Maintain approval		
Recommendation		Maintain approval		

Assessment Determination
<p>This byproduct is imported into Thailand from Chinese vessels fishing in FAO 34. There is a fishery management framework at the African levels, although this only appears to be applied specifically to the sardine stock in the assessment area to a limited extent. Management is supported by species specific data collection and stock assessment, there are significant improvements which would reduce the level of uncertainty. The assessment team recommends the approval of this by-product material against the IFFO RS standard. <i>Sardina pilchardus</i> is assessed as 'Least Concern' by the IUCN Redlist.</p>
Peer Review Comments
Empty space for Peer Review Comments
Notes for On-site Auditor
Empty space for Notes for On-site Auditor

Species-Specific Results

Category	Species	% landings	Outcome (Pass/Fail)	
Category A			A1	
			A2	
			A3	
			A4	
Category B				
Category C	European pilchard	NA	Pass	
Category D				

[List all Category A and B species. List approximate total %age of landings which are Category C and D species; these do not need to be individually named here]

HOW TO COMPLETE THIS ASSESSMENT REPORT

This assessment template uses a modular approach to assessing fisheries against the IFFO RS standard.

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. All species regularly* caught in the fishery 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. **Type 1 species must represent 95% of the total catch. Type 2 species may represent a maximum of 5% of the 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
European pilchard	<i>Sardina Pilchardus</i>	NW African central and southern	NA	Morocco, Mauritania, Senegal	C

Category A species are assessed through an examination of the data collection, stock assessment, management measures, and stock status relating to the species. Category B species are assessed using a risk-based assessment covering similar areas. Category C species are assessed on stock status only. Category D species are assessed using a PSA analysis as described in the relevant section of this document.

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		
C1	Category C Stock Status - Minimum Requirements	
	C1.1	Fishery removals of the species in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment process, OR are considered by scientific authorities to be negligible. Yes
	C1.2	The species is considered, in its most recent stock assessment, to have a biomass above the limit reference point (or proxy), OR removals by the fishery under assessment are considered by scientific authorities to be negligible. Yes
		Clause outcome: Pass
Evidence		
<p>Fishery removals of European pilchard are included in the stock assessment process by North West African countries; Morocco, Mauritania and Senegal.</p> <p>The Moroccan National Fisheries Research Institute (Institut National de Recherche Halieutique, INRH) conducts regular research on the status of the exploited marine resources (Gascoigne, 2014a; INRH, 2015). Stock assessments and advised catch limits have typically been performed by the FAO working group but the INRH has also been publishing stock status reports in recent years (INRH 2014, 2015, 2016). The latest summary FAO report was published in 2014 and used data until 2013 (FAO, 2014).</p> <p>The Mauritanian Institute of Oceanographic Research and Fisheries (Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Océanographiques et des Pêches, IMROP) performs scientific campaigns to assess the status of the exploited stocks in the country (Sidi et al., 2013).</p> <p>A Joint Scientific Committee (Comité Scientifique Cojoint RIM-UE; CSC), created with the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between Mauritania-European Union (EU) raises the importance of the FAO Working Group to assess the stocks with new approaches and robust diagnostics, and also brings international expertise to support the scientific work conducted in the area (CSC, 2014). No new report of the Joint Scientific Committee is available.</p> <p>The Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (Commission Sous-Régionale des Pêches, CSRP; that includes Mauritania and Senegal) is conducting efforts to assess and manage the transboundary small pelagic stocks shared within the countries of the region, jointly with Morocco; an advisory committee was created. A Moroccan management plan for the small pelagic fishery is in place and catch limits have been defined for the Moroccan fleet. Mauritania is currently developing a management plan for the same fishery. Catch limits are defined for European and non-European fleets operating within the Mauritanian EEZ. Several technical measures are in place for each country. Bycatch limits defined for each of the Moroccan and Mauritanian fisheries. Closed areas, considering artisanal and industrial fishing sectors, are defined in each of the countries.</p>		

Based on the Biodyn method, the North west African central stock in 2016 is indicated to be less than fully exploited, (B_{2015} is 48% over the limit reference point); though the ASPIC model with CPUE result is far less optimistic, with B_{2015}/B_{MSY} estimated at 67% (33% under the limit reference point). Fishing mortality relative to the target reference point $F_{0.1}$ ($F_{2015}/F_{0.1}$), ranges from 44% (Biodyn model) to 128% (ASPIC with CPUE) (INRH 2016).

Based on the 2016 assessment (INRH 2016), the North west African southern stock is indicated to be non-fully exploited, with estimated biomass (Biodyn method) above both target $B_{2015}/B_{0.1}=1.37$ and limit levels $B_{2014}/B_{MSY}=1.50$. By the same method, fishing mortality relative to the target reference point $F_{0.1}$ ($F_{2015}/F_{0.1}$) is just 55%. However, the ASPIC estimate is far less optimistic ($F_{2015}/F_{0.1} = 124\%$).

