



RESPONSIBLE
SUPPLY

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 Methodology and Template Report V2.0



RESPONSIBLE
SUPPLY

IFFO RS
Global Standard for Responsible Supply
of Marine Ingredients

Fishery Under Assessment	Greenland halibut <i>(Reinhardtius hippoglossoides)</i> ICES Area IVa-c; VIIa,b,d-h,j2
Date	February 2018
Assessor	Jim Daly

Application details and summary of the assessment outcome				
Name: Pelagia				
Address: Killybegs				
Country:		Zip:		
Tel. No.:		Fax. No.:		
Email address:		Applicant Code		
Key Contact:		Title:		
Certification Body Details				
Name of Certification Body:		SAI Global		
Assessor Name	Peer Reviewer	Assessment Days	Initial/Surveillance/Re-approval	Whole fish/ By-product
Jim Daly	Conor Donnelly	1	Surveillance	By-product
Assessment Period	2017			

Scope Details	
Management Authority (Country/State)	EU/Common Fisheries Policy
Main Species	Greenland halibut (<i>Reinhardtius hippoglossoides</i>)
Fishery Location	ICES IVa-c;Via; VIIa,b,d-h,j2
Gear Type(s)	Demersal trawl, gillnet
Outcome of Assessment	
Overall Outcome	Pass
Clauses Failed	None
Peer Review Evaluation	Agree with recommendation
Recommendation	Pass

Assessment Determination
<p>There is a robust fishery management framework at the EU and UK & Ireland levels applied specifically to the Greenland halibut stock in part of the assessment area. A formal management plan has also been agreed by Greenland and Iceland in 2014. This plan has not yet been evaluated by ICES.</p> <p>The species is considered, in its most recent stock assessment (Iceland and Faroes grounds, West of Scotland, North of Azores, East of Greenland) to have a biomass above the limit reference point.</p> <p>IUCN has categorised Greenland halibut as a species of least concern. The species does not appear in the CITES appendices (both sites accessed 01.03.18).</p> <p>The assessment team recommends the approval of this by-product material against the IFFO RS standard.</p>
Peer Review Comments
Notes for On-site Auditor

Species-Specific Results

Category	Species	% landings	Outcome (Pass/Fail)
Category A			A1
			A2
			A3
			A4
Category B			
Category C	Greenland halibut (<i>Reinhardtius hippoglossoides</i>)		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]

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
Greenland halibut	<i>Reinhardtius hippoglossoides</i>			EU/Greenland/Iceland/Faroes/Norway	C

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. PASS
	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. PASS
		Clause outcome: PASS
Evidence		
<p>Member States of the European Union implement the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) in their waters. In force since 1983, the CFP aims to reconcile resource conservation with the preservation of income and jobs in coastal zones that offer few alternatives in terms of production or employment. It therefore covers not just resources but also markets and structures.</p> <p>The CFP is periodically reviewed and reformed. The most recent CFP reform process was completed in 2013 and came into effect from the 1st January 2014. Key changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The introduction of an objective to ‘ensure high long-term fishing yields for all stocks by 2015 where possible, and at the latest by 2020’ (i.e. movement towards an MSY-based approach). ▪ The gradual (2015-2019) introduction on a fishery-by-fishery basis of a ‘landing obligation’, which effectively bans discarding. ▪ An overhaul of the management structure, including increased regionalisation and more extensive stakeholder consultation <p>Species-specific management:</p> <p>Greenland halibut is subject to a number of different quotas throughout the area but is assessed by ICES as a single stock. TACs are also set for Icelandic and Greenland EEZ’s. In Faroese waters total effort is limited by the number of fishing licences. A formal management plan was agreed by Greenland and Iceland in 2014 aimed at being consistent with MSY. This plan has not yet been evaluated by ICES. This plan has limited overall catches in recent years and has assured that fishing pressure is about Fmsy.</p> <p>Stock areas and their 2018 quotas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Union waters of 2a and 4; Union and international waters of 5b and 6 : 2,500t (Analytical TAC, includes Norway) • International waters of 1 and 2 Union Quota (by-catch only, Precautionary): 900t • Greenland waters of NAFO 1 Union Quota: 1,925t • Greenland waters of 5,12 and 14 Union Quota: 4,515t (plus 575t to Norway, 110t to Faroes, Analytical TAC; restrictions on number of Union vessels) 		

ICES Advice:

ICES produced in 2018 advice in Subareas V, VI, XII, XIV and Subareas 1 and 2:

Subareas 5, 6, 12, and 14 (Iceland and Faroes grounds, West of Scotland, North of Azores, East of Greenland):

The stock was well above MSY Btrigger in the early part of the time-series (until 1990). After dropping below the trigger (2004 and 2005) biomass has steadily increased and is currently above MSY Btrigger. Recent fishing mortality (F) is estimated to be relatively close to FMSY. There remains uncertainty around the population dynamics within the overall distribution area, which is likely contribute to the uncertainty in the advice. ICES advises that when the MSY approach is applied, catches in 2018 should be no more than 24,000 tonnes. This will correspond to fishing at FMSY.

In 2016 quotas in Greenland EEZ and Iceland EEZ were fully utilized as in the preceding fishing years. In the Faroe EEZ the fishery is regulated by a fixed numbers of licenses and technical measures (by-catch and gear restrictions). The mandatory use of sorting grids in the shrimp fishery in Icelandic and Greenland waters since 2002 is observed to have reduced by-catches considerably.

Subareas 1 and 2 (Northeast Arctic):

The fishable biomass (length ≥ 45 cm) increased from 1992 to 2013 and has been relatively stable thereafter. None of the surveys individually cover the complete stock distribution and there are discrepancies between the surveys, leading to high uncertainty. In the absence of a harvest control rule or MSY reference points, advice is based on a precautionary approach where priority is given to keeping the stock biomass above Bpa.

Given the late recruitment to the fishery, the model used is able to produce a 5-year forecast of fishable biomass. At the recent (last 2-year average) fishing intensity level, the stock is forecast to remain above Bpa over this five-year period, and this forms the basis of the advice. ICES provides advice for a two-year period. **R1-R5**

References

R1 EU Fishing Quotas (2018):

- Council Regulation (EU) No. 2018/120 fixing for 2018 the fishing opportunities for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks, applicable in Union waters and, for Union fishing vessels, in certain non-Union waters:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018R0120&from=en>

R2 ICES Advice Greenland halibut (2018):

- Subareas 5, 6, 12, and 14:

<http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2017/2017/ghl.27.561214.pdf>

- Subareas 1 and 2:

<http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2017/2017/ghl.27.1-2.pdf>

R3 NWWG REPORT (2017):

- <http://NWWG%20Report%202017%20Sec%202017%20Greenland%20halibut%20in%20Subareas%205,6,%2012%20and%2014.pdf>

R4 CITES Species Endangered list: <http://checklist.cites.org/#/en>

R5 IUCN Red list: <http://www.iucnredlist.org/search>

Standard clauses 1.3.2.2

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.

