

GLOBAL BENCHMARK TOOL

GSSI Benchmark Report

Scheme: MEL Japan

Scope: Aquaculture Management Standard (version 2.0, 2022), Fisheries Management Standard (version 2.0, 2018)

Date: 21st September 2023

STATEMENT OF RECOGNITION

Scheme	MEL Japan
Scope	Aquaculture Management Standard (version 2.0, 2022) Fisheries Management Standard (version 2.0, 2018)
Date	21 st September 2023

The Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI) Steering Board recognizes the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) to be in alignment with all applicable essential components of:

A	Section A. Governance of Seafood Certification Schemes
B	Section B. Operational Management of Seafood Certification Schemes
C	Section C. Aquaculture Certification Standards
D	Section D. Fisheries Certification Standards

Thereby, GSSI considers the above seafood certification scheme to be in alignment with the FAO Guidelines for the Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine/Inland Capture Fisheries.

This Report lists evidence of alignment with applicable GSSI Essential Components and GSSI Supplementary Components, where implemented.








CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF RECOGNITION	2	Section D. Fisheries Certification Standards.....	140
SCHEME OVERVIEW	4	<i>D.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>	
FROM APPLICATION TO RECOGNITION	5		
WHO IS INVOLVED	6		
EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT	7		
Section A. Governance of Seafood Certification Schemes.....	8		
<i>A.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>			
Section B. Operational Management of Seafood Certification Schemes.....	47		
<i>B.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>			
Section C. Aquaculture Certification Standards	96		
<i>C.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>			

SCHEME OVERVIEW

Scheme name	MEL Japan
About	Marine Eco-Label Japan was launched as a project operated by the Japan Fisheries Association in 2007. In December 2016, the MEL Council was established and became the scheme owner in response to the growing public interest in marine eco-labeling within and outside Japan. The scheme consists of three standards of fisheries, aquaculture and chain of custody (CoC). As of the end of May 2023, there were 221 cases certified: fisheries 22, aquaculture 61 and CoC 138. Visit http://www.melj.jp/ for more information.
Headquarters location	Tokyo, Japan
Scope	Aquaculture Management Standard (version 2.0, 2022) Fisheries Management Standard (version 2.0, 2018)

FROM APPLICATION TO RECOGNITION

	1 ↓	Application Received	The Benchmark Process begins once a Scheme Owner decides to apply for recognition and contacts the Secretariat, who provides an overview of the process.
	2 ↓	Desktop Review	This step helps to assess the Scheme Owner's capability to proceed and successfully complete the Benchmark Process within the expected timeframe.
	3 ↓	Office Visit	The Office Visit may be conducted by the Process IE or both IEs, depending on the outstanding issues of the Desktop Review.
	4 ↓	Benchmark Committee Meeting	The Benchmark Committee acts as the 'Quality Assurance' for the work undertaken by the IE team in the Desktop Review and Office Visit.
	5 ↓	Public Consultation	If recognition is recommended by the Benchmark Committee, the Scheme Owner's approval is required to publish the Benchmark Report for a four-week Public Consultation.
	6 ↓	Recognition Decision by Steering Board	The Steering Board is briefed by the Steering Board Liaison on the Benchmark Report and the Benchmark Committee's recommendation for recognition.
	7	Monitoring of Continued Alignment	GSSI ensures continued alignment of recognized schemes with GSSI Essential Components through an annual reporting process of relevant changes.

Read more about the steps to recognition [here](#).

WHO IS INVOLVED



Scheme Representative

Hisa Kanno
Yoshi Akimoto



Independent Expert (Process)

Section A/B: Josie Foster



Independent Expert (Technical)

Section C: John Hargreaves
Section D: Jose Crespo



Steering Board Liaison

Han Han



GSSI Secretariat Representative

Georgia Armitage



Steering Board Members

Adriana Sanchez
Angel Irago
Han Han
Ingrid Kelling
Jennifer Kemmerley
Judy Panayos
Laurent Develle
Annika Mackensen
Marcelo Hidalgo
Nianjun Shen
Sonia Cordera
Trent Hartill



Benchmark Committee Members

Anne Vanderhoeven
Christian von Dorrien
Josanna Busby
Matt Thompson
Stephen Fisher

EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A	Section A. Governance of Seafood Certification Schemes
B	Section B. Operational Management of Seafood Certification Schemes
C	Section C. Aquaculture Certification Standards
D	Section D. Fisheries Certification Standards

**SECTION A.
GOVERNANCE OF
SEAFOOD
CERTIFICATION
SCHEMES**



A.1 SCHEME GOVERNANCE

A.1.01 Legal Status	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner is a legal entity, or an organization that is a partnership of legal entities, or a government or inter-governmental agency.	<p>Scheme Owner is an entity which could be held legally responsible for its operations.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an official document showing registration with legal authorities and current legal status of organization. Examples include incorporation papers, statutes, business licenses and registration with tax authorities. <p>For government Scheme Owners, clear lines of responsibility and authority on decision making should be identified.</p> <p>Pre-application to require scheme to identify legal registered entity or lead government agency/department.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>Marine Eco-Label Japan (MEL) is in alignment because the scheme owner, the MEL Council, is a legal entity registered as a general incorporated association in Japan. The MEL Council was incorporated on December 2, 2016, under the Act on General Incorporated Associations and General Incorporated Foundations (Act Number 48 of June 2, 2006).</p> <p>Reference: M-1 Statues, and M-2 OMR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference • <u>M-1 Statues, and M-2 OMR</u>

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.02 Impartiality	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner is not directly engaged in the operational affairs (auditing or certification) of the certification or accreditation program.	<p>Scheme Owner is not directly engaged in auditing, certification or accreditation activities in order to ensure freedom of commercial or financial pressure of assurance processes and decision making.</p> <p>This does not include complaint resolution or performance reviews.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impartiality policy, impartiality clauses in certification body and accreditation body contracts, management control procedures
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the scheme owner MEL Council is not directly engaged in the operational affairs of certification or accreditation process which is stipulated in the OMR, Sec.6.</p> <p>The assessments for MEL Certification Scheme are conducted by a third-party CB accredited in ISO/IEC 17065 by AB, a member of IAF (International Accreditation Board).</p> <p>Rules on Segregation of Duties (hereafter, R-SD), Art. 9 stipulates that those who are engaged in respective duties of MEL Council shall not have any conflict of interest with AB and CB that are involved in the MEL Certification Scheme.</p> <p>Reference: M-2 OMR and M-11 R-SD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference • <u>M-2 OMR and M-11 R-SD</u>

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.03 Operating Procedures

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The Scheme Owner operates to a documented set of governance policies and procedures specifying at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Board or governance body election or appointment process, - Process to facilitate participation of stakeholders - Board or governance body representation and Terms of Reference, - Member categories (where applicable), - Income generation or funding processes, - An organizational structure, - The decision making processes of each governance body, - Key personnel roles (responsibility and authority), - Managing conflict of interest, and - quality assurance program. 	<p>The Scheme Owner has policies/procedures available covering all aspects in this Essential Component except Member categories if not applicable.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - statutes and by-laws, organizational chart, internal procedures, job descriptions, conflict of interest statements, quality assurance procedures or manual. - online process document for submission of input, governance body selection process and stakeholder composition, review of previous stakeholder inputs and verify if/how this reached top governance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference • <u>M-1 Statues, M-2 OMR, M-9 ABP, M-10 Organization Chart, M-11 R-SD, M-12 R-AC, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS</u>
<h3>Conclusion</h3>		
<p>'MEL is in alignment because the policies and procedures for operating the MEL certification scheme are stipulated in the Statutes, OMR, and other related documents. The details are in as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board or governance body election or appointment process stipulated in Statutes Chp.5, Art.20, • Process to facilitate participation of stakeholders stipulated in OMR, Cl. 5, and Advisory Board Setting Procedure (hereafter, ABP), • Board or governance body representation and Terms of Reference stipulated in Statutes, Chp.5, Art.20 and 21 and Chp.6 Board of Directors, and OMR 2.2.2 Board of Directors, • Member categories stipulated in Statutes, Chap.3. Membership, Art.5, • Income generation or funding processes stipulated in Accounting Regulations (R-AC), 		

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.03 Operating Procedures

- An organizational structure is described in Organization Chart,
- The decision making processes of each governance body stipulated in Statutes, Art.17 Resolution for General Membership Meeting, and Art.22 Resolution for Board of Directors
- Key personnel roles (responsibility and authority) described in R-SD,
- Managing conflict of interest described in R-SD and Board and Staff Declarations, and
- Quality assurance program stipulated in OMR, and Requirements for Certification Bodies FMS V2.1, AMS V2.0, COC V2.1 (hereafter, RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC).

and S-11 RCB-COC

Reference: M-1 Statues, M-2 OMR, M-9 ABP, M-10 Organization Chart, M-11 R-SD, M-12 R-AC, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS and S-11 RCB-COC

A.1.04 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner makes information freely available about the scheme's ownership, governance structure, the composition, operating procedures and responsibilities of its governance bodies, standard-setting procedures and standards.</p>	<p>All applicable listed governance documents are easily accessible online, free or at cost of any printing and handling costs.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - applicable documents posted on website, easy to find and free to download.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because all the relevant scheme documents are easily accessible in Japanese, also translated into English as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme's governance structure, described in Statues and OMR, • Scheme ownership and standard-setting procedures, described in OMR, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference 1 • <u>M-1 Statues, M-2 OMR</u> • Reference 2 • <u>MEL Website in English</u>

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.04 Transparency

• Composition, operating procedures and responsibilities of its governance bodies, described in Statues and OMR.

All documents are available and downloadable on MEL's website.

A.1.05 Scheme Scope

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner has a defined scope for certification under its standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner clearly defines the scope that the standard covers, for example which species, production systems/gear type, geographical locations, company structures (single units, groupings of sites/boats, smallholder groups/small-scale fisheries, subcontractors, product categories, certifiable units in the chain of custody etc.).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explicit scope definition in standards, certification methodology/requirements, objectives. - contracts with accreditation bodies, certification bodies and/or certified operations 	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because it defines the scope and unit for certification in each standard document. The pertinent documents are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishery Management Standard Ver.2.0 (FMS) • Aquaculture Management Standard Ver.2.0 (AMS) • Chain of Custody Management Standard Ver.2.0 (COCS) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-1 FMS Ver.2.0, S-5 AMS Ver.2.0, and S-9 COCS Ver.2.0</u>

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.06 Scheme Objectives

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has defined objectives for its scheme that aim for responsible use of the resource and has publicly available performance indicators related to scheme objectives.</p>	<p>Objectives for the scheme are defined and documented. The defined objectives cover all environmental resources covered in the standards; this would normally be for example fish populations, habitats and ecosystems, water, possibly energy, endangered species and biodiversity within the impact zone. Indirect use of resources for e.g. feed production may also be addressed. For each objective and associated resources, performance indicators are defined, documented and publicly available.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - standard document with objectives and thresholds.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the objectives for the scheme and the performance (evaluation) indicators are defined in the standards documents.</p> <p>The objectives are described in Statues, Art.3, FMS and AMS Introduction (preface). Performance indicators are also defined in Assessment Sheet FMS (hereafter AS-FMS) and Assessment Sheet AMS (hereafter, AS-AMS).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u><i>M-1 Statues, S-1 FMS Ver.2.0, S-3 AS-FMS, S-5 AMS Ver.2.0 and S-7 AS-AMS</i></u>

A.1.07 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that all types of fishery/aquaculture operations within the scope of its scheme can apply for certification, regardless of their scale, size or</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner application process ensures equal access within the defined standard scope whether directly, sub-contractors or outsourcing (i.e. to certification body).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.07 Non-Discrimination

management arrangements, and has not set an upper limit on the number of operations that can be certified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application process selection criteria do not discriminate on factors such as size, scale, management, minimum number of operators. - review declined applications are due to other non-discriminatory issues (i.e. incomplete, out of scope)
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC stipulate in Cl. 2.4, Non-Discrimination.</p> <p>It described that all the requirements provided in Section 4.4 of ISO/IEC 17065 and in Paragraph 112 of the FAO Guidelines for the Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine Capture Fisheries shall be applicable (FMS and COC), and in Paragraph 133, 134 of the FAO Technical Guidelines on Aquaculture Certification shall be applicable (AMS).</p> <p>This ensures that all types of fishery/aquaculture operations within the scope can apply for certification, regardless of their scale, size or management arrangements, and has not set an upper limit on the number of operations that can be certified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS and S-11 RCB-COC</u>

A.1.07.01 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner has procedures for taking into account the special circumstances of data deficient and/ or small-scale fishery/ aquaculture operations.	<p>The Scheme Owner processes and policies reduce barriers or promote access of small scale enterprises. This may include specific small scale standards or exemptions that do not lower the requirements of the standards themselves.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - separate specific standard for small scale enterprises or programs such as capacity building and access to finance targeted to small scale enterprises. Policies may include sliding scale fees or simplified reporting templates.

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.07.01 Non-Discrimination

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because, following FAO Guidelines, the Introduction of FMS described as follows:

FMS can be applied to the small-scale fisheries. Management systems differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries. Since the data of small-scale fisheries are limited, the historical record of good management practices could be considered as supporting evidence of the adequacy of the management measures and systems. However, if the scientific evidence about the impacts of fishery operation on the stock is uncertain, fishers shall take precautionary approaches to prevent adverse effects on sustainable fishery operations.

In addition, R-LOGO Art.3 describes the structure of logo license fee. The fee is set three layers being varied by the size of total vessels for FMS, the number of employees or total annual turnover for AMS and COCS. This system gives financial benefit and motivation for the small-scale fisheries or aquaculture farmers who could maintain the certification and continuing suitable initiatives.

References

- Reference
 - *S-1 FMS, and M-4 R-LOGO*

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.08 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner does not have mandatory requirements that require a fishery / aquaculture operation to be certified in order to access any markets.	Application selection process and certification methodology/ requirements do not include mandatory requirements for access to markets. Absence of such requirements indicates alignment.
Conclusion	References
MEL is in alignment because no mandatory requirements for access to markets are included in FMS, AMS and COCS. MEL Japan has never interfered with a market entry for certified entities.	n/a

A.1.09 Internal Review

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner undertakes a fully documented annual management review of scheme performance, including its assurance program, and the performance of certification and accreditation bodies. The results of the review are used to revise its operating procedures and practices, where necessary.	System exists for an annual documented management review that covers scheme performance, assurance program, accreditation bodies and certification bodies as applicable. A documented system to use the results of the review to revise operating procedures and systems is available.
Conclusion	References

A . 1 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.1.09 Internal Review

MEL is in alignment because it is stipulated in the OMR 6.4. Management Review that require the MEL Council undergo an annual management review including of its assurance program to allow for verification of Certification Scheme performance, as well as the performance of AB and CB. The documents of the review be reported to the Board of Directors to be used in revising operating procedures and practices as appropriate.

Detail Rules of Operational Management Regulations (hereafter, D-OMR), 3.1 also defines Contents of Management Review.

MEL Council conducted a management review through several meeting and related events such as BOD, General Member Meeting, SSC Meeting, Workshop, Tripartite Meeting, etc., all of which were recorded in minutes or notes. "MEL Management Review Report 2021 Revised (O-2-R)" was newly prepared to summarize all these matters.

- *M-2 OMR, M-3 D-OMR, and O-2-R MEL Management Review Report 2021 Revised*

A.2 SCHEME GOVERNANCE

A.2.01 Logo Use and Claims		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner has a publicly available policy governing use of symbols, logos and claims.</p> <p>This policy includes the provision of written authorizations or licenses to use the scheme's mark/claim/logo only when the facility and products have been certified to the relevant standard.</p> <p>Any misleading use or statement by the certified entity regarding the status or scope of its certification, shall be prohibited.</p>	<p>Scheme Owner has a policy that covers use of symbols, logos and claims if applicable to its system. The policy is public, easily accessible and available in languages appropriate to geographic scope.</p> <p>Contracts or formal agreements with the certified entity specify legal responsibility for the use of the scheme's mark/claim/logo only when the facility and/or product are certified.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - publicly available Logo Use and Claim statement which is explicitly referenced in formal arrangement with certified entity. - other examples include: direct logo agreements, licensing or membership agreements with the Scheme Owner or its commercial partner or indirect contracts/agreements through the certification body. - in the latter case the requirements to include this in contracts/ agreements should be outlined in certification requirements/ methodologies or similar contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because Regulations for Use and Management of Logo (hereafter, R-LOGO) stipulates the conditions and procedure in using the logo, which is available and downloadable on the MEL website.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-4 R-LOGO, S-4</u> <u>RCB-FMS, S-8</u>

A . 2 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.2.01 Logo Use and Claims

Misleading statement or use of logo is defined in RCB-FMS, Cl.5.3.4 and 5.16, RCB-AMS, Cl.5.3.4 and 5.16, RCB-COC, 5.3.8 and 5.16, and in REG-LG, Appendix 2, "Contract on the Use of Logo." In addition, requirement for CB in terms of the contract with the applicant are described in the texts of the documents mentioned above.

RCB-AMS and S-11 RCB-COC

A.2.02 Logo Use and Claims

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>Through the claims policy, the Scheme Owner ensures copyright is protected and that symbols, logos and claims are only applied to activities that are within the scope of certification, do not overstate or mislead users relative to the defined scope, and are relevant to that scope.</p>	<p>Claims policy (see A.2.01), contracts and MoUs ensure that logo use and claims are copyright protected and are restricted to activities within the scope of certification. This includes symbols, logos and claims on and off product, such as marketing materials, consumer brochures and the internet.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - legal registration of logos and seals with applicable agents. - claims policy covers clear scope for on and off product use, claims and statements including policy for misuse. - contractual relationships specify explicitly adherence to claims policy. - records of applications for use of claims, records of complaints or violations.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because its logo is copyright protected by the law, Registered Trademark No,5140153 in Japan, and claim policies are stipulated in R-LOGO, Sec.2 Condition of Use of Logo, and contract in Appendix 2 with the certified entity, which includes the regulation of use of logo and claim and resolution of breach of logo used.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>M-4 R-LOGO</i></u>

A . 2 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.2.03 Logo Use and Claims

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires certificates to include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the identification of the Scheme Owner; - identification of the accreditation body; - the name and address of the certification body; - the name and address of the certification holder; - the effective date of issue of the certificate; - scope of certification - the term for which the certification is valid; - signature of the issuing officer. 	<p>The issuer of the certificate ensures that minimum information enables identification and contact information of assurance process parties (accreditation body, Scheme Owner and certification body), unique name and address of certified entity, date and validity, scope and signature of issuing officer.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mandatory normative documents such as certification requirements/methodologies with certification bodies that cover all points listed. - mandatory certificate template includes all points listed. - review examples of certificates.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB- FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.5.8.1 define the information illustrated in this component to be included in the certificate, and also recommend CB to use the sample of Certificate attached as Appendix D of RCB-FMS and AMS, and Appendix E of RCB-COC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, and C-6 Actual Certificates (in Japanese)</i></u>

A . 2 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.2.04 Logo Use and Claims

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>Where a seafood ingredient can be certified, the Scheme Owner requires that at least 95% of the total seafood ingredient within a product is of certified origin in order for the scheme's logo or certification mark to be used.</p> <p>Where there is less than 95%, the scheme requires that the percentage must be stated and the logo or certification mark cannot be used.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner specifies minimum percentages for use of logo and claims in mixed products. This states that at least 95% of the total seafood ingredient that can be certified, for unqualified claims and for lower percentages, a qualifying statement of the percentage must be used in conjunction with the logo or claim.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - normative documents such as scope definition, certification requirements/ methodologies or other agreements between the Scheme Owner and certification body that define these percentage claims. - logo use and claims policy which is explicitly referenced in formal contracts and agreements with certification bodies and/or certified entities. - review examples of issued certificates where these are public or product information in online databases of certified products where these are available. - if the Scheme Owner does not allow mixed product, then this Essential Component is aligned.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the Appendix I of R-LOGO stipulates the detailed rules on mixing the certified products and the non-certified ingredients.</p> <p>It specifies 95% as the minimum percentages for the use of logo in Art.2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Regulations for Mixture of Certified and Uncertified Marine Product (Different Fish Species) <p>In case that the certified and uncertified marine product of different fish species are mixed, the logo user shall use at least 95% of the total seafood ingredient within the products. Where there is less than 95%, the logo user must state the name and percentage of certified product in the mixed product.</p> <p>Reference: M-4 R-LOGO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-4 R-LOGO</u>

A.3 SCHEME GOVERNANCE

A.3.01 Standard Setting Body		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner shall have a process and governance structure in place for standard setting, reviewing, revising, assessing, verifying and approving.</p> <p>The process shall be carried out with the participation of technically competent persons (e.g. independent experts, and open to suitably qualified representatives of all key stakeholders).</p> <p>The information about the process and organization for standard development and revision shall be made publicly available.</p> <p>It is the Scheme Owners responsibility to ensure a balanced participation by stakeholders.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner clearly identifies the responsible person for assigning the management of the standard setting process.</p> <p>In addition, the procedure, organizational chart or related TORs/contracts with external bodies identifies where each of the tasks (setting, reviewing, revising, assessing, verifying and approving standards) are assigned to. This documentation clearly indicates where the overall responsibility for the standard setting process lies.</p> <p>Procedures defining the process of standard development and revision are easily available for the public, such as online, in appropriate languages.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the MEL scheme documents clearly cover the procedure for standard setting and responsibility of the Standard Setting Committee with the tasks of setting, reviewing, revising, assessing and verifying standards, with the final draft approved by the General Membership. These are described in OMR, Cl.3.1.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 OMR, M-8 G-SSC, M-10</u>

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.01 Standard Setting Body

Guidelines for Establishment of Standard Setting Committee (hereafter, G-SSC) defines SSC structure and procedure, Organization Chart shows the role of SSC in the scheme, and the list of SSC also shows diverse profile of SSC members.

Organization Chart, and L-2 L-SSC

Reference: M-1 OMR, M-8 G-SSC, M-10 Organization Chart, and L-2 L-SSC

A.3.02 Standard Setting Body

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner identifies a central point of contact for standards-related enquiries and for submission of comments. The Scheme Owner makes contact information for this contact point readily available on its website.</p>	<p>Contact details for standard related enquiries and comments are easily available for the public, including online. This can be the same as a general contact point, but should explicitly identify standard related scope.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review website and verify that point of contact responds to enquiries. - review past enquiries and submitted comments
Conclusion	References

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.02 Standard Setting Body

MEL is in alignment because the central point of contact for standard related enquiries is stated in the OMR Sec.5 and easily accessible on the MEL Japanese and English website.

