



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	Tusk (<i>Brosme brosme</i>) North East Atlantic
Date	January 2018
Assessor	Conor Donnelly

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
Conor Donnelly	Sam Dignan	1	Re-approval	By-product
Assessment Period	2017			

Scope Details	
Management Authority (Country/State)	EU/Common Fisheries Policy; Iceland
Main Species	Tusk <i>Brosme brosme</i>
Fishery Location	North East Atlantic
Gear Type(s)	Trawl, gillnet, longline (bycatch in many areas)
Outcome of Assessment	
Overall Outcome	Pass
Clauses Failed	None
Peer Review Evaluation	Approve
Recommendation	Re-approval

Assessment Determination
<p>Removals of tusk in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment process. The latest assessment has shown that fishing mortality is below and stock size above proxy of the MSY reference point (North East Atlantic stock). A management plan is in place for the East Greenland and Iceland grounds stock. For other stocks data collection and stock assessment activities appear to be limited, with significant room for improvement.</p> <p>The gradual (2015-2019) introduction on a fishery-by-fishery basis for EU fishing vessels of a ‘landing obligation’, which effectively bans discarding, should improve information on catches where data is limited. Robust restrictions on % bycatch when targeting other more valuable species are also in place.</p> <p>IUCN has not yet categorised tusk on its’ red list. Tusk also does not appear on the current list of CITES endangered species.</p> <p>Tusk is recommended to be re-approved as by-product material under the current IFFO RS Standard.</p>
Peer Review Comments
Agree with determination
Notes for On-site Auditor

Note: This table should be completed for whole fish assessments only.

Species-Specific Results

Category	Species	% landings	Outcome (Pass/Fail)	
Category A			A1	
			A2	
			A3	
			A4	
Category B				
Category C	Tusk (<i>Brosme brosme</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
TUSK	<i>Brosme brosme</i>	North East Atlantic		EU/CFP, Icelandic waters	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
<p>Evidence</p> <p>In European Union waters the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) is implemented. 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>With regard to resource management, the CFP regulations comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A traditional management tool based on Total Allowable Catches (TACs) and quotas; • Technical measures relating to gear or catch; • Effort-related management, based on vessel engine power and the number of days at sea. <p>The CFP also provides for the introduction of measures to rebuild, over a period of several years, stocks that are threatened in terms of sustainable harvesting, and for recourse to effort-related management rules to supplement TACs and quotas.</p> <p>The gradual (2015-2019) introduction on a fishery-by-fishery basis for EU fishing vessels of a ‘landing obligation’, which effectively bans discarding, should improve information on catches in data-limited fisheries.</p> <p>EU quotas are allocated for 4 stocks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subareas I and II (Arctic) Union and international waters of 1, 2 and 14 (USK/1214EI) 21t • 3a (USK/3A/BCD) 31t • Union waters of 4 (USK/04-C.) 251t • Union and international waters of 5, 6 and 7 (USK/567EI.) 4,130t <p>ICES advice does not correspond to the EU stock areas:</p> <p><u>North East Atlantic Tusk Fishery (Subareas 4, 7-9; Divisions 3.a 5.b 6.a and 12.b):</u></p>		

The ICES framework for category 3 stocks (stocks for which survey-based assessments indicate trends) was applied (ICES 2012). The status evaluation is based on calculating a reference proxy for FMSY using the Surplus Production in Continuous Time (SPiCT) model (ICES 2017). SPiCT-estimated values of the ratios F/FMSY and B/BMSY were used to estimate stock status. The fishing mortality is below and the stock size above proxy of the MSY reference point; therefore, no additional precautionary buffer was applied. Discarding is considered negligible (< 5%). There is currently no precautionary management plan in this area.

Two fisheries in the North East Atlantic (Norwegian and Icelandic waters) are MSC certified (Gillnets, entangling nets) as part of a multi-species assessment for demersal stocks.

East Greenland and Iceland Fishery (Division Va; Subarea XIV):

The basis of the catch options for this stock is a management plan implemented by the Icelandic Ministry of Industries and Innovation (ICES 2017). Spawning-stock biomass (SSB) has been increasing in recent years; the reference biomass (tusk longer than 40 cm) has declined, but remains at a high level. The management plan is considered precautionary and conforms to the ICES MSY approach. Catches in the Greenlandic part of Subarea 14 were not included in this assessment.

The assessor is of the opinion that removals of tusk in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment process. Rules governing the bycatch fishery for tusk when targeting more valuable species, including minimum mesh size, will help conserve stocks in the North-East Atlantic.

IUCN has not yet categorised tusk on its' red list. Tusk also does not appear on the current list of CITES endangered species.

Tusk is recommended to be re-approved as by-product material under the current IFFO RS Standard for Category C species.

References

EU Fishing Quotas (2018): Council Regulation (EU) No 2018/120 (23.01.18):
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/> (accessed 22.02.18)

ICES ADVICE 2017 (Tusk):

- <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2017/2017/usk.27.3a45b6a7-912b.pdf>
- <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2016/2016/usk-icel.pdf>

ICES 2012a: Implementation of Advice for Data-limited Stocks ICES CM 2012/ACOM: 68 42 pp.

CITES appendices: <http://checklist.cites.org> (accessed 26.02.18)

IUCN Red List: <http://www.iucnredlist.org/search> (accessed 26.02.18)

MSC Track a fishery: <https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/@@search?q=certified+tusk&start=0&stop>

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.