



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



RESPONSIBLE  
SUPPLY

IFFO  
RS

ASSURED



# 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



<b>Fishery Under Assessment</b>	<b>Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> FAO 71</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>May 2019</b>
<b>Assessor</b>	<b>Jim Daly</b>

**Application details and summary of the assessment outcome**

<b>Name: Thein Quynh Ltd</b>				
<b>Address:</b>				
<b>Country: Vietnam</b>		<b>Zip:</b>		
<b>Tel. No.:</b>		<b>Fax. No.:</b>		
<b>Email address:</b>		<b>Applicant Code</b>		
<b>Key Contact:</b>		<b>Title:</b>		
<b>Certification Body Details</b>				
<b>Name of Certification Body:</b>		<b>SAI Global</b>		
<b>Assessor Name</b>	<b>Peer Reviewer</b>	<b>Assessment Days</b>	<b>Initial/Surveillance/Re-approval</b>	<b>Whole fish/ By-product</b>
Jim Daly	Virginia Polonio	0.5	SURV 1	By-product
<b>Assessment Period</b>	2018			

<b>Scope Details</b>	
<b>Management Authority (Country/State)</b>	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)
<b>Main Species</b>	Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>
<b>Fishery Location</b>	FAO 71 Pacific, western central
<b>Gear Type(s)</b>	Longline, purse seine, pole and line
<b>Outcome of Assessment</b>	
<b>Overall Outcome</b>	Pass
<b>Clauses Failed</b>	None
<b>Peer Review Evaluation</b>	Approve
<b>Recommendation</b>	Pass

Assessment Determination
<p>Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) skipjack tuna are managed by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) established by the Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC Convention) which entered into force on 19 June 2004. The Commission supports three subsidiary bodies; the Scientific Committee, Technical and Compliance Committee, and the Northern Committee, that each meet once during each year. Scientific advice and management recommendations are made by its Scientific Committee; stock assessments undertaken by the Oceanic Fisheries Programme of the Pacific Community (SPC).</p> <p>An overview of stocks of interest of the Commission was published in August 2018 R3. Based on data from the latest assessment (2016) the stock continues to be assessed as not overfished and overfishing not occurring. The next assessment is due this year (2019).</p> <p>The stock is subject to a species-specific management regime and was assessed under clause C. As fishery removals of WCPO skipjack tuna are included in the stock assessment process and the stock is considered, in its most recent assessment, to have a biomass above its limit reference point it passes clause C.</p> <p>Skipjack tuna is categorised as of least concern on IUCN's Red List of Threatened Species and is not listed on CITES (accessed 16.05.19).</p> <p>Skipjack tuna in the WCPO are recommended for approval as by-product under 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	Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>	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.

### 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
Skipjack tuna	<i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>	WCPO	NA	WCPFC	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		Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>	
<b>C1</b>	<b>Category C Stock Status - Minimum Requirements</b>		
	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
<b>Clause outcome:</b>			<b>Pass</b>
<b>Evidence</b>			
<b>C1.1:</b>			
WCPO skipjack tuna are managed by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) established by the Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPF Convention) which entered into force on 19 June 2004. Stock assessments are undertaken by the Oceanic Fisheries Programme part of the Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystems (FAME) Division of the Pacific Community (SPC).			

This stock was assessed using a Multifan-CL model with the following areas modelled: **R2 p4**



**Figure 1** Skipjack tuna stock assessment area **R2 p4**

Catch data is included in the assessment. Biological reference points are defined for the stock. The latest assessment was undertaken in 2016 (**R1**).

Fishery removals of the species in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment process, the stock passes Clause C1.1.

#### **C1.2:**


WCPFC's Scientific Committee note that fishing mortality of all age-classes is estimated to have increased significantly since the beginning of industrial tuna fishing, but fishing mortality for the stock remains below the level that would result in the MSY ( $F_{recent}/F_{MSY} = 0.45$  for the reference case), and is estimated to have decreased moderately in the last several years.

Across the reference case and the structural uncertainty grid (**Figure 2**)  $F_{recent}/F_{MSY}$  varied between 0.38 (5% quantile) to 0.64 (95% quantile). The scientific committee note that this indicates overfishing is not occurring for the WCPO skipjack tuna stock.


The estimated MSY of 1,891,600 mt is moderately higher than the 2014 estimate due to the adoption of an annual, rather than quarterly, stock-recruitment relationship. Recent catches (2016 data) are lower than, but approaching, this MSY value.

The Scientific Committee note that the latest estimate of spawning biomass is well above both the level that will support MSY ( $S_{latest}/S_{BMSY} = 2.56$ , for the reference case model) and the adopted LRP of 0.2  $S_{BF=0}$  ( $S_{latest}/S_{BF=0} = 0.58$ , for the reference case model), and  $S_{latest}/S_{BF=0}$  was relatively close to the adopted interim target reference point (0.5  $S_{BF=0}$ ) for all models explored in the assessment (structural uncertainty grid: median = 0.51, 5% and 95% quantiles = 0.39 and 0.67) (WCPFC, 2016).

The stock is considered, in its most recent assessment, to have a biomass above its limit reference point and passes Clause C1.2:



**Figure 2.** Temporal trend for the reference case model (**plot above**) and the structural uncertainty grid (**grid below**) in stock status relative to  $SBF=0$  (x-axis) and  $FMSY$  (y-axis). The red zone represents spawning potential levels lower than the agreed LRP, which is marked with the solid black line ( $0.2SBF=0$ ). The orange region is for fishing mortality greater than  $FMSY$  ( $F=FMSY$ ; marked with the black dashed line). The green line indicates the interim target reference point  $50\%SBF=0$ . Source: WCPFC, 2016.



**References**

**R1** WCPFC, 2016. The Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Twelfth Regular Session of the Scientific Committee. Bali, Indonesia, 3-11 August 2016. Summary Report, 26 August 2016. SKJ Management advice and Reference Points pp VIII-XIII

[https://www.wcpfc.int/system/files/01\\_SC12%20Summary%20Report-adopted%20-%2031Oct2016%20%28t-c%29\\_3.pdf](https://www.wcpfc.int/system/files/01_SC12%20Summary%20Report-adopted%20-%2031Oct2016%20%28t-c%29_3.pdf)

**R2** McKechnie, S., Hampton, J., Pilling, G. & Davies, N. (2016). Presentation on: Stock assessment of skipjack tuna in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Ocean Fisheries Programme, SPC. P 4 of 47.

[https://www.wcpfc.int/system/files/Agenda%204.1.3.1.a.2%20SA-WP-04\\_SKJ\\_Assessment\\_2016.pdf](https://www.wcpfc.int/system/files/Agenda%204.1.3.1.a.2%20SA-WP-04_SKJ_Assessment_2016.pdf)

**R3** Overview of Stocks of Interest to the WCPFC <https://www.wcpfc.int/doc/00/overview-stocks-interest-wcpfc>

*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.



## 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.