Regulations of Objection, Complaints and Appeal (hereafter, R-OCA) covers the enquiries related to the standard setting or revision, which is available and downloadable on the MEL website, too.

- [M-2 OMR and M-5 R-OCA](#)
- [MEL Website "Contact us" in English](#)

A.3.03 Decision Making Process

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner strives for consensus decisions on the content of the standard. Where consensus cannot be achieved, the Scheme Owner defines criteria in advance to determine when alternative decision-making procedures should come into effect and what the decision-making thresholds will be.</p>	<p>A mechanism is in place to assure a consensus decision is found where possible. In addition, the mechanism describes how decisions shall be made when a consensus is not possible. The mechanism assures that stakeholders are informed about this mechanism.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedures and/or quality handbook for standard setting and maintenance outlines decision making. - meeting minutes/email correspondence. <p>Standard setting archives and draft standards and meeting minutes could verify that this mechanism was implemented during previous decision-making.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR, Cl.3.1 defines the procedure and resolution method of standard setting and revision.</p> <p>Since the standard related decision should be made by General Membership Meeting, which the resolution is stated in Statues, Art.17.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 Statues, M-2 OMR, and O-4 Documents</u>

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.03 Decision Making Process

As an example, the 8th Extraordinary Membership Meeting was held for the resolution of Effectuation of AMS Ver.2.0. The meeting was conducted based on not actual attendance, but in writing. In accordance with provision of Act on General Incorporated Association "Omission of Resolutions of General Assembly Meeting," consents from all members were necessary. then, on July 29, 2022, a consent letter from all members were successfully received, and the proposal of effectuation of AMS Ver.2.0 was resolved.

8th
Extraordinary
Member
Meeting

A.3.03.03 Decision Making Process

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>Where the Scheme Owner limits decision-making to members, it ensures that membership criteria and application procedures are transparent and non-discriminatory.</p>	<p>For membership organization where decision making is limited to members, the application process and selection criteria are easily available and ensure balanced participation of stakeholders. These criteria could be "Not Applicable" if the Scheme Owner is not a member based organization.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - application procedure, forms, completed applications and any reasons for declining.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because Statues, Chp.3 Membership, specifies the requirement for the members, and Membership Regulations (hereafter, R-MEM) describes the qualification, too. Both documents as well as the member list (L-MEM) are publicly available on the MEL website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 Statues, M-6 M-MEM, and L-4 L-MEM</u> 	

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.04 Complaints

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has a transparent process to assess and handle complaints based on a publicly available procedure for resolving complaints related to governance, scheme management, executive functions and standard setting.</p> <p>Decisions taken on complaints are disclosed at least to the affected parties.</p>	<p>Complaints procedure is documented and clearly outlines steps, timelines and responsibilities to address and resolve complaints.</p> <p>The process for submitting a complaint – how and to whom – is public and easily understood. A process is in place to identify when and if the complaint is addressed and resolved.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - easily found complaint process and submission form online. - documentation of existing complaints and their resolution. - possibly request accreditation and certification bodies for previous submissions of complaints and resolution. - request and cross check with any complaints from stakeholders.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR, Sec.5 stipulates the contact, Art.3.1 describes Public Consultation for standard setting and revision. In addition, R-OCA is publicly available on the MEL website which covers the standard setting related complaints, which the Appendix 1 specifically addresses complaint procedure of standard development.</p> <p>As an example, MEL conducted the public consultation for the revision of AMS from April 14 through June 12. The comments from stakeholders, including small complainant or objections, and responses were published on the MEL website on July 4 and 6, 2022 (in Japanese and English).</p> <p>With regard to the complaints and objections not related to the standard setting matter, MEL Japan has never received through the official procedure (R-OCA) since the last complaints received in December, 2020.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 OMR, M-5 R-OCA, and AR-5 Comments Response Draft Revised AMS Ver.2.0</u> • <u>MEL Website "News Information"</u>

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.05 Standards Review and Revision

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner reviews standards at least every five years for continued relevance and for effectiveness in meeting their stated objectives and, if necessary, revises them in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a process in place for reviewing all standards to ensure continued relevance and meeting stated objectives. Relevance can include market uptake, stakeholder scope and support. Outcome and assessment reports can identify progress towards objectives. Review should be at least every five years after the publication of the current version.</p> <p>Example of evidence of alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure, quality handbook, public work program. - monitoring and evaluation system. - public comments and consideration of reports for standard revisions. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because the scheme requires a review of at least once every five years described in OMR, Cl.3.3, Review of Standards. It also stated in Introduction of FMS and AMS mentioned that the standard shall be reviewed more than once every five years from the officially initial issuance revise as necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>M-2 OMR, and O-10 Working Program Apr. - Sep. 2022</i></u> 	

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.06 Standards Review and Revision

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner allows for comments on the standard to be submitted by any interested party at any time and considers them during the subsequent standards revision process.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a permanent publicly available point of contact defined online for the submission of comments on the standard. This is not just during the development or revision process.</p> <p>A general point of contact online is acceptable for small schemes, as long as it explicitly states that all stakeholders can submit comments on the standard at any time. All comments on standards are considered in subsequent revision process.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - scheme’s website with form for submitting comments on standards. - internal procedure, quality handbook describing the receiving, filing and incorporation of submissions during the subsequent revision process. <p>Review ongoing submissions by interested parties on file.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR, Sec.5 stipulates the contact, Art.3.1 describes Public Consultation for standard setting and revision. In addition, R-OCA is publicly available on the MEL website which covers the standard setting related complaints, which the Appendix1 specifically addresses complaint procedure of standard development.</p> <p>As an example, MEL conducted the public consultation for the revision of AMS from April 14 through June 12. It published a notice of request for comments on April 11, notice of completion of public consultation on June 13 and 14, and summary of opinions and responses on July 4 and 7, 2022 on its website (in Japanese and English).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 OMR, M-5 R-OCA, AR-2, AR-3 and AR-4 Documents Explanatory Meeting No.1, No.2 and Feed Manufactures/Accreditation Body</u> 	

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.06 Standards Review and Revision

MEL also conducted explanatory meetings of revision of AMS for the stakeholders including the certified entities, CB, AB, auditors, research institutes, feed manufactures, etc., received the comments, responded to them properly, and shared the summaries of Q&A with the attendees.

A.3.07 Record Keeping

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner keeps on file for a period of at least one full standards revision the following records related to each standard development or revision process:

- policies and procedures guiding the standard setting activity;
- lists of stakeholders contacted;
- interested parties involved at each stage of the process;
- comments received and a synopsis of how those comments were taken into account; and
- all drafts and final versions of the standard.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to assure all records outlined remain on file for at least one full standards revision period.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- internal procedure, quality handbook describing records to be kept, document and retention policy.

Review the full range of records for the most previous standard development and revision process.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because OMR, CI.3.2 Document Retentions stipulates the record keeping related to standard setting or revision procedure. D-OMR, 2.5 Document Retention also specifies the documents containing the relevant records.

MEL developed the revision of AMS (from Ver.1.0 to Ver.2.0) and the designated procedures were in place. MEL held the SSC meetings, BOD, explanatory meetings for various stakeholders, public consultation, etc. All

References

- *M-2 OMR, M-3 D-OMR, O-7 and O-8 Minutes 10th and 11th AMS SSC Meeting, and AR-1 Summary AMS Revision Development Process*

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.07 Record Keeping

documents including the overview (schedule and procedures), original and revised drafts of standard and related documents, lists of attendees of each session, opinions and responses, etc. were kept in writing record or database in an appropriate manner.

In response to IE's request, the documents, minutes and notes related to standard development for AMS Ver.1.0 were prepared and can be seen in Reference 2 below. This process was conducted from 2017 through 2019.

- [AR-8 Summary AMS Ver.1.0 Development Process, AR-9 Development Aquaculture Standard SSC, AR-10 Announcement Public Consultation AMS Ver.1.0, AR-11 Comments Responses MEL AMS Ver.1.0, AR-12 Notice Effectuation AMS Ver.1.0, O-12, O-13, O-14 O-15 Minutes AMS SSC Meeting 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, respectively and O-16 Summary AMS Feasibility Study Azuma-Cho](#)

A.3.07.01 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The Scheme Owner makes records in A.3.07 available to interested parties upon request.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism to ensure records described in A.3.07 are provided to stakeholders on request for the last revision process.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - policy/procedure describing system and process to provide information, - online form for request, past actual requests and action taken, - possibly request records through online contact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 OMR, and M-3 D-OMR</u>
Conclusion	<p>MEL is in alignment because Regulation of Information Disclosure (hereafter, R-ID) 2.14 specifies that, as the examples of the documents subject to disclosure,</p>	

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.07.01 Record Keeping

documents, a list of involved persons and other important documents prepared upon developing the standards are listed. OMR Cl.3.2 and D-OMR Cl.2.5 also mention document retention and list the specified record.

As with A.3.07 above, all documents, minutes and notes related to standard development for AMS Ver.1.0 (new) and AMS Ver.2.0 (revision) were stored and available to disclose if necessary.

The documents related to AMS Ver.1.0 can be seen in Reference 'AR-9 Development Aquaculture SSC'.

- [AR-8 Summary AMS Ver.1.0 Development Process, AR-9 Development Aquaculture SSC, AR-10 Announcement Public Consultation AMS Ver.1.0, AR-11 Comments Responses MEL AMS Ver.1.0, AR-12 Notice Effectuation AMS Ver.1.0, O-12, O-13, O-14 O-15 Minutes AMS SSC Meeting 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, respectively and O-16 Summary AMS Feasibility Study Azuma-Cho](#)

A.3.08 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>At the outset of a standard development or revision process, the Scheme Owner makes publicly available a summary of the process that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contact information and information on how to contribute to the consultation; - summary of the terms of reference for the standard, including the proposed scope, objectives and justification of the need for the standard; - steps in the standard-setting process, including timelines and clearly identified opportunities for contributing; and - decision-making procedures, including how decisions are made and who makes them. 	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place assuring that a summary of the process is made easily available for the public online at the outset of the process. This includes Who and How to contribute, timeline, summary ToR and decision making (who and how).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook describing elements and process of public summary. - examples of availability of past or current information.

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.08 Participation and Consultation

Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the OMR CI.3.1 stipulates the procedure of setting standard include the case of standard revision. Its step 2 covers the announcement of standard setting, which is supported by D-OMR, 2.1, which mentions the publication of announcement standard development and revision.</p> <p>As an example, MEL experienced standard development process for the revision of AMS. As the first step, 10th SSC Meeting was held on March, 15, 2022 where the overview of AMS revision was explained: background, subjects to revised, main points of revision, schedule and decision processes, transition period and GSSI re-benchmarking procedure were explained. Then, various meetings and discussions were taken place as mentioned above.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>M-2 OMR, M-3 D-OMR, O-7 Minute 10th AMS SSC Meeting</i></u>

A.3.09 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner or delegated authority ensures participation by independent technical experts and enables balanced participation by</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner, or delegated authority, has mechanism to ensure participation of necessary technical experts and balance of different stakeholder perspectives in standard development and maintenance. A balanced participation of stakeholders would include: fisheries/aquaculture management authorities, the fishing/aquaculture industry, fish workers organizations, fishing/aquaculture communities, the scientific community, environmental interest groups, fish processors/traders/retailers, aquaculture input providers such as feed providers, hatcheries/nurseries and possibly treatment providers, as well as consumer associations.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook for standard development

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.09 Participation and Consultation

<p>stakeholders in the standard development, revision and approval process.</p>	<p>- revision and approval processes that describe how balance is achieved, such as through stakeholder mapping, announcements and invitation.</p> <p>Draft documents and meeting minutes/email correspondence indicate that during standard development, revision and approval processes of the past, independent technical experts participated, and a balanced participation by stakeholders was encouraged.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>References</p>
<p>MEL is in alignment because MEL Council has a mechanism to establish the SSC composed with the balanced stakeholder participation as stipulated in the OMR 3.1. G-SSC Art.4, and 6.1 stipulate the composition of SSC and outside expert' attendance to SSC. The Statues of MEL specifies establishment of committee including specialized or expert committee. List of SSC shows the diverse composition of SSC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 Statues, M-2 OMR, M-8 G-SSC, and L-2 L-SSC</u>

A.3.10 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner allows a period of at least 60 days for the submission of comments on the draft standard.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism is in place to assure a minimum of 60 days for comments on major changes of the draft standard.</p> <p>A Standard is considered to be a set of documents that provide rules and guidelines to achieve results and that include all normative documents used for the certification process. The Scheme owner shall define which documents are part of the standard.</p> <p>This may include standard governance and setting procedures, requirements for certification bodies and certified entities</p>

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.10 Participation and Consultation

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- internal procedure/quality handbook defining public comment period, what are considered major changes and what constitutes the standard

- ToR

Review previous comments and dates for submission on draft standards.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the OMR 3.1 specifies the 60 days comment period (step 4).

MEL conducted the 60 days public consultation for the revision of AMS from April 14 through June 12. It published a notice of request for comments on April 11 and presented a draft of standard and guidelines on its website.

As for the definition of the standard, the status of standard is one of the most critical matters in MEL Council same as the Statues. If they are to be revised, a proposal should be subject to the public consultation, approval from Board of Director, and then resolution by the General Membership Meeting that is the top policy making group. On the other hands, standard-related documents such as Guidelines for Audits (GL-FMS, GL-AMS) or Assessment Sheet (AS-FMS, FS-AMS, FS-COC), Requirement for CB (RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS, RCB-COC) are the "supplementary documents," which means that each of them individually is not necessary to obtain the approval from the members including the public consultation process. instead, if each of them is revised, the resolution by the board of director is necessary. Thus, such supplementary documents are a part of standard, but unless the standard, as the core of certification program, is to be revised, the supplementary are not necessary to be the subject of public consultation. Internal document called Classification of Resolution Matters specifies in detail.

References

- [*M-2 OMR, and IR-4 Matters Related Standard Regulations Internal Document,*](#)
- [*MEL Website "Notice of Request for Public Comments on AMS Revision"*](#)

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.11 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>No later than the start of the comment period, the Scheme Owner publishes a notice announcing the period for commenting in a national or, as may be, regional or international publication of standardization activities and/or on the internet.</p>	<p>Timely announcements are made regarding the public comment period in appropriate channels so that they are easily available to relevant stakeholders. This can be online and/or in an appropriate publications. Dates should be clearly stated.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure defining process. - previous announcements are dated and were published before the beginning of the comment period. - newsletters - record of publication on SO's website 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because the OMR 3.1 specifies the publication of announcement on the website (step 4).</p> <p>MEL conducted the public consultation for the revision of AMS from April 14 through June 12, and published a notice of request for comments on April 11 on its website (in Japanese and English).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>M1- OMR</i></u> • <u><i>MEL Website "Notice of Request for Opinions of Public Consultation"</i></u> 	

A.3.12 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner identifies all impacted stakeholders and ensures proactively that all can participate in the standard-</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism is in place to identify all impacted stakeholders. It makes sure that, when needed, alternative tools are in place to leverage potential barriers to participate.</p>

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.12 Participation and Consultation

setting process through a consultation forum or are made aware of alternative mechanisms by which they can participate.

This includes stakeholders that are not well represented in consultations and disadvantaged stakeholders (small-scale operations and vulnerable groups).

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- Stakeholder mapping including past participation
- internal procedure/quality handbook defining public consultation process.
- ToR. Review participation, communication and mechanisms/tools of past or current consultation.
- meeting minutes, announcements, publications and or email communication indicate that the Scheme Owner is proactively seeking the input of specific stakeholder groups.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because, at the beginning of standard setting process, MEL makes the summary publicly available in order for interested parties to be able to participate in the public consultation through the website, which is described in the OMR 3.1 (step 2 and 3).

In the process of MEL AMS development (revision) process, Beside the public consultation, MEL held explanatory meetings for the stakeholders including the certified entities, CB, AB, auditors, research institutes, local governments, NGO, etc. MEL also held another meeting with Fisheries Agency, fish meal suppliers, major retailers to explain the details of AMS revision and received their opinions.

References

- [M-2 OMR, AR-1 Summary AMS Revision Development Process, and AR-4 Minutes Explanatory Meeting Feed Manufacturers Accreditation Body](#)

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.13 Participation and Consultation		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner makes publicly available all comments received in the consultation respecting personal data protection.	<p>All comments received during the public comment period are made publicly available without attribution or identifier.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook describing policy, current or past public comment comments posted online. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR 3.1 requires that the comments received during the period of public consultation be disclosed on the MEL website (step 5).</p> <p>As for an example, MEL conducted the public consultation for the revision of AMS from April 14 through June 12, and published the summary of opinions and responses on July 4 and 7, 2022 on its website (in Japanese and English).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>M-2 OMR, and AR-5 Comments Responses Daft Revised MEL AMS Ver.2.0</i></u> 	

A.3.14 Participation and Consultation	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner takes into account in further processing of the standard, comments received during the period for commenting.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a process for considering all comments received during the public consultation on the standard. Comments which are integrated into the standard should be clearly identified.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - some sort of system (e.g. excel) for organizing, categorizing and responding to comments.

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.14 Participation and Consultation

- review past consultation system, comments and response taken.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because OMR 3.1 requires taking note of the public comments during the period of public consultation (step 5).

As an example, MEL conducted the public consultation for the revision of AMS from April 14 through June 12, and published the summary of opinions and responses on July 4 and 7, 2022 on its website (in Japanese and English), and send a written reply to opinion sons individually. Some of the opinions have been reflected in the texts of GL-AMS.

References

- [M-2 OMR, and AR-5 Comments Responses Draft Revised MEL AMS Ver.2.0](#)

A.3.15 Standards Content

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner ensures that the standard is consistent with the following requirements:

- only includes language that is clear, specific, objective and verifiable;
- is expressed in terms of process, management and / or performance criteria, rather than design or descriptive characteristics; (ISO 59)
- does not favor a particular technology, patented item or service provider; and (ISO 59)
- attributes or cites all original intellectual sources of content.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to review standards in respect to the listed requirements.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- internal procedure/quality handbook defining all list requirements. Some standards state these in their preamble as principles or references.
- review that this list was checked for the current standards
- review standards and if available mandatory checklists/audit manuals in respect to the listed requirements.

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.15 Standards Content

- review any available complaints relating to this requirement.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the OMR 3.1 describes the compliance with international standard ISO/IEC 59 and clarity of languages, and, as a supplement, D-OMR 2.3 Contents of Standards specifies the requirements illustrated in this component.

References

- *M-2 OMR, and M-3 D-OMR*

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.16 Standards Content	
GSSI Component	Guidance
As part of the standard development process, the Scheme Owner assesses the feasibility and auditability of requirements in the draft standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to test the feasibility (cost, time) and auditability (interpretation, consistency) of requirements prior to finalization of the standards.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure, quality handbook, standard setting work plan. - review assessment outcomes of past processes including revisions based on findings.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the OMR 3.1 requires the verification of feasibility for the standard to be developed or revised (step 6).</p> <p>In the AMS development process, after the explanatory meetings for various stakeholders, public consultation and specific sessions for auditors who were supposed to conduct on-site audit based on AMS Ver.2.0 system, 11th AMS Standard Setting Committee was held and confirmed there was no problem of feasibility and auditability.</p> <p>In response to IE's request, the document of "Supplementary Explanation Feasibility Auditability" was newly prepared and minutes of 11th AMS SSC Meeting was rewritten.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 OMR, M3-D-OMR, AR-7 SE Feasibility Auditability MEL AMS Veer.2.0, and O-8-R Minutes 11th AMS SSC Meeting Revised</u>

A.3.17 Standards Content	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner demonstrates that all criteria in the standard contribute to the standard's defined objectives.	Criteria are related to how the Scheme Owner's objectives are met by identifying the acceptable performance. Often they are logically grouped around principles and objectives.

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.17 Standards Content	
	<p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comparison of the Scheme Owner performance indicators with the standard's criteria. - monitoring and evaluation system of the performance indicators. - criteria that are not monitored and not evaluated may be surplus to the objective of the standards.
Conclusion	References
MEL is in alignment because the standard documents include de facto the defined objectives as outlined in the Introduction of the FMS and AMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-1 FMS, S-5 AMS and S-9 COCS</u>

A.3.18 Standards Content	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that the standard is locally applicable. Where the Scheme Owner adapts the standard for direct application at the national or regional level, the Scheme Owner develops interpretive guidance or related policies and procedures for how to take into account local environmental and regulatory conditions.	<p>The Scheme Owner has mechanisms in place to ensure local applicability and relevance. For national or regional standards, the Scheme Owner has a process to take into account local environmental and regulatory conditions through guidance and policies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - policies, internal procedures and quality handbook documenting process to consider environmental and regulatory aspects. - compare geographical scope of standard and implementation (certificates) with available documented interpretation guidance. - assessment or monitoring reporting indicating where locally specific guidance is required.

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.18 Standards Content

Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the standard scope is limited to Japan only and the standards take into consideration national and local government fisheries policies and applications.</p> <p>For instance, the Introduction of FMS describes the following texts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The science-based stock assessment has been conducted by joint collaboration among national and local research institutes, · The national and local governments prepare the Policies of Stock Management, and fishers develop and implement the Plan of Stock Management based on the policies since 2011, · Coastal Fisheries Grounds Enhancement and Development Program Act requires that the national and local governments must promote fish farming by improving and optimizing the management of the surrounding environment, and · MEL aims to evaluate the fishers who positively conduct the sustainable utilization of fish stocks and the preservation of ecosystems. MEL is operated based on the relevant policies, laws and regulations in conformity with the natural, social and historical background of Japanese fisheries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-1 FMS</u>

A.3.19 Standards Accessibility

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner promptly publishes adopted standards, and makes them available for free on its website, and on request, to anyone expressing interest.</p>	<p>Standards are published in a timely fashion and are freely available online and on request. Validity dates coincide with publication dates of standards (taking transition periods into account) and the public work program on standard setting and maintenance.</p>
Conclusion	References

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.19 Standards Accessibility

MEL is in alignment because the OMR 3.1 requires that the approved standard be published without delay on the MEL website.

