



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 | King scallop <i>Pecten maximus</i> ICES Divisions IV a-c, VI a, VII a-b, d-h, j |
| Date | July 2019 |
| Assessor | Jim Daly |

| Application details and summary of the assessment outcome | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Name: Bioceval | | | | |
| Address: | | | | |
| Country: France | | Zip: | | |
| Tel. No.: | | Fax. No.: | | |
| Email address: | | Applicant Code | | |
| Key Contact: | | Title: | | |
| Certification Body Details | | | | |
| Name of Certification Body: | | SAI Global Ltd | | |
| Assessor Name | Peer Reviewer | Assessment Days | Initial/Surveillance/Re-approval | Whole fish/ By-product |
| Jim Daly | Virginia Polonio | 0.5 | Initial | By-product |
| Assessment Period | 2018 | | | |

| Scope Details | |
|---|---|
| Management Authority (Country/State) | UK and Ireland, EU |
| Main Species | King scallop <i>Pecten maximus</i> |
| Fishery Location | UK and Ireland - ICES Divisions IV a-c, VI a, VII a-b, d-h, j |
| Gear Type(s) | Dredge |
| Outcome of Assessment | |
| Overall Outcome | Pass |
| Clauses Failed | None |
| Peer Review Evaluation | Approval |
| Recommendation | Pass |

| Assessment Determination |
|---|
| <p>King scallop is not subject to a species-specific management regime. The comparative lack of scientific information on the status of the population in the assessment area means that a risk-assessment style approach must be taken. The fishery was assessed using the risk-based Productivity, Susceptibility Analysis (PSA) as per IFFO-RS v 2.0 procedures for Category D species. The species has passed this risk-based assessment (Table D1).</p> <p>There are no limits on scallop landings e.g. through Total Allowable Catches (TACs) or quotas. EU legislation specifies a minimum landing size, there are limits on the number of dredges (which vary from area to area), some seasonal closures and some additional effort controls in place.</p> <p>The compliance score reflects indications that some stocks are showing signs of decline. There are limited management measures in place which would increase the risk of unsustainable fishing (e.g. Baie des Seine fishery R4.)</p> <p>King scallop <i>Pecten maximus</i> is not listed on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species but is listed in the Catalogue of Life (2019 Edition). The species is not currently listed on the CITES appendices of endangered species (accessed July 2019).</p> <p>King scallop is approved by the assessment team for the production of fishmeal and fish oil under the IFFO-RS v 2.0 by-products standard.</p> |
| Peer Review Comments |
| <p>PR agrees with the conclusions raised, however, a specific management strategy, with adequate reference points, should be developed. Data collection on bycatch species and impact on the ecosystem is in progress in a FIP project in stage 3. Therefore, PR recommends the approval of this by product material under IFFO RS Standard v2.0.</p> |
| Notes for On-site Auditor |
| |

Species-Specific Results

| Category | Species | % landings | Outcome (Pass/Fail) | |
|------------|------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|--|
| Category A | | | A1 | |
| | | | A2 | |
| | | | A3 | |
| | | | A4 | |
| Category B | | | | |
| Category C | | | | |
| Category D | King scallop <i>Pecten maximus</i> | N/A | Pass | |

[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.

Whole Fish

The process for completing the template for a **whole fish** assessment is as follows:

1. ALL ASSESSMENTS: Complete the Species Characterisation table, to determine which categories of species are present in the fishery.
2. ALL ASSESSMENTS: Complete clauses M1, M2, M3: Management.
3. IF THERE ARE CATEGORY A SPECIES IN THE FISHERY: Complete clauses A1, A2, A3, A4 for **each** Category A species.
4. IF THERE ARE CATEGORY B SPECIES IN THE FISHERY: Complete the Section B risk assessment for **each** Category B species.
5. IF THERE ARE CATEGORY C SPECIES IN THE FISHERY: Complete clause C1 for **each** Category C species.
6. IF THERE ARE CATEGORY D SPECIES IN THE FISHERY: Complete Section D.
7. ALL ASSESSMENTS: Complete clauses F1, F2, F3: Further Impacts.

A fishery must score a pass in **all applicable clauses** before approval may be recommended. To achieve a pass in a clause, the fishery/species must meet **all** of the minimum requirements.

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 |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|--|----------|
| King scallop | <i>Pecten maximus</i> | North East Atlantic | N/A | No species-specific management regime in place | D |

CATEGORY D SPECIES

In a whole fish assessment, Category D species are those which make up less than 5% of landings and 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. In a by-product assessment, Category D species are those which are not subject to a species-specific management regime. In both cases, 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.

The process for assessing Category D species involves the use of a Productivity-Susceptibility Analysis (PSA) to further subdivide the species into ‘Critical Risk’, ‘Major Risk’ and ‘Minor Risk’ groups. If there are no Category D species in the fishery under assessment, this section can be deleted.

Productivity and susceptibility ratings are calculated using a process derived from the APFIC document “Regional Guidelines for the Management of Tropical Trawl Fisheries, which in turn was derived from papers by Patrick *et al* (2009) and Hobday *et al* (2007). Table D1 should be completed for each Category D species as follows:

- Firstly, the best available information should be used to fill in values for each productivity and susceptibility attribute.
- Table D2 should be used to convert each attribute value into a score between 1 and 3.
- The average score for productivity attributes and the average for susceptibility attributes should be calculated.
- Table D3 should be used to determine whether the species is required to meet the requirements of Table D4. A species which does not need to meet the requirements of D4 is automatically awarded a pass.
- Table D4 should be used to assess those species indicated by Table D3 to determine a pass/fail rating.
- Any Category D species which has been categorised by the IUCN Red List as Endangered or Critically Endangered, or which appears in the CITES appendices, automatically results in a fail.