References

Institut National the Recherche Halieutique (INRH 2016). Etat des stocks et des pêcheries Marocaines 2015. August, 2016. http://www.inrh.ma/sites/default/files/etat_stocks2015_inrh_rectif.pdf

Fishsource European pilchard NW Africa central https://www.fishsource.org/stock_page/781

Fishsource European pilchard NW Africa southern https://www.fishsource.org/stock_page/782

FAO, 2016a. Report of the FAO Working Group on the Assessment of Small Pelagic Fish off Northwest Africa. Casablanca, Morocco, 20–25 July 2015. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report. No. 1122. Rome. 243 pp. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5511bb.pdf>

FAO, 2016b. Status summary for small pelagic stocks in the Northern area of the Eastern Central Atlantic. Main outcomes of the FAO Working Group on the Assessment of Small Pelagic Fish off Northwest Africa 2012-2015, Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic, Scientific Sub-Committee, Seventh Session, Tenerife, Spain, 14-16 October 2015, CECAF/SSCVII/2015/2, 17pp. ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/document/cecaf/cecaf_SSC7/old/2_pve.pdf

Gascoigne, J. 2014a. Pêche de sardine au Maroc Plan de travail pour l'année 1 de la FIP (2014-2015). Version validée, 1 décembre 2014, 8pp. <http://fisheryimprovementprojects.org/wp-content/uploads/Plan-de-travail-du-FIP-final.pdf>

Standard clauses 1.3.2.1 - 1.3.2.4

SOCIAL CRITERION

In addition to the scored criteria listed above, applicants must commit to ensuring that vessels operating in the fishery adhere to internationally recognised guidance on human rights. They must also commit to ensuring there is no use of enforced or unpaid labour in the fleet(s) operating upon the resource.

Appendix A - Determining Resilience Ratings

The assessment of Category B species described in this assessment report template utilises a resilience rating system suggested by the American Fisheries Society. This approach was chosen because it is also used by FishBase, and so the resilience ratings for many thousands of species are freely available online. As described by FishBase, the following is the process used to arrive at the resilience ratings:

“The American Fisheries Society (AFS) has suggested values for several biological parameters that allow classification of a fish population or species into categories of high, medium, low and very low resilience or productivity (Musick 1999). If no reliable estimate of r_m (see below) is available, the assignment is to the lowest category for which any of the available parameters fits. For each of these categories, AFS has suggested thresholds for decline over the longer of 10 years or three generations. If an observed decline measured in biomass or numbers of mature individuals exceeds the indicated threshold value, the population or species is considered vulnerable to extinction unless explicitly shown otherwise. If one sex strongly limits the reproductive capacity of the species or population, then only the decline in the limiting sex should be considered. We decided to restrict the automatic assignment of resilience categories in the Key Facts page to values of K , t_m and t_{max} and those records of fecundity estimates that referred to minimum number of eggs or pups per female per year, assuming that these were equivalent to average fecundity at first maturity (Musick 1999). Note that many small fishes may spawn several times per year (we exclude these for the time being) and large live bearers such as the coelacanth may have gestation periods of more than one year (we corrected fecundity estimates for those cases reported in the literature). Also, we excluded resilience estimates based on r_m (see below) as we are not yet confident with the reliability of the current method for estimating r_m . If users have independent r_m or fecundity estimates, they can refer to Table 1 for using this information.”

Parameter	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Threshold	0.99	0.95	0.85	0.70
r_{max} (1/year)	> 0.5	0.16 - 0.50	0.05 - 0.15	< 0.05
K (1/year)	> 0.3	0.16 - 0.30	0.05 - 0.15	< 0.05
Fecundity (1/year)	> 10,000	100 - 1000	10 - 100	< 10
t_m (years)	< 1	2 - 4	5 - 10	> 10
t_{max} (years)	1 - 3	4 - 10	11 - 30	> 30

[Taken from the FishBase manual, “Estimation of Life-History Key Facts”, <http://www.fishbase.us/manual/English/key%20facts.htm#resilience>]

Appendix B – Background on the 5% catch rule

The proposed fishery assessment methodology uses a species categorisation approach to divide the catch in the assessment fishery into groups. These groups are:

- **Category A:** “Target” species with a species-specific management regime in place.
- **Category B:** “Target” species with no species-specific management regime in place.
- **Category C:** “Non-target” species with a species-specific management regime in place.
- **Category D:** “Non-target” species with no species-specific management regime in place

The distinction between 'target' and 'non-target' species is made to enable the assessment to consider the impact of the fishery on all the species caught regularly, without requiring a full assessment be conducted for each. Thus 'target' species are subjected to a more detailed assessment, while 'non-target' species are considered more briefly. For the purposes of the IFFO RS fishery assessment, 'target' and 'non-target' species are defined by their prevalence in the catch, by weight. Applicants must declare which species are considered 'target' species in the fishery, and the combined weight of these must be at least 95% of the annual catch. The remaining 5% can be made up of 'non-target' species. Note also that ETP species are considered separately, irrespective of their frequency of occurrence in the catch.

The proposed use of 5% as a limit for 'non-target' species is one area in which feedback is being sought via the public consultation. The decision to propose a value of 5% ensures consistency with other fishery assessment programmes, such as the MSC which uses 5% to distinguish between 'main' and 'minor' species (see MSC Standard, SA3.4 and GSA3.4.2); and Seafood Watch, which uses 5% when defining the 'main' species for the assessment (see Seafood Watch Standard, Criterion 2). The value is also consistent with the approach used in Version 1 of the IFFO RS Standard, in which up to 5% of the raw material could be comprised of 'unassessed' species.

Comments on this proposition are welcomed along with any other feedback on the proposed approach.