MEL Standards (FMS, AMS, and COCS) and related documents such as GL-FMS, GL-AMS, RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS, RCB-COC, AS-FMS, AS-FMS, and AS-COC are easily available and downloadable on MEL website.

- [M2 OMR, S-1 FMS, S-5 AMS, S-9-COCS, and O-10 Working Program Apr.-Sep. 2022](#)

A.3.20 Standards Accessibility

GSSI Component	Guidance	Conclusion	References
<p>The Scheme Owner shall makes translations of the standard into English and in the most relevant/appropriate languages, to ensure access and transparency, freely available and authorizes translations into other languages where necessary for credible implementation of the standard.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to identify the applicability and need for translations based on geographical scope of certification, as well as the geographical range of certified entities and products. The process includes an assessment in order to ensure accurate translation.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure, quality handbook, current language availability, work plan of translations, process for ensuring accuracy of translations. 	<p>MEL is in alignment because it currently publish Standards and related documents in Japanese, and English, too, despite that there is no stipulation that English translation is needed so far.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MEL Website in English</u>

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.21 Transition Period

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The Scheme Owner ensures that certified entities are informed of the revised standard and transition period, either directly or through their certification bodies.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place assuring that certified entities are informed of standard revision and transition periods. This can be done directly or through other assurance bodies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedures, quality handbook, contracts/agreements or formal arrangements with certification bodies. - review process of previous revisions if applicable. 	
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>MEL is in alignment because OMR 3.1 stipulated the announcement of approved standard (step 7). RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC require that CB inform the certified entities of the details of changes of standard including transition period.</p> <p>MEL published a notice of effectuation of revised MEL AMS Ver.2.0 on August 1. 2022 on its website, and sent a notice letter containing the final standard and related documents, new assessment procedure, transition period to the certified entities on the same date.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 OMR, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, and AR-6 Notice Effectuation MEL AMS Ver.2.0</u> • <u>MEL Website</u>

A.3.22 Transition Period

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that the certified entities are given a period of at least three years to come into compliance with revised fishery standards and at least one year for revised aquaculture standards	<p>Certified entities are given sufficient time to come into compliance with revised standards, for fisheries – minimum three years and at least one year for revised aquaculture standards.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - standards, certification requirements/methodologies which state

A . 3 S C H E M E G O V E R N A N C E

A.3.22 Transition Period

A.3.22 Transition Period	
	minimum transition period for revised standards
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR 3.4 Transition Period requires that the transition period be three years in principle for FMS, AMS and COCS.</p> <p>MEL published a notice of effectuation of revised MEL AMS Ver.2.0 on August 1, 2022 on its website, and sent a notice letter to the certified entities directly, both of which specified the transition period of three years from Ver.1.0 to Ver.2.0.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 OMR, and AR-6 Notice Effectuation MEL AMS Ver.2.0</u> • <u>MEL Website.</u>

A.3.23 Transition Period

A.3.23 Transition Period	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner notes in the standard the date of a revision or reaffirmation of the standard along with a transition period after which the revised standard will come into effect.	Standards include date of version and any transition period for the certified entity to come into compliance. If there are normative documents other than the standard and certification requirements/ methodologies which affect compliance of fisheries/aquaculture, these similarly should contain the described validity dates.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR 3.4 Transition Period requires that the transition period be three years in principle for FMS, AMS and COCS. The enacted date, effective date are shown on the cover page of each Standard.</p> <p>MEL published a notice of effectuation of revised MEL AMS Ver.2.0 on August 1, 2022 on its website, and sent a notice letter to the certified entities directly, both of which specified the transition period of three years from Ver.1.0 to Ver.2.0.</p> <p>M2-OMR Section 3.3 states that each standard will be reviewed at least every 5 years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 OMR, S-1 FMS, F-5 AMS, F-9 COCS, AR-6 Notice Effectuation MEL AMS Ver.2.0</u> • <u>MEL Website</u>

**SECTION B.
OPERATIONAL
MANAGEMENT OF
SEAFOOD
CERTIFICATION
SCHEMES**



B.1 SCHEME MANAGEMENT

B.1.01 ISO-17011 compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has a contractual, enforceable arrangement or formal understanding that requires accreditation bodies to be compliant with the requirements of ISO/IEC 17011 in its applicable version.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable arrangement with a certification body or accreditation body that require the accreditation bodies to be compliant to ISO/ IEC 17011.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts, - memorandums of understanding and/or memorandum of agreements between scheme and accreditation bodies or certification bodies that specify accreditation bodies to be compliant with ISO/IEC 17011. - accreditation bodies' certificate of accreditation (on website). - rules for accreditation bodies in standard.
Conclusion	References

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.01 ISO-17011 compliance

MEL is in alignment as the Operational Management Regulations (hereafter, OMR) 6.2.1 requires that accreditation bodies (ABs) be limited to the organization that have signed a Multilateral Recognition Arrangement (MLA) with the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) and 6.2.2 requires that ABs comply with ISO/IEC 17011. Japan Accreditation Board (JAB) is recognized national accreditation body as the member of the IAF, which verifies that JAB must be compliant to ISO/ IEC 17011.

- [M-1 OMR, and C-3 Accreditation Body Contract JAB \(in Japanese\)](#)
- [JAB Website "Global Agreement"](#)

B.1.02 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that accreditation services are available to certifying bodies irrespective of their country of residence, size, and of the existing number of already accredited bodies, within the scope of the scheme.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that access to accreditation is open to qualified certification bodies without consideration of size, country or number of existing accredited certification bodies. This could be through contracts/agreements, in referenced policies or certification requirements/methodologies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application process/forms, - review list of accredited certification bodies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 OMR</u>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR 6.2.2 requires that ABs comply with ISO/IEC 17011 and make its accreditation services available to all CB unconditionally. ISO/IEC 17011 stipulates impartiality requirements described in Sec.4.4, which ABs must be compliant with that as the member of IAF.</p>		

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.03 Specified Requirements

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The Scheme Owner specifies the requirements for certification bodies that the accreditation body is required to verify, including the respect of the scope of the scheme</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines requirements for certification bodies to ensure accurate and consistent implementation. These are verified as part of the accreditation process by the accreditation body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requirements are specified in certification requirements/ methodologies or a separate certification body and/or accreditation manual. - reference to requirements in contracts or formal agreements with certification bodies or accreditation bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 OMR, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, and AB-2 JFRCA Accreditation Certificate</u>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<p>MEL is in alignment because OMR 6.3.2 specifies the requirement for CBs be limited to those that have already accredited by an AB that satisfies the requirement in 6.2, in conformity with ISO/IEC 17065, which is described throughout RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC.</p> <p>JFRCA holds an accreditation certificate that shows accreditation criteria as ISO/IEC 17065, and a scope of accreditation as MEL Fishery, Aquaculture and Chain of Custody Standards.</p>		

B.1.04 Transition Period

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>Subsequent to any changes in the requirements for assessing certification bodies, the Scheme</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner specifies transition periods for any changes to certification requirements (B.1.03) for certification bodies to come</p>

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.04 Transition Period

Owner ensures certification bodies are given a defined time period within which to conform to the changes.

Special considerations should be given to certification bodies in developing countries and countries in transition.

into compliance with changes. For certification bodies in developing countries consideration is given that may include a longer transition period, capacity building or other measures.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- see B.1.03 reference to transition period and/or special consideration for developing country certification bodies.

Conclusion

'MEL is in alignment because OMR 6.3.2 stipulates that subsequent to any changes in the RCBs for assessing CBs, the MEL Council ensures CBs are informed and given a defined time period within which to conform to the changes, considering the impact of change.

As the scheme is operating only in Japan, CBs in developing countries and countries in transition are not applicable.

References

- [M-2 OMR](#)

B.1.05 Competencies

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner only works with accreditation bodies that have personnel with the necessary education, training, technical knowledge and experience for performing

Guidance

The Scheme Owner ensures personnel competency through contracts or enforceable arrangements with accreditation bodies. Personnel competency includes education, training on the standard, technical knowledge and experience and can be defined by the Scheme Owner.

Examples of objective evidence:

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.05 Competencies

accreditation functions in fisheries and aquaculture operations.

- Agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065.
- Contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body if applicable, certification/accreditation manuals.
- Requirements for Accreditation Bodies and personnel mentioned in the standard

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because it requires that CBs have accreditation by the IAF members to ensure that the Scheme is in conformance with this requirement, which is stipulated in OMR, Cl.6.2.1.

JAB provided information about auditor's competence such as work history, technical background and education opportunities. MEL provides regularly a knowledge enhance program to the JAB technical staff. For instance, JAB auditors participated in MEL's explanatory meeting held on May 17, 2022 that covers AMS revision and lecture of aquaculture topics. A former technical auditor used to attend MEL auditor training courses in 2018 and 2019 as an observer.

References

- [M-2 OMR, AR-4 Minutes Explanatory Meeting AB, and AB-5 Summary AB Technical Knowledge](#)

B.1.06 External Review

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner ensures that external audits are carried out on the accreditation body to assess performance.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner ensures accreditation bodies undergo external/ independent performance assessments.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- assessment process and requirements of IAF, ISEAL or other membership organization.
- Scheme Owner accreditation manual or requirements, contracts or agreements, assessment reports.

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.06 External Review

Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because external and independent performance review is a standard component of IAF membership through the MLA. IAF members undergo peer review by other IAF members to ensure quality and consistency of approach across their whole membership. MEL requires AB to be the member of IAF, which is stipulated in OMR, Cl.6.2.1.</p> <p>According to JAB, the periodic assessment conducted by APAC (Asia Pacific Accreditation Cooperation) is taken place ocean every four years. The latest assessment had been conducted from May to November 2021. As a result, JBA's MRA was reapproved on August 21, 2022 and announced on the JAB website on August 22, 2022 (in Japanese). Besides, it was confirmed the previous APAC MRA certificate issued on May 10, 2020.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>JAB Website "Mutual Recognition Reapproval (in Japanese)"</u> • <u>M-2 OMR, AB-1 MRA Certificate</u>

B.1.07 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that the accreditation body is transparent about its organizational structure and the financial and other kinds of support it receives from public or private entities.</p>	<p>Scheme owner ensures accreditation body transparency regarding organizational structure and financial support. The Scheme Owner requires disclosure of this information directly from the accreditation body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation body website with information, certification/ accreditation manuals, contracts and/or agreements. - agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065; - annual or periodic reports.
Conclusion	References

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.07 Transparency

MEL is in alignment because OMR Cl.6.2.1 stipulates that MEL only works with ABs that sign MLA with IAF. JAB, MEL's current AB, complies with the this requirement that it issues annual reports, organization structure, both of which are available on JAB website. JAB Business Report was translated into English for Round 2 session.

- [JAB Website "JAB Organization Chart"](#)
- [AB-6 JAB Business Report 2021 Eng., AB-7 JAB Finance Statements 2021 Jpn.](#)

B.1.08 Office Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner ensures that the accreditation process includes an on-site audit of the certification body.	<p>The Scheme Owner specifies that accreditation includes an on-site audit of the certification body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies, accreditation body office audit reports, audit schedule. - specified in accreditation body or certification body contracts/ agreements. - agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because, as a member of IAF, JAB includes an office audit as a part of the accreditation approach for its accreditation process.</p> <p>Further, the contract between MEL and JAB, Art.7 stipulates that the AB shall conduct an accreditation of MEL's certification body in accordance with ISO/IEC 1701. It requires AB conduct an on-site assessment which includes an office audit and field audit.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>C-2 Accreditation Body Contract JAB (in Japanese), and AB-3 Notification Continued Accreditation</u>

B . 1 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.1.08 Office Audit

The 2nd surveillance assessment was conducted at JFRCA headquarters from July 7 to 9, 2021 and the notification for continued recognition of accreditation was issued on July 11, 2022. This took longer than the original plan due to COVID-19 outbreak which caused to postpone the witness audit.

[JFRCA \(in Japanese\)](#)

B.1.09 Field Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that the accreditation process includes a review of the performance of certification bodies and auditors, using witness audits.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner specifies that accreditation includes a performance review of certification bodies and auditors, that may include desktop reviews, office visits, witness audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies, accreditation body audit reports, audit schedule, specified in accreditation body or certification body contracts/agreements. - agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because, as a member of IAF, JAB includes an office audit as a part of the accreditation approach for its accreditation process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AB-8 JAB Witness Assessment Report Eng.</u>

B.1.09 Field Audit

Further, the contract between MEL and JAB, Art.7 stipulates that the AB shall conduct an accreditation of MEL's certification body in accordance with ISO/IEC 1701. It requires AB to conduct an on-site assessment which includes an office audit and field audit

As a part of second surveillance assessment, JAB's witness audit was conducted at Oita Mirai Suisan, a certified entity being engaged in Yellowtail Aquaculture, who took annual audit for MEL AMS Certification, and two JAB technical auditors participated in that on May 30, 2022. The witness assessment report was provided by JAB and translated into English as a reference.

B.2 SCHEME MANAGEMENT

B.2.01 ISO-17065 Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies operating in the scheme are accredited to conduct certifications for the scope of their respective standards in conformance with ISO/IEC 17065 in its applicable version.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable arrangement with certification body that require to follow the principles of ISO/ IEC 17065 for the scope of the respective standard of the scheme.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts, memorandums of understanding and/or memorandum of agreements between Scheme and accreditation bodies or certification bodies that specify certification bodies be accredited with ISO 17065 - accreditation manual or certification requirements/methodologies; certification bodies certificate of accreditation. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because the OMR 6.3.2 requires CBs be compliant with ISO 17065 and accredited by IAF-membered ABs.</p> <p>The contract between MEL and JFRCA describes that CB must be in compliance with ISO 17065, which also described throughout RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-1 OMR, and C-3 Certification Body Contract JFRCA (in Japanese)</u> 	

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.02 Fee structure		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to maintain a written fee structure that is available on request and is adequate to support accurate and truthful assessments commensurate with the scale, size and complexity of the fishery, fish farm or chain of custody. The fee structure is non-discriminatory and takes into account the special circumstances and requirements of developing countries and countries in transition.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement in the contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement with the accreditation body and/or certification body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation manual/certification requirements/methodologies. - possibly also review accreditation body audit reports that this requirement is verified, and for compliance of certification bodies on this requirement. - policy or procedure which outlines how fee structures of certification bodies could address special requirements of developing and in transition countries in a non-discriminatory manner; certification body fee structure and policy (online or request). 	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.5.2.1. require that the CB provide a certification fee system adequate for carrying out appropriate auditing for the FMS/AMS/COCS and make it accessible to users. Since there are various types of fisher/aquaculture operation/distributors and processors in Japan covered by the MEL certification scope, it is desirable for the CB to provide a fee system in accordance with the business size of the applicant.</p> <p>JFRCA's Regulations of Certification Assessment Fee specifies fee structure by standards, types of assessment, number of audit processes etc. MEL Council approved JFRCA's application of fee structure sending back to them a acceptance letter issued on February 2, 2018</p> <p>As the scheme is operating only in Japan, developing/ in transition countries are not applicable.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-2 RCB, CB-1 JFCRA Regulations Assessment Fee (in Japanese), and CB-2 MEL Letter Acceptance Assessment Fee (in Japanese)</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.03 Certification Cycle

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The Scheme Owner defines that the validity of a certification cycle does not exceed 5 years in the case of fishery or 3 years in the case of aquaculture certification and 3 years in the case of chain of custody certification.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement in the contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement with the accreditation body and/or certification body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - accreditation manual/certification requirements/methodologies. Issued certificates with validity (online database or on request)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS,</u> <u>S-8 RCB-AMS,</u> <u>S-11 RCB-COC,</u> <u>and L-5 L-CE</u>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.5.8.2 stipulated that certification remains valid for no longer five years for FSM and three years for AMS and COCS.</p> <p>MEL publishes the list of certified entities on its website, which shows the effective date and validity date, so does JFRCA which includes the due date of next annual audit.</p>		

B.2.04 Surveillance

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies carry out periodic surveillance and monitoring at sufficiently close intervals to verify that certified operations continue to comply with the certification requirements. For</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement in the contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement with accreditation body and/or certification body. Scheme owner risk assessment system should identify “sufficient close intervals”.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.04 Surveillance

aquaculture operations, this shall be on an annual basis.

- accreditation manual/certification requirements/methodologies.
- Scheme Owner internal risk assessment system with assessment reports.
- Audit reports, schedules and issued certificates.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the RCB-FMS and RCB-AMS Cl.5.10.1 require that the CB conduct an annual audit within eighteen months after the initial audit or the renewal audit, or within 12 months after the last annual audit.

RCB-COC Cl.5.10.1 requires that the CB decide the frequency of annual audits and conduct them in accordance with the CoC risk of the applicant. The Risk Evaluation Methods and Frequency of Annual Audit are stipulated in the Appendix C, which determines the interval between the last and next audits deepening on the scores.

References

- [S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, and S-11 RCB-COC](#)

B.2.05 Assessment Methodology

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies apply a consistent methodology to assess compliance with the standard.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner defines the methodology to assess compliance with the standard. An internal assessment (updated regularly) with clear outcomes, identifies if the methodology is consistent between certification bodies or if the methodology needs revising.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- certification requirements/methodologies,
- contracts and agreements with the certification body,
- guidance interpretation documents,

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.05 Assessment Methodology

- Scheme Owner internal assessment system with assessment reports,
- training and calibration records.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the methodologies to be used to assess compliance with the FMS/AMS are described in both Guidelines for Auditors (GL-FMS and GL-AMS) and Assessment Sheet for Auditors of Auditors (AS-FSM, AS-AMS and AS-COC) which are all freely available on MEL website.

OMR Cl.6.4 requires that an annual management review, including an assurance program, to allow for verification of certification scheme performance, as well as the performance of ABs and CBs.

Besides, MEL operates three audit support programs/tools: Peer Review System, Auditor Training Course and Essential of Audit Reporting. This integration helps enhance the consistency of auditor capability, report writing skills and less flexibility in judgments in interpreting the standards that IE had considered problematic during MOCA in 2021.

The Essentials, including samples of audit reports, illustrate the models with clear and specific examples based on the fact and scientific evidence, and with a reasonable logical story. The Audit Training Courses include audit simulation (case studies, group exercises) for practical learning and understanding the best practices from other audits and areas that are easy to mistake. The Peer Review System recruits external expertise to identify the inconsistencies for judgment and things to be corrected. In fact, there were some things that peer-reviewers pointed out as "hard-to-understand" for auditors which might lead to misunderstanding, picked up as the subjects in Training Course, and even entered into the texts of revised AMS Guidelines. Overall, these initiatives work very well and help enhance the quality of audit system.

Per IE's request for Desktop Review Round 2, additional references that contain auditor attendance record and peer reviewing system were added (see Reference 2 below)

References

- [M-2 OMR, S-2 GL-FMS, S-6 GL-AMS, M-14 TM, M-15 EAR, and IR-1 Introduction Peer Review System Internal Document](#)
- [O-17 Attendee List Auditor Training Program 202103-07 Eng., O-18 Photos Auditor Training Program, O-19 Certificate Auditor Training Program Eng., AA-3-PR Peer Review AMS Kurose Suisan Yellowtail, and AF-1-PR Peer Review FMS Wajima Purse Seine Fishery](#)

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.05 Assessment Methodology

Plus, since November 2020, MEL and CB have never official received any complaints or objections regarding the judgment of audits, it can be said that MEL's approaches to improve the quality of auditing have worked effectively.

B.2.06 Termination, Suspension, Withdrawal

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies have consistent documented procedure(s) that specify the conditions under which certification may be suspended or withdrawn, partially or in total, for all or part of the scope of certification.</p>	<p>For accurate and consistent implementation of the standard, the Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies have documented procedures that specify the conditions under which certification may be suspended or withdrawn, partially or in total, for all or part of the scope of certification.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body; accreditation manual, certification requirements/methodologies, - audit reports, - guidance documents specifying the conditions under which certification may be suspended or withdrawn.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because the RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC, Sec.5.12. require the CBs to comply with ISO/IEC 17065 Sec. 7.11, Termination, reduction, suspension or withdrawal of certification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S-4 RCB FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, CB-5 CAB Report

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.06 Termination, Suspension, Withdrawal

In fact, in the case of revision of scope of certification (downsizing) and revocation of certification were in place last year. MEL received the histories of each case, including discussion between MEL, CB and the entities, and finalized the decision after obtaining an approval from the Board of Directors. Then, MEL published a notice of each matter on its website.

- [Pufferfish Revocation, and CB-6 CAB Report Sea Lance Suspension, MEL Website "Revised FMS Certification and Assessment"](#)
- [MEL Website "Revocation of FMS Certification"](#)

B.2.07 Multi-site Certification

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies follow procedures and guidance for multi-site certifications as written in the standard or other scheme documents, if allowed under the scheme.</p>	<p>If the Scheme Owner explicitly does not allow multi-site certification (prohibits, not that it is not yet developed or exists) requirement is "Not applicable". Otherwise, the Scheme Owner requires certification body to follow have documented procedures and guidance for multi-site certification, detailed in the agreement or in the standards</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body; - requirements and guidance for multi-site certification - audit reports.
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>References</p>
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS and RCB-AMS Cl.5.4.4 require that, in case the applicant consists of multiple fishing cooperatives (aquaculture cooperators) or business operators, the audit team be able to select sites through sampling and to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S-4 RCB-

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.07 Multi-site Certification

conduct on-site audit only at the selected sites. The audit team selects samples by the method described in Appendix B. In the process of sampling, a template be used and filled out.

As for the multi-site certification of CoCS, RCB-COC, Cl.5.4.3 requires that, in case the applicant is a Type A or Type C multi-site applicant, the audit team be able to select sites through sampling and to conduct on-site audit only at the selected sites. The audit team selects samples by the method described in Appendix B. And Cl.5.4.6 requires that the audit team, in case the applicant is a Type B multi-site applicant, conduct the audit in all the sites. However, if one or more of the constituent sites have site(s) further inside and their nature is similar to A or C of multi-site, it is possible to subject the site to sampling assessment.

As for Aquaculture, AMS newly created "Appendix 1: Guidelines for Aquaculture, Unit of Certification," which ensure the definition of multi-site certification and supporting guide for assessment.