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|--------------|
| D1 | Species Name: | King scallop <i>Pecten maximus</i> | |
| | Productivity Attribute | Value | Score |
| | Average age at maturity (years) | 2-3 | 2 |
| | Average maximum age (years) | 10-20 | 2 |
| | Fecundity (eggs/spawning) | >1,000,000 | 1 |
| | Average maximum size (cm) | 21, usually 10-16 | 1 |
| | Average size at maturity (cm) | 8-9 | 1 |
| | Reproductive strategy | Broadcast spawner | 1 |
| | Mean trophic level | 2 | 1 |
| | Average Productivity Score | | 1.29 |
| | Susceptibility Attribute | Value | Score |
| | Overlap of adult species range with fishery | >50% of stock occurs in the area fished | 3 |
| | Distribution | Not scored if overlap scored | |
| | Habitat | Epibenthic on– clean firm sand, fine or sandy gravel, occasionally muddy sand | 3 |
| | Depth range | 10-110m | 3 |
| | Selectivity | Newhaven dredge 8-9 teeth, 11cm long and spaced 8cm apart. Mesh of 80-100mm. | 2 |
| | Post-capture mortality | Most dead or retained | 3 |
| | Average Susceptibility Score | | 2.75 |
| | PSA Risk Rating (From Table D3) | | Pass |

Compliance rating

Concerns have been raised over increasing mortality, declining recruitment and spawning stock biomass in several Scottish fisheries. King scallop stocks are not routinely monitored or assessed in England, Wales or Northern Ireland at present; some stocks are thought to be showing signs of decline.

There are limited management measures in place so that there may be a significant risk of unsustainable fishing (e.g. Baie des Seine fishery (**R4**). There are no limits on scallop landings e.g. through Total Allowable Catches (TACs) or quotas. EU legislation specifies a minimum landing size, there are limits on the number of dredges (which vary from area to area), some seasonal closures and some effort controls.

References

R1 Age/size at maturity, overlaps and selectivity attributes

Howarth & Stewart (2014). The dredge fishery for scallops in the United Kingdom (UK): effects on marine ecosystems and proposals for future management. Report to the Sustainable Inshore Fisheries Trust. Marine Ecosystem Management Report no. 5, University of York, 54 pp.

http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/79233/1/Howarth_and_Stewart_2014_Ecosystem_effects_management_of_UK_scallop_fisheries.pdf

R2 Trophic level

Pinnegar et al (2002). Long-term changes in the trophic level of the Celtic Sea fish community and fish market price distribution. J. Appl. Ecol. 39, 377-390. (Pg 379)

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.497.3030&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

R3 Other attributes

<http://www.marlin.ac.uk/species/detail/1398>

R4 ICES, 2017. Interim Report of the Scallop Assessment Working Group (WGSCAL-LOP), 10–12 October 2017, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK. ICES CM 2017/SSGEPD:25. 18 pp.

<http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/SSGEPD/2017/01%20WGSCALLOP%20-%20Report%20of%20the%20Scallop%20Assessment%20Working%20Group.pdf>

Standard clauses 1.3.2.2

Table D2 - Productivity / Susceptibility attributes and scores.

| Productivity attributes | Low productivity/ High risk | Medium productivity/ Medium risk | High productivity/ 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 brooder or significant parental investment | Demersal spawner "berried" | Broadcast spawner |
| Mean trophic level | >3.25 | 2.5–3.25 | <2.5 |

| Susceptibility attributes | | High susceptibility/ High risk | Medium susceptibility/ Medium risk | Low susceptibility/ Low risk |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | Score 3 | Score 2 | Score 1 |
| Availability | 1) Overlap of adult species range with fishery | >50% of stock occurs in the area fished | Between 25% and 50% of the stock occurs in the area fished | <25% of stock occurs in the area fished |
| | 2) Distribution | Only in the country/ fishery | Limited range in the region | Throughout region/ global distribution |
| Encounterability | 1) Habitat | Habitat preference of species make it highly likely to encounter trawl gear (e.g. demersal, muddy/sandy bottom) | Habitat preference of species make it moderately likely to encounter trawl gear (e.g. rocky bottom/reefs) | Depth or distribution of species make it unlikely to encounter trawl gear (e.g. epi-pelagic or meso-pelagic) |
| | 2) Depth range | High overlap with trawl fishing gear (20 to 60 m depth) | Medium overlap with trawl fishing gear (10 to 20 m depth) | Low overlap with trawl fishing gear (0 to 10 m, >70 m depth) |
| Selectivity | | Species >2 times mesh size or up to 4 m length | Species 1 to 2 times mesh size or 4 to 5 m length | Species <mesh size or >5 m length |
| Post capture mortality | | Most dead or retained Trawl tow >3 hours | Alive after net hauled Trawl tow 0.5 to 3 hours | Released alive 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 | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 1.00 – 1.75 | 1.76 – 2.24 | 2.25 – 3.00 |
| Average Productivity Score | 1.00 – 1.75 | PASS | PASS | PASS |
| | 1.76 – 2.24 | PASS | PASS | TABLE D4 |
| | 2.25 – 3.00 | PASS | TABLE D4 | TABLE D4 |

| D4 | Species Name | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | 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 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. | |
| | | | Outcome: |
| Evidence | | | |
| References | | | |
| <i>Standard clause 1.3.2.2</i> | | | |

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.