[FMS, S-4 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, S-6 GL-AMS](#)

B.2.08 Audit Reports

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to ensure consistency in audit report formats and in how the reports are completed.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies and has some system for quality control.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies; - guidance specifying formats for audit reports and reporting, mandatory audit templates; - review online audit reports for consistency of report format and reporting, Scheme Owner quality management system for review of audit reports.

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.08 Audit Reports

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC require that the audit team prepare an audit report. The following matters be specified in the audit report. The report be prepared along with the sample audit report attached to the Guidelines for Auditors provided separately. It is desirable that the audit team prepare the report in line with the requirements given in Sec. 6.5.1 of ISO 19011.

MEL operates three audit support programs/tools: Peer Review System, Auditor Training Course and Essential of Audit Reporting. This integration helps enhance the consistency of auditor capability, report writing skills and less flexibility in judgments in interpreting the standards.

The Essentials illustrate the models with clear and specific examples based on fact and scientific evidence, and with a reasonable logical story. The Audit Training Courses include audit simulation for practical learning and understanding best practices from other examples and the areas that are easy to mistake. The Peer Review System recruits external expertise to identify the inconsistencies for judgment and things to be corrected. In fact, there were some things that peer-reviewers pointed out as hard-to-understand for auditors which might lead to misunderstanding were picked up as the themes in Training Course. These initiatives work very well and help enhance the consistency in audit reporting.

References

- [S-4 RFB-FMS,](#)
[S-8 RCB-AMS,](#)
[S-11 RCB-COC,](#)
[M-14 TM, M-15](#)
[EAR, and IR-1](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Peer Review](#)
[System](#)

B.2.09 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component

Guidance

The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies

The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to have a documented procedure to enable input from all stakeholders during the certification process.

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.09 Participation and Consultation

have in place consistent procedures for stakeholders to provide input during the certification process.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirements for mechanism for stakeholder input during certification process.
- guidance specifying procedures.
- review certification body process for input:
- publicly available information for stakeholder input, public announcements, audit work plans, requests for input.
- audit reports with stakeholder input.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the RCB-FMS, AMS Cl.5.3.5 and RCB-COC, Cl.5.3.9 require that the CB, at the time of receipt of audit application, make a public announcement and have a consistent system in place by which interested stakeholders can provide input.

JFRCA publicly announces the applications for certification and accept public input during the certification process on their website.

MEL also has a system of receiving opinions from stakeholders for CB's certification decision through the procedure called Complaint, Objections and Appeal (R-COA).

References

- [M-5 R-OCA, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, and S-11 RCB-COC](#)

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.10 Non-Compliances	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies follow its requirements for determining non-compliances, verifying corrective actions arising from non-compliances and allowing for appeals of non-compliances.</p>	<p>For accurate and consistent implementation of the standard, the Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies follow non-compliances, verifying corrective actions arising from non-compliances, and allowing for appeals of non-compliances.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body. - accreditation manual, certification requirements/methodologies. - guidance documents, determining non-compliances, verifying corrective actions arising from non-compliances and allowing for appeals of non-compliances, in order to support consistency between certification bodies. - audit reports. - standards.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS and RCB-AMS, Cl.5.5.6-8 and 5.10.4-7, and RCB-COC, Cl.5.5.5-7 and 5.10.4-5 define the procedures for non-conformity (non-compliance) and its corrective action to be verified. As for appeals of non-compliances, RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.5.14 define that the requirements provided in Sec.7.13 of ISO/IEC 17065 shall be applicable.</p> <p>For AMS, NCs are not allowed, which means this is not applicable in MEL's mechanism for Aquaculture. But, if NCs are found during assessment, they should be corrected before certification is granted. For FMS, in the case of identifying the minor NCs, the corrective action measures should be taken place during the designated period, which needs a specific report. For COCS, same procedure as FMS should be conducted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS,</u> <u>S-4 RCB-AMS,</u> <u>S-11 RCB-COC,</u> <u>and M-5 R-OCA</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.10 Non-Compliances

JFRCA's MEL Certification Regulations specify the methodology outlines, steps and closure for the appeal of on compliance. MEL also has system that R-OCA (Regulations of Objections, Complaints and Appeals) specifies handling the appeals of non-compliances, which is categorized as D: Assessment and judgment certification body (certification judgment).

B.2.11 Site Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that the scope of the (re-)certification audit includes a visit to locations pertinent to the scope of the certification.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner requires that the scope of the audit (initial, annual or re-assessment) includes on-site assessment of premises covered by the scope of the standards and within which one or more key activities are performed.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, - accreditation manual, certification requirements/methodologies, - guidance documents specifying procedures for determining site visits including sampling, - review audit reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS and RCB-AMS Cl.5.5.3 (RCB-COC Cl.5.5.2) require that the audit team conduct all the audits at the site, and Cl.5.5.4 (RCB-COC Cl.5.5.3) require that the audit team take the following steps at the time of an on-site audit (shown in the step 1 to 5). The details of each step of the audit process are provided in Appendix C. The definition of "site" is stipulated in RCB-FMS and AMS Cl. 1.4, and COC Cl.1.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS and S-11 RCB-COC</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.11 Site Audit

JFRCA's MEL Certification Regulations also specify this requirement.

B.2.12 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that a list of certified entities is made publicly available.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner makes publicly available a list of certified entities either directly or requires of certification bodies/accreditation bodies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - system to show the certification status of entities is publicly available online (e.g. database or online certificate list). If this system is outsourced to the accreditation bodies or certification bodies, this is required and the system described in the contract/ agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, in a separate accreditation manual or certification requirements/methodologies.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.5.9.1 require that the CB disclose the status of certification. While JFRCA publishes and updates the list of certification information on its website, MEL also does, after receiving the notification from JFRCA, on the MEL website (in Japanese and English).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, and L-5 L-CE • MEL Website "About Certification"

B.2.13 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.13 Transparency

For fisheries, the Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to make full audit reports available on request after certification has been granted, while excluding commercially sensitive information.

Applicable only to fisheries, for Aquaculture “Not Applicable”. The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make full audit reports, after certification has been granted, available online or upon request. Commercially sensitive information is excluded. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with certification body and certified entity with this requirement,
- certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement,
- guidance specifying that making reports available to stakeholders happens in a timely manner,
- review certification body website for posted reports or process for responding to requests.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS Cl.5.9.1 requires that the CB disclose the status of certification and a summary of the audit report by electronic medium. The CB, based upon an agreement with the applicant, disclose to the public the whole text of audit reports by electronic medium or at the request of a third party.

RCB-FMS Cl.5.3.3 requires the CB conclude an assessment contract with the applicant. The agreement specifies the disclosure of whole text of the assessment report except for commercially sensitive matters. The full assessment reports of FMS (excluding annual reports) are published on the JFRCA website with treatment of blackening the sensitive information (i.e. business, personnel, etc.).

References

- [*S-4 RCB-FMS*](#)
- [*JFRCA Website "Certification Reception Status and Certification Results \(in Japanese\)"*](#)

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.14 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>For aquaculture, the Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to make summary audit reports publicly available (excluding commercially sensitive material information) after certification has been granted.</p>	<p>Applicable only to Aquaculture. For Fisheries “Not Applicable”. The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make summary audit reports, after certification has been granted, publicly available. Commercially sensitive information is excluded. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with certification body and certified entity with this requirement. - certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement. - guidance specifying that making reports available to stakeholders happens in a timely manner. - certification body website for posted reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-AMS Cl.5.9.1 requires that the CB disclose the status of certification and a summary of the audit report by electronic medium. The CB, based upon an agreement with the applicant, disclose to the public the whole text of audit reports by electronic medium or at the request of a third party.</p> <p>RCB-AMS Cl.5.3.3 requires the CB conclude an assessment contract with the applicant. The agreement specifies the disclosure of whole text of the assessment report except for commercially sensitive matters. The full assessment reports of AMS (excluding annual reports) are published on the JFRCA website with treatment of blackening the sensitive information (i.e. business, personnel, etc.).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-8 RCB-AMS</u> • <u>JFRCA Website</u> <i>“Certification Reception Status and Certification Results (in Japanese)”</i>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.14.02 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>For aquaculture, the Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to make full audit reports publicly available on request after certification has been granted, while excluding commercially sensitive information.</p>	<p>Applicable only to Aquaculture. For Fisheries “Not Applicable”. The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make full audit reports, after certification has been granted, publicly available or upon request. Commercially sensitive information is excluded. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with the certification body and certified entity with this requirement, - certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement - guidance specifying that making reports available to stakeholders happens in a timely manner - certification body website for posted reports. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-AMS Cl.5.9.1 requires that the CB disclose the status of certification and a summary of the audit report by electronic medium. The CB, based upon an agreement with the applicant, disclose to the public the whole text of audit reports by electronic medium or upon request.</p> <p>RCB-AMS Cl.5.3.3 requires the CB conclude an auditor contract with the applicant. The CB also include an agreement with the applicant in the audit contract regarding the disclosure of whole text of the certification report except for commercially sensitive matters. The full assessment reports of AMS (excluding annual reports) are published on the JFRCA website with treatment of blackening the sensitive information (i.e. business, personnel, etc.).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>JFRCA Website "Certification Reception Status and Certification Results (in Japanese)"</u> • <u>S-11 RCB-COC</u> 	

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.15 Notification of Changes

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner notifies accreditation bodies, certification bodies and certified entities of any change in management procedures which affects scheme rules and procedures for accreditation or certification.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a system to ensure that accreditation bodies, certification bodies and certified entities are notified in a timely manner of any substantive change in management procedures. This is defined as changes which affect scheme rules and procedures for accreditation and/or certification. Where the scheme outsources responsibility of notification to accreditation bodies or certification bodies, there is a requirement for certification bodies to have a procedure for this notification and guidance on how this should take place (timeframe, manner, channel, etc.).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts/agreements with accreditation bodies and certification bodies regarding notification of changes, internal procedure/qualityhandbook for change management, ring information flow.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Sec.5.1 require that the CB be applicable Sec.7.10 of ISO/IEC 17065, and Cl.5.11 require that the CB, on receipt of information from the MEL Council of changes in the certification scheme documents, inform the applicant within thirty days the details of changes and whether it is necessary to reissue a certificate (to conduct a re-audit) and the transition period, etc. in case the changes are seen as possibly affecting the applicant.</p> <p>MEL published a notice of effectuation of revised MEL AMS Ver.2.0 on August 1. 2022 on its website, and sent a notice letter to the AB, CB as well as the certified entities. In other cases, the internal document, which affects assessment interpretation or procedure, or consulting matters raised by CB, should be announced at the regular monthly meeting held every month where CB, Fisheries Agency are attended.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS,</u> <u>S-4 RCB-AMS,</u> <u>S-11 RCB-COC,</u> <u>and AR-6</u> <u>Notice</u> <u>Effectuation</u> <u>MEL AMS Ver.2.0</u> • <u>MEL Website</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.16 Corrective Action

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner clearly defines the criteria relating to the classification of non-conformities. Where the Scheme Owner allows for certification of an entity with non-compliances, the Scheme Owner requires that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only non-conformities on minor, non-critical issues are allowed; - a timeline for closing out corrective actions must be defined; - a system to verify that corrective actions have been closed out is in place. 	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the criteria related to rating the severity of non-conformities for certification bodies. If Scheme allows for certified entities with non-compliances, these can only be (All must be met): minor/non-critical, with a defined timeline for closing out and a mechanism defined to verify resolution.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies specifying classifications of non-conformities and conditions for allowing certification with non-compliances. - guidance specifying procedures and process for classifying nonconformities and conditions for issuing certification, audit reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment as the RCB-FMS and RCB-AMS Cl.5.5.6-5.5.9, and RCB-COC Cl.5.5.5-5.5.9 specify the procedure of non-conformity and corrective action. And, RCB-FMS and Crab-AMS Sec.5.7 define the decision rules of certification with regard to the non-conformity and minor non-conformity for each standard.</p> <p>Outlines are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · For FMS, if one non-conformity is found or more than four non-conformities found in "one" Principle, CB cannot certify the applicant, · For AMS and COCS, if one non-conformity is found, CB cannot certify the applicant, and · The timeline for corrective action is within six months <p>As an example, in the initial assessment for Aquaculture at Nanyo Bejoy conducted in March, 2022, the non-conformity of "no record of heath examination" was pointed out, then corrective action was taken place, and then it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, AF-1 Audit Report FMS Wajima Purse Seine Fishery, and CB-8 Corrective Action Nanyo Bejoy AMS</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.16 Corrective Action

was verified to have been corrected. The attached "Non-Conformity Corrective Action Report" issued by JFRCA illustrates the measures was in place healthily

As another example, the assessment report of Large & Medium-Scale Purse Seine Fishery, Wajima Fisheries Cooperative described that, among five species prepared for, Bluefin Tuna and Japanese Sardine were judged as major non-conformity due to the overfished of stock conditions that, at this case, the applicant did not take corrective action. Thus, these two species were not granted for certification. This is the example that MEL FMS system for non-conformity and corrective action worked adequately.

RCB-FMS, AMS Cl.5.10.3-5.10.7 (RCB-COCS Cl.5.10.4-5.10.6) also specify the procedure of non-conformity and corrective action in the case of surveillance (annual and emergency audit) and renewal audit.

B.2.17 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has defined the qualifications and competence criteria required by auditors and audit teams, employed by certification bodies, and it makes this information publicly available.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditor and audit teams qualifications and competency and these requirements are publicly available. Competencies and qualifications include knowledge in the standard, education, experience and personal attributes.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for each function, - auditor assessment and training records,

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.17 Auditor Competence

		- auditor CVs.
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Sec.4.1 define the Auditors' qualification, competence criteria, etc. Auditors' evaluation and training records include these criteria and competencies. An updated list of auditors trained with detailed auditor CVs are kept in JFRCA office.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, and CB-9 MEL Auditors List 20220801</u>

B.2.18 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner requires certification body auditors to have successfully completed training in the scheme to the satisfaction of the Scheme Owner.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditor training in the standard including initial and ongoing development.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for each function. - auditor assessment and training records. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and Crab-COC Cl.4.1.4 defines the training requirements to ensure necessary knowledge and competencies for the MEL system. Training Manual also describes the details of auditor training course.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-14 TM, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, O-11 Schedule Auditor Training Course 2021-2022, CB-9 Auditor</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.18 Auditor Competence

In 2021, four training courses (three for existing auditors and one for new applicant), and, in 2022, one course for existing have been held.

Regarding IE's request of Round 2, MEL Auditor List (CB-9) shows the date of latest attendance to the training courses in the left columns of each standard (Fisheries, Aquaculture and CoC). In addition, two references were attached: photos of training course and certification of training completion.

[List 20220801, O-18 Photos Auditor Training Program, and O-19 Certificate Auditor Training Program Eng.](#)

B.2.19 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that certification body auditors successfully complete auditor training based on ISO 19011. This does not include technical experts seconded to audit teams.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditors to have successfully completed (passed) training based on ISO 19011 Guidelines for auditing management systems) and that the audit team includes at least one auditor. Technical experts can supplement auditor expertise, but are not formally auditors and do not count as an auditor.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for each function. - auditor assessment and training records. - auditor CVs. - audit Reports. 	
Conclusion		References
MEL is in alignment because the RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.4.1.4.1 require that the CB document the process for ensuring that auditors and designated instructors have the personality, knowledge, and competence		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-14 TM, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-</u>

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.19 Auditor Competence

stipulated in Sec.7.1, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, and 7.2.3.4 of ISO 19011, and RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC CL.4.1.4.4 require that the CB ensure that its auditors and designated instructors have completed training in auditing competence based on ISO 19011. Requirement of auditor assessments and training records are described in Cl.7.4 and 7.5 and Sec.8 of the Training Manual. An updated list of auditors trained with detailed auditor CVs are maintained in JFRCA office.

In terms of lead auditor qualification, the RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-CoCS Cl.4.1.2 stipulates that, as competence of designated instructor, a person who has conducted certification audits of the FMS/AMS more than five times as an auditor, and who not only conducts audits alone but is also able to direct an assistant auditor.

JFRCA stipulates the lead auditor qualification shown in the page 10, Form K-6, Management of Auditor Competence that evaluates lead auditor's completion of ISO 19011 training.

In 2021, four training courses (three for existing auditors and one for new applicant), and in 2022, one course for existing have been held. Each class for standard understanding and ISO 19011-based audit lecture require the attendees to take an exam or write report right after them.

[AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, O-11 Schedule Auditor Training Course 2021-2022, and CB-12 JFRCA Management Auditor Competence Eng.](#)

B.2.20 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies include the following in their competence assessment of auditors:	The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification bodies to include all of the elements in the Essential Component in the management of personnel competence (ISO 17065 clause 6.1.2).

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.20 Auditor Competence

- an assessment of knowledge and skills for each fundamental area the auditor will be expected to be working,
- an assessment of knowledge of pertinent fishery and /or aquaculture Programs and the ability to access and be able to apply relevant laws and regulations,
- an assessment of the personal attributes of the auditor, to ensure they conduct themselves in a professional manner,
- a period of supervision to cover the assessment fishery and/or aquaculture principles, specific audit techniques and specific category knowledge,
- a documented sign off by the certification body of the satisfactory completion of assessment requirements.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement,
- guidance outlining the system and criteria for competencies, training, etc. (see B.2.17-B2.19, 21-22),
- auditor assessment and training records,
- auditor CVs,
- accreditation body reports.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because RCB- FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.4.1.7 stipulate that the requirements provided in Sec. 6.1.3 of ISO/IEC 17065 be applicable.

Assessment method for qualifications and competence of auditors is provided in the Appendix A of each RCB. Requirement of auditor assessments and training records are described in Cl.7.4 and 7.5 and Sec.8 of the Training Manual. An updated list of auditors trained with detailed auditor CVs are maintained in JFRCA office.

As with B.2.18, MEL Auditor List (CB-9) shows the date of latest attendance to the training courses in the left columns of each Standard (Fisheries, Aquaculture and CoC).

In addition, in JFRCA's Management of Auditor Competence, Form K-2 (page 6) shows auditor's qualification and competence assessment, Form K-1 shows the list of audit cases conducted by auditors, Form K-4 shows completion record of auditor training courses/program, and Form K-6 shows ISO 19011 training record.

References

- [M-14 TM, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, O-11 Schedule Auditor Training Course 2021-2022, CB-9 Auditor List 20220801, CB-12 JFRCA Management Auditor Competence, CB-13 JFRCA Auditor #009 AMS Competence Record Jpn., and CB-14 JFRCA Auditor](#)

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.20 Auditor Competence

Examples of actual records (in Japanese) for two designated instructors (one for AMS and one for FMS) were added as recorded evidence of competence management by JFRCA

[#019 FMS Competence Record Jpn.](#)

In 2021, four training courses (three for existing auditors and one for new applicant), and, in 2022, one course for existing have been held.

B.2.21 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that certification body lead auditors maintain category and scheme knowledge.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body lead auditors to have and maintain the necessary training, technical knowledge and experience to ensure consistent and accurate audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement, - guidance outlining the system and criteria for lead auditors, - lead auditor assessment and training records, - lead auditor CVs, - accreditation body reports. 	
Conclusion		References
MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.4.1.4.2 require that CBs conduct training for auditors to ensure their knowledge and competence necessary for certification audit.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-14 TM, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, O-11</u>

B.2.21 Auditor Competence

RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.4.1.4.3 also require that the CB ensure that its auditors and designated instructors participate in activities such as gaining additional business experience, training, private study, coaching, attendance at meetings, seminars, conferences or other relevant activities for their Continuing Professional Development (CPD) to maintain the best and latest techniques and knowledge for fisheries/ aquaculture management.

Requirement of auditor assessments and training records are described in Cl.7.4 and 7.5 and Sec.8 of the Training Manual. An updated list of auditors trained with detailed auditor CVs are maintained in JFRCA office. In 2021, four training courses (three for existing auditors and one for new applicant), and in 2022, one course for existing have been held.

As with B.2.20, MEL Auditor List (CB-9) shows the date of latest attendance to the training courses in the left columns of each Standard (Fisheries, Aquaculture and CoC).

In addition, in JFRCA's Management of Auditor Competence, Form K-2 (page 6) shows auditor's qualification and competence assessment, Form K-1 shows the list of audit cases conducted by auditors, Form K-4 shows completion record of auditor training courses/program, and Form K-6 shows ISO 19011 training record. Examples of actual records (in Japanese) for two designated instructors (one for AMS and one for FMS) were added as recorded evidence of competence management by JFRCA.

[Schedule Auditor Training Course 2021-2022, CB-9 MEL Auditor List 20220801, CB-12 JFRCA Management Auditor Competence, CB-13 JFRCA Auditor #009 AMS Competence Record_Jpn., and CB-14 JFRCA Auditor #019 FMS Competence Record_Jpn.](#)

B . 2 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.2.22 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies have a continuing professional development program in place that provides auditors with current best practice for fishery and/or aquaculture.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditor ongoing professional development to maintain current best practice in sector.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for continuous professional development, - auditor training, assessment and training records.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-FMS, RCB-AMS and RCB-COC Cl.4.1.4.3 require that the CB ensure that its auditors and designated instructors participate in activities such as gaining additional business experience, training, private study, coaching, attendance at meetings, seminars, conferences or other relevant activities for their Continuing Professional Development (CPD) to maintain the best and latest techniques and knowledge for fisheries/ aquaculture management.</p> <p>Requirement of auditor assessments and training records are described in Cl.7.4 and 7.5 and Sec.8 of the Training Manual. An updated list of auditors trained with detailed auditor CVs are maintained in JFRCA office.</p> <p>As with B.2.20, MEL Auditor List (CB-9) shows the date of latest attendance to the training courses in the left columns of each Standard (Fisheries, Aquaculture and CoC).</p> <p>In addition, in JFRCA's Management of Auditor Competence, Form K-2 (page 6) shows auditor's qualification and competence assessment, Form K-1 shows the list of audit cases conducted by auditors, Form K-4 shows completion record of auditor training courses/program, and Form K-6 shows ISO 19011 training record. Examples of actual</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M-14 TM, S-4 RCB-FMS, S-8 RCB-AMS, S-11 RCB-COC, O-11 Schedule Auditor Training Course 2021-2022, CB-9 MEL Auditor List 20220801, CB-12 JFRCA Management Auditor Competence, CB-13 JFRCA Auditor #009 AMS Competence Record_Jpn., and CB-14 JFRCA</u>

B.2.22 Auditor Competence

records (in Japanese) for two designated instructors (one for AMS and one for FMS) were added as recorded evidence of competence management by JFRCA.

In 2021, four training courses (three for existing auditors and one for new applicant), and in 2022, one course for existing have been held. At the beginning of the course, MEL makes a rule of providing updated information to the attendees such as MEL activities, fisheries industry, global trend, GSSI matter, etc.

*Auditor #019 FMS
Competence
Record Jpn.*

B.3 SCHEME MANAGEMENT

B.3.01 Segregation

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The Scheme Owner requires that all certified products are identified and segregated from non-certified products at all stages of the supply chain.	<p>The Scheme Owner requires clear identification and separation of certified from non-certified product at all stages of the supply chain.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chain of Custody standards, audit checklists, certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement. - Chain of Custody audit reports. 	
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>MEL is in alignment because COCS Sec.3.2 requires that the applicant have a system in place that ensures certified marine products can be identified and segregated at all stages, and Sec.3.3 requires that the applicant have in place mechanisms for ensuring segregation at all stages.</p>		<p><u>S-9 COCS</u></p>

B.3.02 Entities to be Audited

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires all entities that are physically handling the certified product to undergo a Chain of Custody	The Scheme Owner requires all entities in a supply chain that physically handle the product and where there is the possibility of mixing undergo a Chain of Custody audit if the product will be claimed as certified or carry a label. Entities in the supply chain which do not take physical control

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.02 Entities to be Audited

audit by an accredited certification body if the product can be destined for retail sale as a certified, labelled product.

Exceptions: No audit is required for storage and distribution of tamper-proof, packaged products.

or only handle storage and distribution in tamper proof packaging need to be identified, but do not require a Chain of Custody audit.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, certified entity, certification requirements/methodologies defining types of operations and activities that require auditing according to these requirements,
- Chain of Custody reports.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because the Introduction of COCS states that to ensure that the seafood products bearing the ecolabel logo or sold as certified products are in fact produced from fishery products conforming to either the MEL FMS or AMS. At all stages of the supply chain, all entities that are physically handling the certified seafood products must comply with the MEL COCS.

Then, COCS CI.1.2 requires that applicants verify that their immediate suppliers have acquired MEL Fisheries, Aquaculture Certification or CoC Certification. An applicant that purchases certified seafood products from entities distributing, storing, or selling in unopened packages further verify that the suppliers of said entities have acquired MEL Fisheries or Aquaculture Certification or CoC Certification.

Last, R-LOGO CI.2.1.2 requires that the certified organization ensure that the product is processed and distributed by companies certified by COCS of MEL. all enterprises that physically handle the certified products must obtain CoC certification.

References

- [S-9 COCS](#)

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.03 Records for Traceability

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to verify that all entities within the chain maintain accurate and accessible records that allow any certified product or batch of products to be traceable from the point of sale to the buyer.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification bodies that all entities within the supply chain, including those which may not undergo a Chain of Custody audit (see B.3.02), maintain up to date, complete and accessible records that allow for full traceability of the product along the entire supply chain.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chain of Custody standard. - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/ methodologies specifying criteria for document control and maintenance. - auditor checklists.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because COCS Sec.3.5 requires that the applicant have in place a traceability system that enables to at all stages;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · to trace from shipping slips the products sold by the applicant as certified seafood products at all stages of their management system, · to check that the products sold by the applicant as certified marine products are separated at all stages, · when the applicant sells products that include certified marine products and non-certified products mixed in processing stages as certified marine products, to check that the certified marine products in question do meet the requirements stipulated in the Appendix 1 of R-LOGO, and · have an applicant present accurate, complete, and unaltered records concerning traceability upon request from consumers, shipment recipients, Certification Body, or MEL Council. <p>All CoC assessment reports include Traceability Checklist and Product Flow Chart (flow diagram) on the applicant's site: certified product flow diagram from loading to shipping and processing details of certified product from loading to shipping.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-9 COCS, S-10 AS-COC, AC-1 Audit Report CoCS Takatoku Suisan, AC-2 Audit Report CoCS Sendai Suisan, and AC-3 Audit Report Kurose Suisan</u>

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.04 Sub-Contractors

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that entities are able to demonstrate that these Chain of Custody requirements are met by the enterprise’s subcontractors.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that certified entity takes full responsibility that all subcontractors fully meet Chain of Custody requirements and has a system to demonstrate this.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - sub-contract agreements, internal audits. If the Scheme Owner does not allow sub-contracting then this is aligned (as opposed to Not Applicable)</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because COC Cl.1.2.2 require that a type-B multi-site applicant conform to the requirement that all sites be contracted with the entity located in the central office.</p> <p>COC Cl.3.1.2 also requires that the central office enter into contract with all sites handling certified seafood products and ensure that all sites comply with the requirements for segregation, traceability (Sec.3), and logo management (Sec.4) as per the MEL COCS.</p> <p>The copies of contract for processing of Kurose Suisan, Seiho Shoji and Yumigahama Suisan, all of which have obtained CoC Certification illustrate the mutual responsibility in place. And, in the sampled audit reports of Sendai Suisan and Kurose Suisan show that the head office of the certified entities have a system to conduct operation together with subcontractors or co-packers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-9 COCS, S-10 AS-COC, AC-2 Audit Report CoCS Sendai Suisan, AC-3 Audit Report Kurose Suisan, CB-11 Contract for Processing: Kurose Suisan, Seiho Shoji and Yumigahama Suisan (in Japanese)</u>

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.05 Auditing Methods and Frequency

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner has or requires certification bodies to have documented procedures for auditing methods and frequency of audits that meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certificate validity does not exceed 3 years; - periodicity depends on risk factors - changes to an entity's traceability system that are deemed to affect the integrity of the Chain of Custody result in a re-audit (onsite). 	<p>The Scheme Owner has or ensures certification bodies have documented Chain of Custody audit methodologies including: validity of certificate cannot exceed 3 years, frequency of audits takes into consideration risk factors and an onsite audit is required when substantive changes to the certified entities traceability system take place. These are instances where the integrity of the Chain of Custody could be affected such as company mergers, major new markets.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requirements in the contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, in a separate accreditation manual or for example in certification requirements/methodologies. - guidance interpretation specifying frequency, auditing methods and risk factors, in order to support consistency between certification bodies. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because of followings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · RCB-COC Cl.5.8.2 requires that the certification remain valid for no longer than three years, · RCB-COS Cl.5.10.1 requires that the CB decide the frequency of annual audits and conduct them in accordance with the CoC risk of the applicant. The Risk Evaluation Methods and Frequency of Annual Audit are stipulated in the Appendix C, and RCB-COC, and · RCB-COC Cl.5.10.2 requires that, in case there is deemed to be a possibility of non-conformity to the requirements of the COCS or material risks relating to the reliability of the scheme, the CB conduct an emergency audit of the applicant. The information regarding these risks be verified and shared if the MEL Council so desires. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-9 COCS, S-10 AS-COC, and S-11 RCB-COC</u> 	

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.05 Auditing Methods and Frequency

The methodology of risk assessment is stipulated in Appendix C of RCB-COC. COCS Sec.2.2 includes the notification of change to the CB and the approval of change by the CB.

B.3.06 Non-Conformity/Corrective Actions

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires the certification body to record all identified breaches of the chain of custody, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an explanation of the factors that allowed the breach to occur; - an explanation of the corrective actions required to ensure that a similar breach does not re-occur; - the time frames for the corrective actions to be completed; and - the date of closing out of the corrective actions and how the problem was solved. 	<p>The Scheme Owner requires of certification bodies to document all breaches of Chain of Custody with explanation of contextual factors, corrective actions, and timeframes for corrective actions, date of closing and resolution.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/methodologies defining requirements of reports, contract or agreement specifying requirements, mandatory template reports. - Chain of Custody audit report.
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>MEL is in alignment because of the followings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · RCB-COC Cl.5.5.6 requires that, in case any non-conformity is found in the CoC during the initial audit, the audit team requests the applicant to take corrective measures and verify that the non-conformity has been corrected before deciding certification or re-certification. The audit team also conducts an on-site verification, if necessary, · RCB-COC Cl.5.5.7 requires that the audit team record the following matters regarding a confirmed non-conformity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The date when the non-conformity was discovered - The nature and cause of the non-conformity and solution for the problem 	<p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-11 RCB-COC, CB-8 Corrective Action Meiho CoCS</u>

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.06 Non-Conformity/Corrective Actions

- The corrective actions for eliminating the cause
 - The date for the corrective actions to be completed
 - The date when the corrective measures were verified, and
- RCB-COC Cl.5.10.2 requires that, in case any non-conformity is confirmed in an annual audit, emergency audit, or unscheduled audit, the CB instruct the applicant to take corrective measures. The period and timing between the correction of non-conformities and the completion of verification by the CB be no longer than two months after the audit team holds the closing meeting with the applicant. Provided, however, that if the CB acknowledges a valid reason, the period until the completion of verification of corrective measures may be extended. The Certification Body shall inform these matters to the MEL Council on each such occasion.

As an example, in the initial assessment for CoC at Meiho Co., Ltd. conducted in August, 2021, the non-conformities such as mistake in scope of certification, manual and product flow diagram, etc. were pointed out, then corrective action was taken place, and then it was verified to have been corrected. The attached "Non-Conformity Corrective Action Report" issued by JFRCA illustrates the procedure is in place.

B.3.07 Audit Reports

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that certification body audit reports include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the date of the inspection/audit;- the name(s) of the person(s) responsible for the audit and report;- the names and addresses of the sites inspected/audited;	The Scheme Owner requires of certification bodies that all Chain of Custody audit reports include all of the elements in the Essential Component. Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.07 Audit Reports

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the scope of the inspection/audit; - the non-conformities identified; - the result of at least one mass balance assessment for each product covered by the Chain of Custody audit; and - a conclusion on the conformity of the client with the Chain of Custody requirements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/methodologies defining requirements of reports, mandatory template reports. - Chain of Custody audit report. |
|--|--|

Conclusion

'MEL is in alignment because RCB-COC Cl.5.5.4 requires that the audit team prepare an audit report. The following matters be specified in the audit report. The report shall be prepared along with the sample audit report attached to GL-COC provided separately. It is desirable that the audit team prepare the report in line with the requirements given in Sec.6.5.1 of ISO 19011.

- The basic information of the applicant
- The date the audit was conducted
- The audit team that conducted the audit
- The scope of certification
- The details of any non-conformities found at the time of the audit
- The balance of purchased volume and shipped volume (mass balance) regarding certified seafood that falls within the scope of certification
- The result of the audit
- The basis of the audit result
- The status of logo use and management (only in annual audits and renewal audits)

References

- [S-II RCB-COC, S-9 COCS, AC-1 Audit Report CoCS Takatoku Suisan, AC-2 Audit Report CoCS Sendai Suisan, and AC-3 Audit Report Kurose Suisan](#)

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.08 Audit Reports

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to file reports at their office and to make these reports available to relevant parties upon request.</p>	<p>Certification bodies are required to maintain files of Chain of Custody audit reports (paper or electronic) and make these available upon request to relevant parties, within contractual arrangements with certified entities.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - contracts, agreements, certification requirements specify Chain of Custody reports are filed and process for making them available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>S-11 RCB-COC, AC-1 Audit Report CoCS Takatoku Suisan, AC-2 Audit Report CoCS Sendai Suisan, AC-3 Audit Report Kurose Suisan, CB-4 JFRCA Assessment Contract (in Japanese)</i></u>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<p>MEL is in alignment because RCB-COC Sec.5.13 stipulates that the requirements provided in Sec.7.12 of ISO/IEC 17065 be applicable.</p> <p>RCB-COC 5.01 requires that the CB disclose the status of certification and outline of the certification report by electronic medium. The CB, based upon an agreement with the applicant, disclose the whole text of certification report by electronic medium or upon request.</p> <p>JFRCA's Assessment Contract (format) Art.2.2 notes that upon acceptance, the client's application will be announced publicly and Art.2.3 notes that, upon certification - reports shall be made public without commercially sensitive information. In fact, JFRCA publishes the CoC audit report, excluding annual report, on their website blackening the sensitive information of the applicant.</p>		

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.09 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that an enterprise certified entity keeps records that demonstrate conformity with the Chain of Custody requirements for a period that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exceeds the shelf life of the certified product; and - exceeds the periodicity between audits 	<p>Certified entity must keep records documenting compliance with Chain of Custody standard requirements at a minimum time that is longer than a. the shelf life of the product and b. time between audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chain of Custody standard, guidance interpretation and audit checklist that specify document retention policy. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because COCS Cl.2.1.3 requires that the applicant retain records from all the stages relating to the certified seafood products in a state available for presentation, for the duration of the CoC certification validity period of three years at least. When shipped certified marine products may be stored for periods of over three years (e.g. considering sell-by dates), the records must be kept available for presentation for the duration of the period that the certified products in question are stored.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>S-9 COCS</u>

B.3.10 Multi-Site CoC

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>Where a scheme allows for Chain of Custody certification of multiple sites managed under the control of a single entity, the Scheme Owner defines specific audit procedures that ensure all sites comply with the Chain of Custody certification requirements. Control can include direct ownership, franchises, or</p>	<p>If the Scheme Owner does not allow Chain of Custody of multi-sites (prohibits not that it is not yet developed or exists)- requirement is "Not applicable". Otherwise, the Scheme Owner defines audit procedure for multi-sites (under control of one entity) and requirements for internal control management system.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.10 Multi-Site CoC

where the entity has a signed agreement or contract with each site.

- Chain of Custody standard, guidance or checklist specifying procedure and internal control system.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because COCS Sec.1.3 requires that multi-site applicants, in addition to the requirements defined in the MEL CoCS, meet additional requirements stipulated in Appendix 2, Sec.1. The Appendix 2 describes the requirement for multi-site applicants including the relationship between the central and sites, common management system, internal audit system and relevant matters. The Assessment Sheet for Auditors also covers the details of audit procedure for multi-site CoC certification.

Sampled audit reports: Takatoku Suisan, Sendai Suisan and Kurose Suisan, illustrate how multi-site assessment was conducted and how the relationship between the central and sites work, whether the sites are within the same group or not.

References

- [S-9 COCS, S-II AS-COC, AC-1 Audit Report CoCS Takatoku Suisan, AC-2 Audit Report CoCS Sendai Suisan, and AC-3 Audit Report Kurose Suisan](#)

B.3.11 Multi-Site CoC

GSSI Component

Where the Scheme Owner allows for multisite certification, they require that all sites are assessed as part of the internal audit during the period of validity of the certificate.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner does not allow Chain of Custody of multi-site requirement is "Not applicable". Otherwise, the Chain of custody standard requires all sites are assessed as part of the internal audit during the validity period of the certificate.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- standard, guidance interpretation and audit checklist.

B . 3 S C H E M E M A N A G E M E N T

B.3.11 Multi-Site CoC

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because COCS Appendix 1, Sec.1 stipulates the requirement for internal audits, and Appendix 2 fully describes internal audit system for multi-site certification.

The audit reports of Sendai Suisan (multi-site A) and Kurose Suisan (multi-site B) illustrate that they established internal audit system, assigned a person responsible for internal audit at the site, gave them a learning opportunity, and had them conduct actual or test internal audit.

References

- [S-9 COCS, S-11 AS-COC, AC-2 Audit Report CoCS Sendai Suisan, and AC-3 Audit Report Kurose Suisan](#)

**SECTION C.
AQUACULTURE
CERTIFICATION
STANDARDS**



C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.01 Antimicrobial Usage	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the decision to treat with antimicrobial agents, and their subsequent application, is consistent with the Principles for Responsible & Prudent Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Aquatic Animals and other guidance of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code i.e., by the aquatic animal health professional or other relevant competent authority and in response to a diagnosed disease; see Articles 6.2.7 and 6.2.8 of the 2015 Aquatic Animal Health Code).</p>	<p>The standard is expected to prohibit prophylactic usage for growth promotion and require that all antimicrobials are used in response to a diagnosed disease (i.e., by the aquatic animal health professional or other relevant competent authority) and the audit is expected to include a review of suitable evidence (e.g., records of disease testing etc. prescriptions for treatments).</p> <p>The audit is expected to include a review of evidence (such as written records or through interviews) to ensure consistency with OIE guidelines (2015) Article 6.2.7 “The veterinarian or other aquatic animal health professional authorized to prescribe veterinary medicines should indicate precisely to the aquatic animal producer the treatment regime, including the dose, the treatment intervals, the duration of the treatment, the withdrawal period and the amount of antimicrobial agents to be delivered, depending on the dosage and the number of aquatic animals to be treated. The use of antimicrobial agents extra-label/off-label may be permitted in appropriate circumstances in conformity with the relevant legislation” and Article 6.2.8 “Aquatic animal producers should use antimicrobial agents only on the prescription of a veterinarian or other aquatic animal health professional authorized to prescribe veterinary medicines, and follow directions on the dosage, method of application, and withdrawal period.”</p>

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.01 Antimicrobial Usage

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.3 that requires that, in the case of disease outbreaks, aquatic animals shall be treated in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

It includes the standards 2.3.2, 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 that require that;

- Aquaculture farmers treat diseases in accordance with the diagnosis and decision on treatment under the supervision of Fish Epidemic Prevention Officers (2.3.2),
- Aquaculture drugs be used in accordance with the Act on Securing Quality, Efficacy and Safety of Pharmaceuticals, Medical Devices, Regenerative and Cellular Therapy Products, Gene Therapy Products, and Cosmetics (Act No. 145 of 1960) and other relevant regulations, and aquaculture farmers establish procedures for drug usage to minimize any impact on the environment (2.3.3), and
- Antimicrobial agents be used in accordance with the Principles for Responsible and Prudent Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Aquatic Animals of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (2.3.4).

References

- [AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1.02 Biosecurity

GSSI Component

The standard requires that workers with responsibilities in aquatic animal husbandry have been adequately trained and are aware of their responsibilities in aquatic animal health management practices.

Guidance

The audit is expected to include a review of evidence that relevant workers have been appropriately trained and aware of their responsibilities. Examples of suitable evidence could include suitable training or appropriate qualifications, and interviews with staff. The training of workers may be a component in a broader management system e.g., a health management plan.

Conclusion

References

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.02 Biosecurity

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.3.5 that requires that aquaculture workers be trained, educated, and competent to manage aquatic animal health. Workers must have high awareness of these matters and act responsibly. Workers are required to attend training sessions organized by the local government and others. A record of training must be kept.

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1.03 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires that aquatic animals are kept under farming conditions suitable for the species being raised.</p>	<p>The objective of this requirement is to verify that the species is being farmed in the proper environment to maintain its health. Due to the very broad nature of this Essential Component, specific guidance cannot be provided. Expected evidence could include requirements for farm siting (including permitting for the farm site and species), aquatic health plan maintenance, assurance or monitoring aquatic animal health, on-farm water quality and temperature monitoring, etc.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.1 that requires that aquatic animals be managed in a suitable environment to minimize stress on them, and precautionary measures against diseases be planned and executed.</p> <p>It includes the standards 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 that require that;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3</u> 	

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.03 Biosecurity

- Aquaculture farmers use proper water in accordance with Water Quality Standards for Fisheries based on the type of target species and their life stage (2.1.1),
- Aquaculture farmers provide sufficient cage space and a suitable rearing density to maintain satisfactory environmental conditions at the growing site (2.1.2),
- Aquaculture farmers monitor the environmental conditions of the farming site by using proper indicators. Appropriate procedures shall be established for dealing with deteriorating conditions (2.1.3), and
- Aquaculture farmers use suitable feed matched to the nutritional requirements of aquatic animals, with proper quantities for maintaining their healthy condition (2.1.4).

[*Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan*](#)

C.1.04 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures to respond to disease outbreaks, which includes the ability to quarantine the aquatic animal where feasible.</p>	<p>It is expected that disease response procedures would be a component of the aquatic animal health management system. Feasibility of quarantine depends on a combination of species, culture system and production environment. In cases where quarantine is applicable, a review of suitable evidence is expected to demonstrate and verify the ability to contain diseased aquatic animals.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.3 that, in the case of disease outbreak, requires that the aquatic animals be treated in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori</i></u>

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.04 Biosecurity

It includes the standards 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 that require that;

- Aquaculture farmers establish and implement procedures for responding to disease (2.3.1),
- Aquaculture farmers treat diseases in accordance with the diagnosis and decision on treatment under the supervision of Fish Epidemic Prevention Officers (2.3.2), and
- Antimicrobial agents be used in accordance with the Principles for Responsible and Prudent Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Aquatic Animals of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code 2.3.4).

[PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1.05 Biosecurity

GSSI Component

The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures and/or systems for the early detection of aquatic animal health issues, which include routine monitoring of stocks and the environment.

Guidance

Appropriate procedures are expected to include general health/ behavioural inspections or testing for specific diseases with suitable monitoring (e.g., regular and including a suitable range of parameters, and of sufficient sample size to identify or anticipate disease outbreaks expediently, as well as increased surveillance when potential issues are identified.) Environmental monitoring is expected to include detection of unfavourable environmental quality factors that could adversely affect the health of the aquatic animal (e.g., water temperature and quality).

Verification is expected and could include reviews of written records and monitoring results to ensure procedures and/or systems are operational is

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.05 Biosecurity

also expected. This could also be captured in an aquatic health management plan.

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.1 that requires that be managed under the suitable environment to minimize stress on them and the precautionary measures against diseases shall be planned and executed.

It includes the standards 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 that require that;

- Aquaculture farmers use proper water in accordance with Water Quality Standards for Fisheries based on the type of target species and their life stage (2.1.1),
- Aquaculture farmers shall provide sufficient cage space and a suitable rearing density to maintain satisfactory environmental conditions at the growing site (2.1.2), and
- Aquaculture farmers shall monitor the environmental conditions of the farming site by using proper indicators. Appropriate procedures shall be established for dealing with deteriorating conditions (2.1.3).

It also includes the criterion 2.2 that requires that the aquatic animals be maintained under appropriate management to prevent disease outbreak and spread, and the standard 2.2.1 that requires aquaculture farmers monitor the health condition of aquatic animals regularly with appropriate indicators.

References

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.06 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that mortalities and moribund aquatic animals are routinely collected, where collection is a feasible practice.</p>	<p>GSSI expects this Essential Component to be applied where collection is a feasible function of good management practice (e.g., finfish grow out). Examples where this is not suitable could include where aquatic animals may be too small to effectively collect (e.g., shrimp farming). Record keeping on the numbers of, and reason for, mortalities is expected.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.2.2 that requires that aquaculture farmers establish a procedure for the collection and treatment of dead and moribund aquatic animals, and treat them properly in accordance with the decided procedure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods</i>, <i>AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA</i>, <i>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan</i>, and <i>AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</i>

C.1.07 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the aquaculture facility to have operational fish health management practices. Evidence must be shown that these address the following elements (where relevant to the species, scale, and production system covered by the Standard's scope):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective biosecurity 2. Identification and use of suitable available vaccines 	<p>It is expected that the standard will contain sufficient elements and/ or audit of culture practices for an operational program relative to the scale, species, and production systems covered by the standard's scope, including a focus on disease prevention (e.g. the use of vaccines). The content of the measures are expected to be overseen (but not necessarily full time employment) of an aquatic animal health professional.</p>

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.07 Biosecurity

3. Introductions and transfers of farmed animals (where relevant, which is overseen by an aquatic animal health professional.

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.2 that requires that aquatic animals be maintained under appropriate management to prevent disease outbreaks and spread.

It includes the standards 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 that require that;

- Aquaculture farmers monitor the health condition of aquatic animals regularly with appropriate indicators (2.2.1),
- Aquaculture farmers establish a procedure for the collection and treatment of dead and moribund aquatic animals, and shall treat them properly in accordance with the decided procedure (2.2.2),
- Aquaculture farmers manage their facilities to prevent escape, and not release diseased aquatic animals intentionally (2.2.3),
- Seed be certified free from specific or material pathogens before introduction to aquaculture sites (2.2.4), and
- Aquaculture farmers manage the aquatic animals properly by effective preventive measures and vaccination throughout all the rearing stages (2.2.5).

References

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods](#), [AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA](#), [AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan](#), and [AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1.07.05 Biosecurity

GSSI Component

The standard requires that the aquatic animals are vaccinated against all relevant/important diseases for which vaccines are both available and effective.

Guidance

Relevant/important pathogens could include those identified by the aquatic animal health professional and sources such as the OIE/ transboundary disease lists. Verification, such as a review of

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.07.05 Biosecurity

justification by the aquatic animal health professional as to which vaccines could be used and records/receipts for vaccinations is expected.

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.2.5 that aquaculture farmers manage the aquatic animals properly by vaccination throughout all rearing stages, and the indicator 2.2.5 A requires that the vaccine be properly used in accordance with the relevant laws and regulations.

References

- [AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1.08 Off-farm Disease Transmission

GSSI Component

The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish and implement procedures for the disposal of mortalities using appropriate methods that prevent the spread of disease.

Guidance

Given the nature of this requirement, the standard may appear as a general requirement; however verification that practices are employed is expected. Relevant examples can be found in Articles 4.7.7 and 4.7.8 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code 2015 (see www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_aquatic_animal_waste.htm).

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.2.2 that requires that aquaculture farmers establish a procedure for the collection and treatment of dead and moribund aquatic animals, and treat them properly in accordance with the decided procedure.

References

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.09 Off-farm Disease Transmission

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures and/or systems to reduce the likelihood of disease and parasite transmission within the aquaculture facility and between it and natural aquatic fauna.</p>	<p>Appropriate procedures or systems are expected to address both on farm disease and parasite transfer (such as the ability to quarantine diseased stocks, separating equipment) as well as between the facility and natural fauna (such as disinfection of effluents for diseased stocks, following). The approach taken would be expected to be relevant to the species, production system, scale of production, and legal requirements. Can be “not applicable” with suitable justification provided by the scheme.</p> <p>Where pathogens or parasites are a known concern (for example, sea lice on farmed salmon); Appropriate procedures or systems are expected to include specific requirements or actions defined in the standard or specified by the aquaculture facility through a suitable risk assessment or other evidence such as local or national regulations. Appropriate management measures in these cases could include treatment trigger levels of parasite numbers on the farm-facility or siting requirements that require that the aquaculture facility is located at suitable distances from wild populations.</p> <p>Verification that the management measures are suitable and employed is expected.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes criterion 2.2 that requires that aquatic animals be maintained under appropriate management to prevent disease outbreak and spread.</p> <p>It includes the specific standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 that require that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquaculture farmers manage their facilities to prevent escape, and not release diseased aquatic animals intentionally (2.2.3), and • Seed be certified free from specific or material pathogens before introduction to aquaculture sites (2.2.4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose</u> 	

C.1 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.1.09 Off-farm Disease Transmission

It also includes criterion 4.4 that requires that aquaculture be operated properly to minimize any impacts on the aquaculture sites and surrounding environment, and the standard 4.4.1 that requires aquaculture be operated in compliance with the relevant laws and regulations on habitat and biodiversity, and the result of environmental assessment.

The 4.4.1 includes the specific indicators 4.4.1 C and 4.4.1 D that require that;

- Number of aquaculture animals escaping from the aquaculture sites is recorded during the transfer of animals or in a natural disaster (e.g., typhoon) (4.4.1 C), and
- Proper measures are taken to prevent the escape of aquaculture animals (4.4.1 D).

[Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.1.10 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the aquaculture facility to maintain records on veterinary drug and chemical usage and the rationale for their use.</p>	<p>Verification that suitable records are maintained is expected. Suitable records are expected to include type, concentration, and dosage, method of administration and withdrawal times of chemicals and veterinary drugs and the rationale for their use.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.3.2 that requires that aquaculture farmers treat diseases in accordance with the diagnosis and decision on treatment under the supervision of Fish Epidemic Prevention Officers, and the 2.3.3 that requires aquaculture drugs be used in accordance with the relevant laws and regulations.</p> <p>It also includes the standard 3.2.1 that requires that aquaculture medicine be used based on the expertise and accurate diagnosis of Fish Epidemic Prevention Officers to optimize its medical efficiency, and records of drug usage be kept.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u>

C.2 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.2.01 Chemical Usage		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the establishment, implementation and maintenance of an appropriate system for the application of chemicals and veterinary drugs.	An appropriate system could conform to the relevant sections of Article 6.2.7 and 6.2.8 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code (2015) (www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_antibio_resp_prudent_use.htm) or other suitable reference. The system is expected to ensure that the application of the product follows the instructions of the manufacturer or other competent authority. Verification that the system is operational is also expected.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.3.1 that requires that, aquaculture farmers establish and implement procedures for responding to disease, and it includes the indicator 2.3.1 A that requires that procedures for diagnosis and cure of diseases in case of disease outbreak be provided.</p> <p>The standard 2.3.2 also requires that aquaculture farmers treat diseases in accordance with the diagnosis and decision on treatment under the supervision of Fish Epidemic Prevention Officers (FEPO), and it includes the indicator 2.3.2 A that requires that diagnosis and decision on treatment of diseases be implemented based on the results of examinations conducted by FEPO, etc., and 2.3.2 B requires that, when antimicrobial agents are used, procedures (e.g., instructions for the use of fisheries antibacterial agents) be followed and documented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u> 	

C . 2 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.2.01 Chemical Usage

In addition, the standard 2.3.3 requires that aquaculture drugs be used in accordance with the Pharmaceutical Affairs Law (Act No.145 of 14 1960) and other relevant regulations, and aquaculture farmers establish procedures for drug usage to minimize any impacts on the environment. It includes the indicators 2.3.3 A, 2.3.3 B and 2.3.3 C that require:

- In case medicines are used, proper measures be taken to prevent the contamination of other aquaculture animals and the spilling of medicines into the environment. (2.3.3 A)
- When medicines are used, the cage where the medicines are used, the name and dose of medicines, the date of medication, and the period of cessation be recorded. (2.3.3 B), and
- Information be recorded on aquaculture drugs such as record of purchase, manufacturer and retailer, serial numbers, date of production, purchase, and use, and administrated dosage in stock, etc., and aquaculture drugs be stored properly to prevent deterioration in their quality. (2.3.3 C)

C.2.02 Chemical Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires appropriate controls for all chemicals, incl. veterinary drugs, that enter the environment during or after use (whether already covered by GSSI Essential Components or not) in order to minimize adverse impacts on environmental quality. Manufacturer's guidance or equivalent directions should be followed, and where appropriate, relevant examples of chemicals</p>	<p>It is expected that the standard will require all chemicals used by the aquaculture facility and that will enter the environment are at least used according to the manufacturer's guidance (such as on label requirements or Safety Data Sheets (SDS) or, in the case of veterinary drugs, the guidance of the aquatic animal health professional to prevent adverse impacts upon the environment. Chemicals that pose a high risk of adverse impacts to environmental quality, examples of which should be specifically defined by the standard (e.g., copper-based anti-foulant treatments in marine cage aquaculture or anti-parasite or anti-microbe bath treatments), accepting that perceptions regarding high risk and the chemicals involved are subject to rapid change, or identified through a risk based self-</p>

C . 2 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.2.02 Chemical Usage

that pose a high risk of adverse impacts to environmental quality should be specifically defined by the standard

assessment by the farmer (e.g., an environmental risk assessment)--or through reference to a recognized relevant classification system (e.g. the UN Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)). It is expected that the standard or the risk-assessment will define any necessary additional requirements to minimize the impacts (e.g., EQS limits for copper residues in the benthic environment).

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.3.3 that requires that aquaculture drugs be used in accordance with relevant laws and regulations and that aquaculture farmers establish procedures for drug usage to minimize any impact on the environment. It also includes the indicator 2.3.3 A that requires that, in case medicines are used, proper measures be taken to prevent the contamination of other aquaculture animals and the spilling of medicines into the environment.

In addition, it includes the standard 4.1.1 that requires that the aquaculture equipment, cages and vessels be maintained regularly and painted not containing heavy metals and hazardous chemicals to prevent contamination of aquaculture facilities and surrounding areas.

The case of Sea Urchins and Scallops seem to be "not applicable" because both do not need medical treatment. However, they use industrial chemicals: a farmer of Sea Urchins uses lubricant oil for vegetable cutting machine to prepare feed, and farmers of Scallop use antifoul agent for nets and ship bottom paint for work boats. Thus these two reports have not left out.

References

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods,](#)
[AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA,](#)
[AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan,](#)
[and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.3 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.3.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires that the aquaculture facility and its daily operations ensure that good culture and hygienic conditions are maintained. Relevant aspects include proper management of all chemicals, fuels and feeds including their safe storage</p>	<p>This is a general Essential Component that covers a range of potential issues depending on the type of production system, species being cultured, and the local environment, and as such there is a need for flexibility in how consistency is achieved. It is expected that the following issues would be addressed and the systems verified to be operational:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate storage of chemicals and fuel (e.g., stored in a lockable, labeled facility, limited access by personnel, leakage prevention - all based on Safety Data Sheets (SDS) (see figure 4.14 of the A Guide to The Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS), available at: www.osha.gov/dsg/hazcom/ghsguideoct05.pdf) - Appropriate storage of feed (e.g., stored separately from sources of contamination, accurately labeled, keeping medicated and nonmedicated feed separated.) - Appropriate pest control (e.g., prevent contamination of feed, chemicals by rodents or insects etc.) - Domestic sewage control/disposal to avoid local contamination - General farm waste (e.g., empty feed bags, household rubbish, food containers etc.). 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>First, the MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.3.3 that requires that aquaculture farmers establish procedures for drug usage to minimize any impact on the environment, and the indicator 2.3.3 C requires that information be recorded on aquaculture drugs such as records of purchase, manufacturer and retailer, serial numbers, date of production, purchase, and use, and administrated dosage in stock, etc., and aquaculture drugs be stored properly to prevent deterioration in their quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan,</u> 	

C . 3 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.3.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

Second, it includes the standard 3.3.1 that requires that feeds, feed additives and feed ingredients be used responsibly to prevent chemical contamination, and traceable record on feeds used for each aquaculture unit be kept. The indicator 3.3.1 G requires that feed be properly stored to prevent contamination with harmful chemical substances or other contaminants.

Third, it includes the standard 4.1.1 that requires that the aquaculture equipment, cages and vessels be maintained regularly and painted not containing heavy metals and hazardous chemicals to prevent contamination of aquaculture facilities and surrounding areas, and the indicators 4.1.1 B, C, D and F require that Lubricating oil, paint, and detergent used for equipment in seawater be used properly to avoid adverse effects on the environment (B) and be stored to prevent deliberate or accidental inflow into the environment (C), antifoulant for nets and substances in the paint used for boats not contain any organic tin compound (D), and unneeded equipment (broken fishing nets, containers of chemical, etc.) be disposed of by appropriate methods and not left in the aquaculture farm (F).

Fourth, it includes the standard 4.1.2 that requires that water used for aquaculture be utilized in compliance with relevant laws and regulations, and the indicator 4.1.2 E requires that the quality of the wastewater satisfy the wastewater standards at in-land aquaculture facilities.

Last, it includes the standard 4.1.4 that requires that waste disposal from aquaculture operated in closed water be managed properly to prevent negative impact on the benthic environment.

and AA-4 Audit Report
AMS Yellowtail Shozuya
Suisan

C . 3 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.3.02 General Environmental Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that aquaculture facility infrastructure is appropriately maintained in order to prevent negative environmental impacts, whether from construction, operation or decommissioning (e.g., including the requirement for derelict equipment and materials to be collected and disposed of responsibly.)</p>	<p>Given the wide variety of production systems in aquaculture specific guidance cannot be provided and flexibility by the evaluator is required using a risk-based approach. Examples could include the requirement for derelict or damaged gear in shellfish or cage aquaculture to be collected and disposed of responsibly, or for that waste from pond construction is not placed in mangrove forests in shrimp farming. It is expected that specific requirements or risk based management systems would be required where appropriate, along with suitable verification. These requirements may also be included in other Standards, such as sensitive habitat protection or escape prevention.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 3.5.3 that requires that equipment, machinery, and packing materials for the shipment be maintained in hygienic conditions, and the indicator 3.5.3 D requires that these used for shipping be properly stored to prevent contamination with vermin.</p> <p>It also includes the standard 4.1.1 that requires that the aquaculture equipment, cages and vessels be maintained regularly and painted not containing heavy metals and hazardous chemicals to prevent contamination of aquaculture facilities and surrounding areas, and the indicator 4.1.1 F requires that unneeded equipment (broken fishing nets, etc.) be disposed of by appropriate methods and not left in the aquaculture farm.</p> <p>Furthermore, the standard 4.1.4 requires that waste disposal from aquaculture operated in closed water be managed properly to prevent negative impacts on the benthic environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods</u>, <u>AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA</u>, <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan</u>, and <u>AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u>

C.4 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.4 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.4.01 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the aquaculture facility to sources feed from a manufacturer that can trace aquatic feed ingredients including fish meal and fish oil (>1% inclusion) to the species and, at least, to the country of origin.</p>	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the following standards and indicators require the resource information.</p> <p>Primarily, the standard 3.3.1 requires feed, feed additives, and feed ingredients be used responsibly to prevent chemical contamination, and traceable records on feed used for each aquaculture unit be kept as well. It includes the indicators 3.3.1 B and C that require that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Information on manufactured feed and feed additives is recorded, such as the manufacturer, provider, name of the product, serial number, quantity, date of purchase, composition, etc.; and records be stored (3.3.1 B). · For manufactured feed and feed additives, documentation be obtained and kept showing conformity with the Act on Safety Assurance and Quality Improvement of Feeds and the origin of manufactured feed ingredients (for fish meal, oil, etc., the species of the raw fish material, and whether the identification of the fishing water is traceable) (3.3.1 C). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u>

C . 4 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.4.01 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

Similarly, the standard 4.2.2 that requires that the species and origin of fish used to produce fish meal and fish oil be traceable. It includes the indicators 4.2.2 B and C that require that;

- Information on manufactured feed and feed additives, such as the manufacturer, provider, name of the product, serial number, quantity, date of purchase, composition, etc. be recorded and records of purchase be kept (4.2.2 B), and
- Warranty documents be obtained for manufactured feeds and feed additives showing conformity with the relevant regulations, the origin of manufactured feed materials (fish meal, oil, etc., must be traceable to identify the species of the raw material fish and fishing area), or records be made of oral representations by suppliers and be kept (4.2.2 C).

As supplementary information, Kurose Suisan and Shozuya Suisan obtained a certificate of quality for feed or certificate of product history for feed from feed manufactures: Skretting and Farm Choice for Kurose Suisan, and Hayashikane Sangyo for Shozuya Suisan. These documents showed the species, country of origin, etc. in detail. CB filed the evidences at their office.

C.4.02 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer who produces feed that excludes fishmeal and fish oil from	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.

C . 4 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.4.02 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

endangered species and is validated as such.	Endangered species are expected to be defined in the Standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam’s Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.
Conclusion	References
The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.2.2 that requires that the species and origin of fish used to produce fish meal and fish oil be traceable, and the indicator 4.2.2 F requires that the fish used as a material for fish meal and fish oil not be endangered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</i>

C.4.03 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that prohibits the use of fishmeal and fish oil from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (I.U.U.).	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.
Conclusion	References
The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.2.2 that requires that the species and origin of fish used to produce fish meal and fish oil be traceable, and the indicator 4.2.2 E requires that only feeds, not originate from illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) sources, be used.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</i>

C . 4 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.4.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that has a written policy which includes assessment of source fishery status and identification of improvement needs and work plan to deliver improvements. The policy must include a commitment and timeline to source aquaculture and fishery products from responsible/best practice sources, such as those certified a standard benchmarked at minimum consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines or by identified independent risk assessment.</p>	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.2.2 that requires that the species and origin of fish used to produce fish meal and fish oil be traceable, and the indicator 4.2.2 D requires that the written policy for responsible procurement of feed ingredients be obtained from the feed manufacturer, and its guideline text mentions, "The auditor shall confirm that the applicant obtains the written policy for responsible procurement of feed ingredients from the feed manufacturer and the policy must include the consideration for conservation of target stocks used as feed ingredients."</p> <p>As supplementary explanation, Kurose Suisan and Shozuya Suisan certainly obtained a written policy from feed manufacturers or feed meal manufacturers: Kurose Suisan obtained it from Skretting and Farm Choice, and Shozuya Suisan obtain Peruvian fish meal supplier's certification of IFFO RS (renamed to Marine Trust) through Hayashikane Sangyo. CB filed these evidences at their office.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u>

C . 4 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.4.05 Feed Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard prohibits the use of raw fish as a direct feed source in grow-out.</p>	<p>0% of feed at any time during production (under the scope of certification) may contain “whole fish” or “wet fish”, which includes any form of uncooked wet fish (whole or chopped or frozen etc.), which includes direct feed, supplemental feeding, or on-farm made applications. Alternatives would be to require 100% use of commercial dry pelleted feeds.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a suitable review of evidence, such as feed use records, visual observation, and financial records in aquaculture industries where this is common practice.</p> <p>A non-applicable (N/A) designation is only acceptable where 100% of production under the scope of the standard (including species, production intensity and production systems covered) uses entirely commercial dry pelleted feeds (e.g., Atlantic salmon).</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.2.3 that requires, in principle, the unprocessed fish such as whole fish caught, mollusks, crustaceans, etc., not be used as a direct feed source during the rearing stage of cultured fish, and the indicator 4.2.3 A requires that unprocessed fish not be used as a direct feed source.</p> <p>In addition, the indicator 4.2.3 B requires that moist pellet not continuously be used for feeding during the rearing stage. In the case of exceptional use, moist pellet should be prepared and fed in accordance with the methods that meet all the specified conditions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u>

C.4 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.4.06 Feed Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standards prohibits aquatic feed protein from the same species and genus as the species being farmed.	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer).	
Conclusion	References	
The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.2.3 that requires that, in principle, the unprocessed fish such as whole fish caught, mollusks, crustaceans, etc., not be used as a direct feed source during the rearing stage of cultured fish, and the indicator 4.2.3 C requires that use as feed of the same species or same genus as the cultured fish be prohibited.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u> 	

C.4.07 Feed Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
Where applicable, the standard requires that the aquaculture facility has suitable measures in place to ensure that feed is used efficiently at the individual production unit level.	Suitable measures are expected to be part of a wider feed management system, such as the measurement of FCR (Feed Conversion Ratio) and FIFO (Fish In Fish Out ratio) as well as documented records of visual feed response and staff training. Verification that the measures are operational and fit for purpose is also expected.	
Conclusion	References	
The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.1.4 that requires that aquaculture farmers use suitable feed matched to the nutritional requirements of aquatic animals, with proper quantities for maintaining their healthy condition. The indicator 2.1.4 D requires that the amounts of feed given to aquatic animals are recorded for each rearing unit, and 2.1.4 E requires that a proper amount of feed be adjusted and given to the aquatic animals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS</u> 	

C . 4 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.4.07 Feed Biosecurity

In addition, it includes the standard 4.2.4 that requires that the amount of fish meal and fish oil in feed be reduced appropriately during the rearing stage of cultured fish, the indicator 4.2.4 A requires that manufactured feed containing low amount of fish meal be used during the rearing stage of culture fish, and the indicator 4.2.4 B requires that efforts be made to reduce the proportion of fish oil used to the extent that it can be substituted by fish oil from fishery processing residue or vegetable oil and fat. This requirement was stipulated primarily for the purpose of environment concern, but it could be interpreted as a measure of feed efficiency and feed management improvement.

[Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.4.08 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
<p>The standard requires that appropriate records are kept on all feed use. At a minimum this must include: feed source, feed Batch/Lot/ID number, date of purchase, and feed conversion ratio (FCR) MT</p>	<p>Appropriate records are expected to include those stated in the component, and, where appropriate, feed inclusion percentages of fishmeal and fish oil or a fish in: fish out ratio. Appropriate records are expected to be kept for each individual production unit. Verification of appropriate record keeping and suitable documentation from feed manufacturers is also expected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose</u>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 3.3.1 that requires that traceable record on feeds used for each aquaculture unit be kept, and the indicators 3.3.1 B and C require that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Information on manufactured feed and feed additives be recorded, such as the manufacturer, provider, name of the product, serial number, quantity, date of purchase, composition, etc.; and records be stored (3.3.1 B), and 	

C . 4 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.4.08 Record Keeping

· For manufactured feed and feed additives, documentation be obtained and kept showing conformity with the relevant laws and regulations and the origin of manufactured feed ingredients (for fish meal, oil, etc., the species of the raw material fish, and whether the identification of the fishing water be traceable). (3.3.1 C)

In addition, it includes the standard 4.2.2 that requires that the species and origin of fish used to produce fish meal and fish oil be traceable, and the indicators 4.2.2 B and C require that;

- Information on manufactured feed and feed additives, such as the manufacturer, provider, name of the product, serial number, quantity, date of purchase, composition, etc. be recorded and records of purchase be kept (4.2.2 B), and
- Warranty documents be obtained for manufactured feeds and feed additives showing conformity with the relevant laws and regulations, the origin of manufactured feed materials (fish meal, oil, etc., must be traceable to identify the species of the raw material fish and fishing area), or records made of oral representations by suppliers and be kept (4.2.2 C).

*Suisan, and AA-4
Audit Report AMS
Yellowtail Shozuya
Suisan*

C.5 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.5.01 Benthic Habitats

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>For cage production systems, the standard requires appropriate management measures for preventing excessive impacts of aquaculture facility waste on benthic environments, including impacts of a biological, chemical or physical nature.</p>	<p>Appropriate measures for marine cage production systems are expected to consider biological, chemical and physical impacts and additional chemical residues resulting from culture practices and should use appropriate sampling methods. Where relevant, they should conform to ISO 16665. The use of systems combining suitable allowable zones of effect and environmental quality standards (EQS) of effect are expected. Verification that the measures are operational and fit for purpose is expected. Evidence of the prevention of adverse impacts could include comparisons with baseline conditions, reference locations, or standardized limits with a suitable justification for their use. Where adverse impacts are detected it is expected that appropriate mitigation measures/ remedial action for the identified adverse impacts on the surrounding natural ecosystem are applied. Sanctions that address situations where EQS' are exceeded and there is no effective remediation within a suitable timeframe could include withholding certification. While generally recognized as a marine cage issue, benthic impacts can also occur in freshwater cage systems. The degree of management measures should reflect the degree of potential impacts relative to the environment, production system, species, and size of production.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 4.1 that requires that aquaculture activities be carried out in accordance with suitable operating procedures established to minimize environmental impact caused by aquaculture equipment and materials, excretions of aquatic animals, and feed residues.</p> <p>It also includes the standard 4.1.3 that requires that the density of fish be controlled adequately, and organic matter be monitored to prevent increased sedimentation of organic matter and occurrence of de-oxygenated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods</i>, <i>AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA</i>, <i>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan</i>, and <i>AA-4 Audit Report</i> 	

C . 5 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.5.01 Benthic Habitats

water, and the 4.1.4 that requires waste disposal from aquaculture operated in closed water be managed properly to prevent negative impact on the benthic environment.

In addition, it includes the standards 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 that require that;

- Aquaculture farmers use proper water in accordance with Water Quality Standards for Fisheries based on the type of target species and their life stage (2.1.1),
- Aquaculture farmers provide sufficient cage space and a suitable rearing density to maintain satisfactory environmental conditions at the growing site (2.1.2), and
- Aquaculture farmers monitor the environmental conditions of the farming site by using proper indicators. Appropriate procedures shall be established for dealing with deteriorating conditions (2.1.3).

The indicator 2.1.1 B requires, specifically on water and benthic environment, that contamination indicators, such as COD, and total nitrogen level for seawater, as well as COD and TS on the bottom, meet the water quality standards for fisheries.

AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan

C.5.02 Predator Control

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard prohibits the use of any lethal predator control techniques on endangered species. Exceptions for worker safety and where euthanization is an act of	Verification of the predator controls used, appropriate record keeping, and details of the endangered species in the region of the aquaculture facility are expected. Examples of supporting evidence of non-use could include interview, appropriate signage, and mortality records. Exceptions for worker safety and where euthanization is an act of mercy are acceptable and expected.

C.5 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.5.02 Predator Control

mercy are acceptable and expected.

Endangered species are expected to be defined in the standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam’s Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.4.2 that requires that, in case a hazardous organism belongs to an endangered species, the species be eliminated through non-lethal measures, except when there is concern about the safety of workers or when priority is given to euthanasia of a moribund organism.

References

- [*AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods*](#), [*AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA*](#), [*AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan*](#), and [*AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan*](#)

C.5.03 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

GSSI Component

The standard requires that in areas where damage of sensitive habitats has occurred previously, and where restoration is possible and effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed.

Guidance

It is expected that the standard will define sensitive habitat in context with its scope and an appropriate date to be used prior to which legal impacts can be “grandfathered in” and provide supporting evidence for the date. Verification at the aquaculture facility is expected to include whether restoration is necessary, to what degree (evidence could include maps, aerial photos, satellite images, government certification etc.) and whether that the active restoration is suitable (i.e., will it be successful and restore a suitable area of sensitive habitat).

C . 5 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.5.03 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 4.4 that requires that aquaculture be operated properly to minimize any impacts on the aquaculture sites and surrounding environment. It also includes the standard 4.4.1 that requires that, in case sensitive habitat is identified, recovery of resources be carried out.

The indicators 4.4.1 A and 4.4.1 B require that;

- The area of the aquaculture operation not be, or not be adjacent to, a habitat of endangered species (4.4.1 A), and
- If the area of the aquaculture operation or its surrounding area be or be adjacent to a habitat of endangered species, proper measures be taken to prevent impact on the habitat (4.4.1 B).

References

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.6 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.6.01 Record Keeping	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the establishment, implementation and maintenance of an appropriate record keeping system for all seed that is intentionally stocked.	<p>An appropriate records system may include source of the seed, date of purchase, stocking density, vaccination record of the seed, and stocked seed batch identification.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 3.5 that requires that traceability be assured at all rearing stages. It also includes the standard 3.5.1 that has the indicator 3.5.1 A that requires that the date of landing and the total weight (or number of individuals) be recorded for each rearing unit.</p> <p>In addition, it includes the standard 2.2.4 that requires that seed be certified free from specific or material pathogens before introduction to aquaculture sites, and the indicator 2.2.4 A requires that the rearing history of the aquaculture seeds before introducing them into the site be confirmed and recorded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods</u>, <u>AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA</u>, <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan</u>, and <u>AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan</u>

C . 6 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.6.02 Wild Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that where the deliberate use of wild seed is justifiable, it is collected in a manner that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensures controls are in place so that the collection of seed is not detrimental to the status of the wild target and non-target populations, nor that of the wider ecosystem. This requires a documented management approach that ensures those wild populations are not overfished and not subject to recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, and avoids, minimizes or mitigates fishing impacts on essential habitats and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear; - Avoids the use of environmentally damaging collection practices; <p>And ensures that the source fishery is regulated by an appropriate authority.</p>	<p>Expected examples of “justifiable use” include where there is a lack of commercially-available hatchery-raised seed, inability/lack of technology to hatchery-raised the farmed species, or passive collection of mollusks. Justification could be offered at the standard or aquaculture facility level. Verification is expected to include the need to provide suitable evidence by the aquaculture facility (e.g., a summary report written by a credible 3rd party on the source fishery, a self-certification by the appropriate management authority, a 3rd party fishery certification that verifies suitable compliance).</p> <p>A documented management approach is expected to follow Component D.3.01 where the standard requires the existence of documented management approaches or other management framework covering the unit of certification and the stock under consideration, including management measures consistent with achieving management objectives for the stock under consideration. Expected outcomes of the management approach are described in the Guidance of D.6.01 Target Stock Status, D.6.05 Non-Target Catches, D.6.06 Endangered Species, and D.6.07 Habitat, respectively. Definitions of terms related to wild fisheries can be found in Section D terms of the Glossary.</p> <p>Examples of environmentally damaging collection practices include blast, poison, and Muro-ami fishing practices.</p>
Conclusion	References

C . 6 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.6.02 Wild Seed

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 4.3 that requires that seed be used properly to minimize any impact on natural resources.

It also includes the standard 4.3.2 that requires that the use of wild seeds be justifiable when seed are collected legally without negative impact on natural resources and the environment.

Reference: AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan

- [AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods](#), [AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA](#), [AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan](#), and [AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.6.03 Hatchery Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that hatchery-raised seed are free from relevant/important pathogens before stocking for grow-out.	<p>Relevant/important pathogens are expected to include those identified by the aquatic health professional and sources such as the OIE/ transboundary disease lists (See Chapter 1.3 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code 2015 http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/aquatic-code/access-online/).</p> <p>Verification of suitable measures is expected to include reviews of disease-testing methods, the disease tested for, and the results (including ISO 23893-1:2007), and the vaccination record of the seed. This could form part of the aquatic animal health management plan.</p>	
Conclusion		References

C . 6 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.6.03 Hatchery Seed

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 2.2 that requires that aquatic animals be maintained under appropriate management to prevent disease outbreak and spread. It includes the standard 2.2.4 that requires that seed be certified free from specific or material pathogens before introduction to aquaculture sites.

In addition, it includes the criterion 4.3 that requires that seed be used properly to minimize any impact on natural resources, and the standard 4.3.1 that requires that hatchery-raised seed be used preferentially at the aquaculture site where the seed is available.

It also includes the indicators 4.3.1 B and 4.3.1 C require that seeds be examined and separated if necessary and imported seed be tested and certified as disease-free.

- Reference

- [AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.7 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.7 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.7.01 Escapes	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility establishes, implements, and maintains an appropriate system to minimize the unintentional release or escape of cultured species. This should include monitoring and management of the physical facilities and practices	<p>An appropriate system is expected to be based on an evaluation of the likelihood of events and the magnitude of impacts on surrounding environment (where risk assessments are used they met use a suitable scientific method and taking into consideration, siting, culture practices, local environmental conditions, including extreme events, and other relevant uncertainties) according to the precautionary approach and possible impacts on surrounding natural ecosystems, including fauna, flora, and habitat. Specific requirements stated in the standard are acceptable.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence of an operational and fit for purpose system.</p> <p>The monitoring of the management practices could include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Measures for escape detection ii) Monitoring for and record keeping of escapes events iii) Suitable training of employees iv) Incident management and infrastructure, including response or recapture measures. v) Regular monitoring and maintenance of the culture system vi) Regular review and failure analysis vii) Containment infrastructure (relative to the species being farmed and the production system individual elements can be “Not Applicable” with these considerations).
Conclusion	References
The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 2.2.3 that requires that aquaculture farmers manage their facilities to prevent escape.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods, AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop

C . 7 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.7.01 Escapes

It also includes the indicators 4.4.1 C and 4.4.1 D that require that the number of aquaculture animals escaping from the aquaculture sites be recorded during the transfer of animals or in a natural disaster (e.g., typhoon), and proper measures be taken to prevent the escape of aquaculture animals.

Aomori PFCA, AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan

C.7.02 Genetically Modified Organisms

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>In the case where the culture of GMO organisms is permitted, the standard requires a suitable evaluation of the risk of environmental impacts.</p>	<p>A suitable evaluation is expected to have been performed using an appropriate scientific method that assesses the likelihood of events and the magnitude of impacts, and take into account relevant uncertainties according to the precautionary approach. The evaluation should consider the possible impacts on genetic diversity, aquatic communities and ecosystems. Where ICES Code of Practice on the Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms 2005 is relevant, consistency with these requirements on genetically modified organisms (GMO) is also expected. Verification is expected to include a review of supporting evidence.</p>
Conclusion	References

C.7 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.7.02 Genetically Modified Organisms

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the standard 4.3.3 that requires the use of genetically modified organisms be prohibited without proper implementation of an environmental assessment.

- [AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan, and AA-4 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Shozuya Suisan](#)

C.8 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.8.01 Salinization	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the aquaculture facility establishes, implements, and maintains an appropriate system that addresses the impact of salinization of freshwater resources and the surrounding environment by the aquaculture facility.</p>	<p>An exemption for standards that do not cover land-based saline water systems is expected.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are expected to be based on risk assessments or standardized requirements. Controls could include relevant monitoring of freshwater resources (e.g., groundwater resources, local water bodies, local soils) for salinity changes and measures such as pond-linings, limiting groundwater use and other control techniques. The standard is expected to prohibit the aquaculture facility to contributing to changing freshwater resources and the surrounding environment to saline conditions. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose, such as a visual inspection of the site.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 4.1 that requires that aquaculture activities be carried out in accordance with suitable operating procedures established to minimize environmental impact.</p> <p>The standard 4.1.2 requires that salinization of fresh water be controlled to maintain water quality at the aquaculture sites and surrounding environment, and the indicator 4.1.2 F requires that, in case seawater fish aquaculture is conducted at in-land aquaculture facilities and wastewater is drained into freshwater areas, the concentration of chloride ion in the vicinity of drainage outlet be less than 200mg/l.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AA-5 Audit Report AMS Ver.1.0 Mori Ayu Land Aqua Std.4.1.2</i>

C . 8 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.8.01 Salinization

Unfortunately, there are no cases in Ver.2.0 that can provide evidence of alignment for this component because of only four certifications. Yet, we have a good example in Ver.1.0. Mori YogyoJo (Mori Fish Farm), Ayu (Sweetfish), Land-based Aquaculture is the best example to show how waste seawater is drained into freshwater with proper treatment (reduce saline concentration). The indicator 4.1.2 F of Ver.2.0 was moved from that of 4.1. 2 G of Ver.1.0, and the text and concept itself have not changed at all. Furthermore, Mori has a strong intention to transition from Ver.1.0 to Ver.2.0 at the time of next annual audit in the near future (probably, May 2023).

C.8.02 Water Use

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>Where appropriate (e.g. land-based freshwater ponds supplied with groundwater and all culture systems where water resources are limiting) the standard requires that the aquaculture facility has appropriate management measures for efficient water use.</p>	<p>This requirement is based on Paragraph 47 of the Technical Guidelines on Aquaculture Certification state “Measures should be adopted to promote efficient water management and use, as well as proper management of effluents to reduce impacts on surrounding land, and water resources should be adopted.” GSSI recognizes that standards for efficient water management and use are not common in many current aquaculture standards. Generally it is expected that this Essential Component will only apply to aquaculture facilities that use land-based freshwater ponds supplied with groundwater and all culture systems where water resources are limiting. An exemption for all other production systems is expected. This can also be “not applicable” for standards that do not cover relevant production systems.</p> <p>Management measures may include a general promotion or awareness of efficient water use or actions that may lead to more efficient use. Where groundwater is used the standard is expected to require that the aquaculture facility establish, implement and maintain an appropriate system to</p>

C . 8 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.8.02 Water Use

prevent aquifer drawdown and negative impacts on freshwater resources and the surrounding environment caused by the facilities operations. Verification that the system is operational and fit for purpose is expected.

Conclusion

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 4.1 that requires that aquaculture activities be carried out in accordance with suitable operating procedures established to minimize environmental impact. The standard 4.1.2 requires that water used for aquaculture be utilized in compliance with relevant laws and regulations. The indicator 4.1.2 D requires that in-land aquaculture facilities obtain the rights of water usage from local government and use the amount of water within the permitted range.

The guideline test of indicator 4.1.2 D mentions, "This indicator requires the in-land aquaculture facilities to obtain the rights of water usage from local government and to use the water for aquaculture within the permitted range. The auditor shall confirm the permission issued by local government, the amount of intake water per hour (or the specification of water pump) and no decrease of water amount at the source due to water intake for aquaculture use last three years." These with an underline are the indicators in-land aqua-farmers have to comply with.

References

- Aquaculture Management Standard V2.0
- Aquaculture Management Standard Guidelines for Auditors - Indicators of Conformity - Version 2.0

C . 8 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.8.03 Water Quality

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires, where appropriate, management measures for effluents in order to reduce adverse impacts on the water quality of water bodies receiving effluents. Monitoring of the systems effluents against appropriate criteria is required.</p>	<p>Appropriate measures are expected to include.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring and recording of effluent or receiving water quality, and which may including key parameters that need to be addressed include, where applicable: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Nutrients – Nitrate/Nitrogen (impacts on seawater) ii) Nutrients – Phosphate/Phosphorous (impacts on freshwater) iii) Dissolved oxygen iv) Salinity v) Suspended Solids vi) pH 2. Defined, aquaculture appropriate, maximum reference points (e.g., general concentration limits or aquaculture facility-specific limits) or mandatory systems (e.g., presence of a suitable filter) are defined to prevent pollution 3. Where reference points are exceeded, the scheme either refuses certification or that mitigation methods are employed and monitored to meet a time bound goal to come into compliance. <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose, including visual inspection of the site. Where effluent concentration limits are used for compliance, independent verification of conformance is also expected.</p> <p>“Where appropriate” is expected to include standards that cover production systems that release effluent that has the potential to impact water quality, e.g., fed/intensive aquaculture in ponds and raceways. An exception for marine cage aquaculture and on or offbottom shellfish culture is expected.</p>
Conclusion	References

C . 8 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.8.03 Water Quality

The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 4.1 that requires that aquaculture activities be carried out in accordance with suitable operating procedures established to minimize environmental impact. The standard 4.1.2 requires that water used for aquaculture be utilized in compliance with relevant laws and regulations.

The Indicators 4.1.2 D and 4.1.2 E require that;

- In-land aquaculture facilities obtain the rights of water usage from local government and use the amount of water within the permitted range (4.1.2 D), and
- The quality of the wastewater satisfy the wastewater standards at in-land aquaculture facilities (4.1.2 E).

The guideline text of indicator 4.1.2 E mentions, "For in-land farming facilities, it is ideal to release the wastewater after proper treatment. There are no laws to regulate the wastewater from aquaculture farms in Japan. It must be confirmed that the wastewater meets the wastewater standard as follows:"

Examination Items	Criteria
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	< 10mg / L (river)
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	< 8mg / L (ocean)
Suspended Solids (SS)	< 50mg / L

Only the case of Sea Urchins is "applicable, which showed that it is in "conformity."

- [AA-1 Audit Report](#)
[AMS Sea Urchin KS](#)
[Foods](#)

C.9 AQUACULTURE STANDARD

C.9.01 Legal Compliance		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires (evidence of) compliance with all local and national laws and regulations relevant to aquaculture, especially concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application of chemicals and veterinary drugs - feed, feed ingredients and fertilizers - habitat and biodiversity (including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where required) - seed sourcing at both source and destination - Escapes and releases - water use, water quality and waste discharge 	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence provided by the aquaculture facility to support compliance with relevant laws. For feed, its ingredients & fertilizers, verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer).</p> <p>For seed sourcing this could include international laws (e.g., CITES, OIE and ICES import guidelines) and laws governing introductions and transfers of live aquatic animals.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The MEL Aquaculture Management Standard is in alignment because it includes the criterion 1.1 that requires that aquaculture operations be conducted in compliance with all the relevant laws, regulations and ordinances of national and local governments where the aquaculture site is located.</p> <p>The standard 1.1.2 requires that aquaculture farmers carry out production in compliance with all the relevant national and local laws and regulations, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishery Act (Act No.267 of 1949), Act on the Protection of Fishery Resources (Act No. 313 of 1951), • Sustainable Aquaculture Production Assurance Act (Act No.51 of 1999), • Act on Promotion of Inland Waters Fishery (Act No.103 of 2014), 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AA-1 Audit Report AMS Sea Urchin KS Foods</u>, <u>AA-2 Audit Report AMS Scallop Aomori PFCA</u>, <u>AA-3 Audit Report AMS Yellowtail Kurose Suisan</u>, and <u>AA-4 Audit Report AMS</u> 	

C . 9 A Q U A C U L T U R E S T A N D A R D

C.9.01 Legal Compliance

- Act on Securing Quality, Efficacy and Safety of Pharmaceuticals, Medical Devices, Regenerative and Cellular Therapy Products, Gene Therapy Products, and Cosmetics (Act No.145 of 1960),
- Act on Safety Assurance and Quality Improvement of Feeds (Act No.35 of 1953),
- Food Sanitation Act (Act No.233 of 1947) and Food Safety Basic Act (Act No.2003), and
- Other relevant laws and regulations.

Besides, the standard 2.3.4 requires the compliance with Principles for Responsible and Prudent Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Aquatic Animals of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code, the 4.1.2 requires the compliance with Water Pollution Prevention Act (Act No.138 of 1970), the 4.2.1 requires the compliance with Act on Safety Assurance and Quality Improvement of Feeds (Act No.35 of 1953), and the 4.4.1 requires the compliance with Basic Act on Biodiversity (Act No.58 of 2008) and Nature Conservation Act (Act No.85 of 1972).

Yellowtail Shozuya
Suisan

**SECTION D.
FISHERIES
CERTIFICATION
STANDARDS**



D.1 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.1.01 Designated Authority

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the existence of a fishery management organization or arrangement that manages the fishery of which the Unit of Certification is a part.	A "fisheries management organization or arrangement" is defined by FAO (see Glossary). This term is used throughout the benchmarking framework and is intended to represent the "designated authority" mentioned in paragraphs 29.2 (36.2) and 29.4 (36.5) of the FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines. In this context it is essentially an entity holding the legal and generally recognized mandate for establishing fisheries management measures and taking management decisions such that those measures and decisions are legally enforceable. Where the stock under consideration is a transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock it might also encompass a Regional Fisheries Management Organization (RFMO) – see Essential Component D.1.07. The fisheries management organization or arrangement may also be part of relevant traditional, fisher or community approaches to the management of the stock under consideration, provided their performance can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not just hearsay).	
Conclusion		References
<p>Marine Eco-Label Japan (MEL) is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 1.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) An organization and system shall be established to manage the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part. There should be an established management organization and system in order to manage the unit of certification.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 1.1.2 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>AF-1, AF-3</i>

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.01 Designated Authority

Whether organizations and arrangements (such as a fisheries cooperative association, national/local organization, official research institute, etc.) which manage the fishery are established.

- References on the management organizations and arrangements for the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.1.2; 1.1.2 (a). p. 5.

Examples of these requirement(s) and indicator(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.1.1 (a). p. 38-39 and 1.1.2 (a). p. 40-41.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Clam) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.1.1 (a). p. 9-10 and 1.1.2 (a). p. 11-13.

D.1.02 Designated Authority

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that in order for the fishery management organization or arrangement to receive and respond to in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available (D.1.03-D.1.05) the fishery management organization or arrangement convenes regularly, as needed, to manage the integrated	The focus of this Essential Component is the capacity of the fishery management organization or arrangement to receive and respond to in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available. The FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines do not specify a requirement for any specific frequency or type of meetings of the fishery management organization or arrangement. Paragraph 29.3 refers to the requirement for timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of identified impacts of the fishery on the ecosystem. Principle 2.10 of the Guidelines requires that schemes be based on the best scientific evidence available. Best scientific evidence available is defined in the Glossary as a process by which scientific advice is commissioned and solicited by the management system. The wording of this Essential Component is intended to ensure that the Standard requires that this is done in a timely and organized way that is properly documented.

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.02 Designated Authority

process of information collection, stock assessment, planning, formulation of the management objectives and targets, establishing management measures and enforcement of fishery rules and regulations.

The CCRF also uses the word "timely" in many places in describing requirements for responsible fisheries management, e.g. Article 6.13 "timely solutions to urgent matters"; Article 7.4.4: "timely, complete and reliable statistics on catch and fishing effort are collected and maintained in accordance with applicable international standards and practices and in sufficient detail to allow sound statistical analysis. Such data should be updated regularly and verified through an appropriate system."; Article 12.3 requires that States should ensure that data generated by research are analyzed, that the results of such analyses are published, respecting confidentiality where appropriate, and distributed in a timely and readily understood fashion, in order that the best scientific evidence is made available as a contribution to fisheries conservation, management and development.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall be conducted based on the data and information collected, and management decisions shall be made accordingly taking into account the assessment results. The methodology and results of the assessment shall be made publicly available in a timely manner.

Indicator(s) 2.4 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether the fishery management organization or arrangement receives and responds in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available, and the fishery management organization or arrangement convenes regularly, as needed, to manage the integrated process of information collection, stock assessment, planning, formulation of the management objectives and targets, establishing management measures and enforcement of fishery rules and regulations.

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.02 Designated Authority

- Existence of a comprehensive fishery management organization or arrangement which receives and responds in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available
- Existence of a fishery management organization or arrangement which conducts comprehensive fishery management.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.4; Indicators 2.4 (c). p. 25-27.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):
 AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (c). p. 110-111.
 AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Clam) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (c). p. 57-58.

D.1.03 Best Scientific Evidence Available

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the fishery management organization or arrangement receives and responds to in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available regarding the status of the stock under consideration and the likelihood and magnitude of adverse	This essential component is about the taking into account of the best scientific evidence available by the Fishery Management Organization in a timely manner. This relates to both stock status and fishery impacts, hence all are mentioned in the component language. Best scientific evidence available is described in the Glossary. For the stock under consideration it can derive from assessments of stock status outside of what is regarded as a traditional “stock assessment”, accommodating techniques for data limited fisheries and including traditional knowledge, providing its validity can be objectively verified. The actions of the fishery management organization or arrangement in both receiving and responding to the best scientific evidence available must be in accordance with the Precautionary

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.03 Best Scientific Evidence Available

impacts of the unit of certification on the stock under consideration and the ecosystem.

Approach (D.1.06). This Essential Component is also linked to those in D.3 that cover the collection and handling of data and information.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall be conducted based on the data and information collected, and management decisions shall be made accordingly taking into account the assessment results. The methodology and results of the assessment shall be made publicly available in a timely manner.

Indicator(s) 2.4 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether the fishery management organization or arrangement receives and responds in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available related to the status of the stock under consideration and the likelihood and magnitude of adverse impacts of the unit of certification on the stock under consideration and the ecosystem,, and the fishery management organization or arrangement convenes regularly, as needed, to manage the integrated process of information collection, stock assessment, planning, formulation of the management objectives and targets, establishing management measures and enforcement of fishery rules and regulations.

- Existence of a comprehensive fishery management organization or arrangement which receives and responds in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available
- Existence of a fishery management organization or arrangement which conducts comprehensive fishery management.

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.03 Best Scientific Evidence Available

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):
Indicators 2.4 (c). p. 25-27.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (c). p. 110-111.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (c). p. 57-58.

D.1.04 Best Scientific Evidence Available

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that management objectives take into account the best scientific evidence available.	<p>This Essential Component applies to all management objectives referred to in Essential Components under Performance Area D.2.</p> <p>Best scientific evidence available is described in the Glossary. It can come from assessments of stock status outside of the typical “stock assessment”, accommodating techniques for data limited fisheries and including traditional knowledge, providing its validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic process, and is not simply hearsay).</p> <p>Note that the requirement for the management system to take into account the best scientific evidence available is not inconsistent with the Precautionary Approach (see Essential Component D.1.06), which requires inter alia that the absence of adequate scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures. Both of these requirements apply.</p>	
Conclusion		References

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.04 Best Scientific Evidence Available

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall be conducted based on the data and information collected, and management decisions shall be made accordingly taking into account the assessment results. The methodology and results of the assessment shall be made publicly available in a timely manner.

Indicator(s) 2.4 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether an assessment is conducted with the best scientific evidence available. Further, whether an adaptive management with precautionary approach is implemented with regard to the result of the assessment.

- Implementation of a assessment with the best scientific evidence available
- Implementation of the adaptive management with precautionary approach based on the assessment above

Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.

Indicator(s) 2.5 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether the management objectives and management measures to achieve the management objectives exist based on the Best Scientific Evidence Available and consistent with the long term sustainable use of the fisheries resources under management and management measures to achieve the management objectives exist.

- Existence of management objectives (including those equivalent thereto)
- Existence of management measures (including those equivalent thereto)

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.04 Best Scientific Evidence Available

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.4 and 2.5; Indicators 2.4 (a). p. 25-27. and 2.5 (b). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (a). p. 98-107. and 2.5 (b). p. 119-122.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (a). p. 53-54. and 2.5 (b). p. 62-63.

D.1.05 Best Scientific Evidence Available

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that management measures implemented through the management system to achieve the management objectives are based on the best scientific evidence available.	<p>This Essential Component applies to all management measures referred to in Essential Components under Performance Area D.5.</p> <p>Best scientific evidence available is described in the Glossary. Note that it includes traditional knowledge and can come from assessments of stock status outside of a typical stock assessment, accommodating techniques for data limited fisheries, providing their validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic process, and is not simply hearsay).</p> <p>Note also that the requirement for the management system to take into account the best scientific evidence available is not inconsistent with the Precautionary Approach (see Essential Component D.1.06), which requires inter alia that the absence of adequate scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures. Both of these requirements apply.</p>

Conclusion

References

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.05 Best Scientific Evidence Available

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.

Indicator(s) 2.5 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether the management objectives and management measures to achieve the management objectives exist based on the Best Scientific Evidence Available and consistent with the long term sustainable use of the fisheries resources under management and management measures to achieve the management objectives exist.

- Existence of management objectives (including those equivalent thereto)
- Existence of management measures (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (b). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (b). p. 119-122.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (b). p. 62-63.

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.06 Precautionary Approach

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the precautionary approach is applied widely through the management system to the conservation, management and exploitation of living aquatic resources in order to protect them and preserve the aquatic environment.</p>	<p>The General Principles and Article 6.5 of the CCRF prescribe a precautionary approach to all fisheries, in all aquatic systems, regardless of their jurisdictional nature, recognizing that most problems affecting the fishing sector result from insufficiency of precaution in management regimes when faced with high levels of uncertainty.</p> <p>The precautionary approach referred to in this Essential Component is that elaborated in the FAO Document: Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions, FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 2. Rome, FAO. 1996.</p> <p>To meet this Essential Component, the standard must require inter alia that the management system uses a suitable method of risk management to take into account relevant uncertainties in the status of the stock under consideration and the impacts of the unit of certification on that stock and the ecosystem, including those associated with the use of introduced or translocated species. Where the application of less quantitative and data demanding approaches results in greater uncertainty, the management system should apply more precaution, which may necessitate lower levels of utilization of the resource.</p> <p>The FAO Guidelines (Paragraph 29.6) state that the absence of adequate scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures.</p> <p>The FAO Guidelines (Paragraph 31) note that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks. This issue can be addressed by taking a risk assessment/risk management approach (see also D.4.07).</p> <p>The FAO Guidelines (Paragraph 32) also note that a past record of good management performance could be considered as supporting evidence of the adequacy of the management measures and the management system.</p> <p>The suitability of the method of risk management applied should be assessed by the technical team undertaking the assessment for certification.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>References</p>
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the Guidelines for Auditors of the Fisheries Management Standard state as follows;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AF-1, AF-3</i>

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.06 Precautionary Approach

Requirement 1.2.6 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Taking due account of various uncertainty inherent in fisheries stocks, ecosystem and stock management, precautional fisheries management is undertaken. There shall be a mechanism to change and improve management measures in an adaptive manner depending on the status of the stock under consideration and of the ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 1.2.6 (a) in the Guidelines for Auditors of the Fisheries Management Standard

(a) Whether a mechanism exists in order to change and improve management measures in an adaptive manner to unexpected changes of the situation on the stock under consideration and relative matters due to environmental changes, etc.

- Existence of the mechanism of precautionary measures and adaptive management

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the Guidelines for Auditors of the Fisheries Management Standard: Requirements 1.2.6; Indicators 1.2.6 (a).

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.6 (a). p. 62-63.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.6 (a). p.34-36.

D.1.07 International Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
Where the stock under consideration is a transboundary fish stock, straddling	This Essential Component is intended to build on D.1.01 to provide greater specificity in the event that the stock under consideration is a transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.07 International Management

fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock, the standard requires the existence of a bilateral, subregional or regional fisheries organization or arrangement, as appropriate that is concerned with the management of the whole stock unit over its entire area of distribution.

stock or high seas fish stock. In this case, as well as the national authority with the legal and generally recognized mandate for establishing fisheries management measures and taking management decisions, there is expected to be an international institution or arrangement established (usually between two or more States) to be responsible for coordination of activities related to fisheries management over the entire area of distribution of the stock. This is to make sure that management of these stocks and fleets that fish on them is coordinated at the international level. Activities of the international institution or arrangement may include consultation between parties to the agreement or arrangement, formulation of fishery regulations and their implementation, allocation of resources, collection of information, stock assessment, as well as monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS). (e.g. a Regional Fisheries Management Organization – RFMO). See also CCRF Article 7.1.3 et seq. See also D.1.11, D.1.12 and D.1.13.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 1.2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be a cooperative stock management system (organization) in the regions where the stock under consideration is utilized or in more extensive areas. If the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, for instance in the case of transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock, there shall be in compliance with stock management measures set by the competent management authorities.

Indicator(s) 1.2.4 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in case that the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, a cooperative international/regional/bilateral stock management system or organization exists, as appropriate, that is concerned with the management of the whole stock unit over itsentire area of distribution in addition to national/local system or organization to manage the stock under consideration.

References

- [AF-1, AF-4](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.07 International Management

- Existence of an regional stock management system or organization
- Existence of an international stock management system or organization

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.4; Indicators 1.2.4 (a). p. 13-14.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):
 AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.4 (a). p. 58-59.
 AF-4: (Kii Channel, Anchovy) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.4 (a). p. 26-27.

D.1.08 Participatory Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the governance and fisheries management system under which the unit of certification is	Participatory is described in the Glossary. Principle 2.4 (2.5) of the FAO Guidelines requires ecolabelling schemes to be transparent, including balanced and fair participation by all interested parties. Requiring the standard also to require that the governance and management system being assessed is participatory and transparent (i.e. not just the scheme/ standard itself) is consistent with paragraph 6.13 of the CCRF, which states that: States should, to the extent permitted by national laws and regulations, ensure that decision making processes are transparent and achieve timely solutions to urgent matters. States, in accordance with appropriate procedures, should facilitate consultation and the effective participation of industry, fishworkers, environmental and other interested organizations in decision-making

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.08 Participatory Management

managed to be both participatory and transparent, to the extent permitted by national laws and regulations.

with respect to the development of laws and policies related to fisheries management, development, international lending and aid.

To meet this Essential Component, the standard must require the fisheries management organization or arrangement to make information and advice used in its decision-making publicly available, to the extent allowed by national laws and regulations. While it is possible for an organization to be separately participatory or transparent, being one without the other is regarded as of much less value, hence both are needed to meet this Essential Component. A participatory approach to fisheries management requires there to be an opportunity for all interested and affected parties to be involved in the management process. This does not mean that stakeholders are necessarily required to have specific decision rights in the fishery, or that participatory mechanisms must be included in National laws, but there should be a consultation process that regularly seeks and accepts relevant information, including traditional, fisher or community knowledge and there should be a transparent mechanism by which the management system demonstrates consideration of the information obtained.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 1.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Decision-making process for the management of the unit of certification shall be transparent and ensuring participation of relevant stakeholders including related fishers, scientists and the government.

Indicator(s) 1.2.3 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether relevant fishers, researchers, administration officers and other relevant stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process in the fisheries management system under which the unit of certification is managed in order to be both participatory and transparent

- Existence of documents on the organization chart for the decision-making arrangement and participation list on the relevant stakeholders

References

- [AF-1](#), [AF-2](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.08 Participatory Management

Indicator(s) 1.2.3 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether any decision-making process with transparency exists.

- Existence of the rules for the decision-making process and the record of discussion

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.3; Indicators 1.2.3 (a)(b). p. 12.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.3 (a)(b). p. 55-57.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.3 (a)(b). p. 47-50.

D.1.09 Small Scale and/or Limited Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard is applicable to governance and management systems for small scale and/or data limited fisheries, with due consideration to the availability of data and the	<p>Being data limited is not necessarily synonymous with being small scale (hence the and/or in the Essential Component text), but the issues for fishery management may be similar.</p> <p>The scheme and standard should be applicable to any fishery that falls within the scheme's geographic scope, i.e. different types and scales of fisheries, including potentially small scale and/or data limited fisheries. If a scheme has a part of its standard that applies only to a subset of fisheries, such as small scale and/or data limited fisheries, then it needs to explain under what circumstances that part of the standard would be invoked.</p>

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.09 Small Scale and/or Limited Fisheries

fact that management systems can differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries.

This same logic would apply to other potential subsets of fisheries such as deep sea, low trophic level, salmon etc. This should not mean, however, the standard for these subsets of fisheries is fundamentally different (e.g. lowered) compared to the standard applicable to other fisheries. Being applicable to small scale and/or data limited fisheries relates to being able to take into consideration different kinds of information and utilize different fishery management approaches in a risk management context. In order to be applicable to governance and management systems for small scale and data limited fisheries, the standard should also be applicable to relevant traditional, fisher or community approaches used by the fisheries management organization or arrangement to manage the unit of certification, provided their performance can be objectively verified. Evidence to verify the performance of the relevant traditional, fisher or community approaches would need to be established by the certification body implementing the standard and could be derived, for example, from the assessment of conformance with other GSSI Essential Components, in particular those covering the Stock and Ecosystem Status and Outcomes (D.6).

If the scheme is generally applicable to all types of fisheries, (i.e. including small scale and/or data limited fisheries), then there is no need to explain the specific applicability, but in this case it may be harder for the scheme to demonstrate that the standard is indeed applicable to governance and management systems for small scale and/or data limited fisheries. In this context, it is important to recognize the great diversity of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, as well as the fact that there is no single, agreed definition of these terms (see the Glossary). Small-scale fisheries represent a diverse and dynamic subsector, often characterized by seasonal migration. The precise characteristics of the subsector vary depending on the location. Accordingly, GSSI does not prescribe a specific definition of small-scale fisheries or data limited fisheries.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

References

- [AF-7](#)
- [AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.09 Small Scale and/or Limited Fisheries

There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.

Indicator(s) 2.5 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, fisheries governance and management systems for those fisheries are prepared, with due consideration to the availability of data and the fact that management systems can differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries.

- Existence of small-scale fisheries or data limited fisheries

Indicator(s) 2.5 (e) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively verified and applied into the fisheries management system.

- Existence of verification methods of the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (d) and (e). p. 28-31.

In addition, MEL FMS explicitly describes that it is applicable to small scale fisheries in the Introduction (page 4, line 14) as follows:

2) FMS can be applied to the small-scale fisheries. Management systems differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries. Since the data of small-scale fisheries are limited, the historical record of good management practices could be considered as supporting evidence of the adequacy of the management measures and systems. However, if the scientific evidence about the impacts of fishery operation on the stock is uncertain, fishers shall take precautionary approaches to prevent adverse effects on sustainable fishery operations.

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.09 Small Scale and/or Limited Fisheries

<p>Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):</p> <p>AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (d). p. 65 and 2.5 (e). p. 66.</p> <p>AF-7: (Ishikari Bay, Herring) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (d). p. 72 and 2.5 (e). p. 72.</p>	
---	--

D.1.10 Management System Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires that the fisheries management system under which the unit of certification is managed operates in compliance with local, national and international laws and regulations, including the requirements of any regional fisheries management organization that exercises internationally recognized management jurisdiction over the fisheries on the stock under consideration.</p>	<p>Under this Essential Component the standard requires that the fisheries management system must operate legally (locally, nationally and internationally); the legality of the fishery (i.e. compliance with applicable fishing regulations) is covered under other requirements in this Performance Area. The term "fisheries management system" is distinct from the "fishery management organization or arrangement" Both of these terms are defined in the glossary.</p> <p>For the purposes of clarity, this Essential Component includes compliance with the rules and regulations of any RFMO/A that exercises internationally recognized management jurisdiction over fisheries on the stock under consideration in the high seas and implementation of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 61/105, paragraphs 76-95 concerning responsible fisheries in the marine ecosystem.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 1.2.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-4</u>

D.1.10 Management System Compliance

The unit of certification should be conducted in compliance with regulations and arrangements set by national and local governments following effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement.

Indicator(s) 1.2.1 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether an effective fisheries management system, including monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement, for the fishery of which the unite of certification is a part exists in accordance with relevant laws and regulations

- Existence of laws and regulations to effectively manage the fishery of which the unite of certification is a part
- Existence of the effective management system for the fishery of which the unite of certification is a part operates in accordance with relevant laws and regulations

Requirement 1.2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be a cooperative stock management system (organization) in the regions where the stock under consideration is utilized or in more extensive areas. If the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, for instance in the case of transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock, there shall be in compliance with stock management measures set by the competent management authorities.

Indicator(s) 1.2.4 (a) in FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in case that the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, a cooperative international/regional/bilateral stock management system or organization exists, as appropriate, that is concerned with the management of the whole stock unit over its entire area of distribution in addition to national/local system or organization to manage the stock under consideration.

- Existence of an regional stock management system or organization
- Existence of an international stock management system or organization

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.10 Management System Compliance

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.1 and 1.2.4; Indicators 1.2.1 (a). p. 8-9. and 1.2.4 (a). p. 13-14.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.1 (a). p. 46-47 and 1.2.4 (a). p. 58-59.

AF-4: (Kii Channel, Anchovy) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.1 (a). p. 17-18 and 1.2.4 (a). p. 26-27.

D.1.11 Fishery Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that the fishery of which the Unit of Certification is a part is managed under an effective legal framework at the local, national or regional (international) level as appropriate.	<p>Legal framework is described in the Glossary. An effective legal framework is one that is shown to be fit for purpose, such that the fishery seeking certification proceeds in an orderly and well controlled manner. An effective legal framework should enable the fisheries management organization or arrangement to perform its functions without hindrance from systemic and repeated illegal activity. An effective legal framework can be one that incorporates traditional, fisher or community approaches (e.g. co-management under community approaches) provided their performance can be objectively verified. With respect to fisheries in the high seas, the legal obligations of UNCLOS and UNFSA have particular relevance. See also Essential Component D.1.12 regarding the need for effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement of the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part.</p> <p>Evidence of the performance of the legal framework can be derived from the assessment of conformance with other Essential Components, in particular D.1.12 and D.1.13 covering compliance and enforcement.</p>	
Conclusion		References
MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-5</u>

D.1.11 Fishery Compliance

Requirement 1.2.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification should be conducted in compliance with regulations and arrangements set by national and local governments following effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement.

Indicator(s) 1.2.1 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether measures on the penalties against the laws and regulation including the fishery management measures exist and the penalties are appropriately executed to the violation against the laws and regulation including the fishery management measures.

- Existence of the record of appropriate execution of the penalties to the violation

Requirement 1.2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be a cooperative stock management system (organization) in the regions where the stock under consideration is utilized or in more extensive areas. If the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, for instance in the case of transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock, there shall be in compliance with stock management measures set by the competent management authorities.

Indicator(s) 1.2.4 (b) in FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in case that the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part is in compliance with stock management measures in accordance with national/local laws and regulations, which are also consistent with relevant regional/international laws and regulations.

- Existence of management measures for the fishery including the penalties against the measures and a report on execution of the penalties as applicable.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.1 and 1.2.4; Indicators 1.2.1 (b) p. 8-9. and 1.2.4 (b). p. 13-14.

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.11 Fishery Compliance

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.1 (b). p.48. and 1.2.4 (b). p. 60.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.1 (b). p. 22-23. and 1.2.4 (b). p. 32-34.

D.1.12 Fishery Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement of the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part.	<p>Effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement is described in the Glossary. Evidence of high levels of compliance in the fishery of which the Unit of Certification is a part with all applicable local, national and international laws and regulations (as appropriate, per Essential Component D.1.10) would be indicative of effective monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement. The suitability of monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement for the fishery of which the Unit of Certification is a part should be assessed by the technical team undertaking the assessment for certification relative to the standard.</p> <p>Both this Essential Component and Essential Component D.1.11 (effective legal framework) derive from Paragraph 29.5 (36.6) of the Ecolabelling Guidelines which refers to "the fishery". It is, therefore, the effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement of the "fishery" (see Glossary) that is the subject of this Essential Component, and this may extend beyond the unit of certification (as per paragraph 25 of the Guidelines, the unit of certification could encompass: the whole fishery, where a fishery refers to the activity of one particular gear-type or method leading to the harvest of one or more species; a sub-component of a fishery, for example a national fleet fishing a shared stock; or several fisheries operating on the same resources). If the stock under consideration is not transboundary, then the Standard need only be concerned with the effectiveness and suitability of the monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement activities at the national level for the fishery of which the Unit of Certification is a part. For transboundary</p>

D.1.12 Fishery Compliance

stocks, however, there are several Essential Components that apply such that the Standard must be concerned with fishery management and compliance at the international level and the status of the whole stock across its entire range. Essential Component D.1.11 covers the need for an effective legal framework at the local, national or regional (international) level as appropriate and Essential Component D.1.13 covers the need for the Unit of Certification to be operating in compliance with the requirements of local, national and international law and regulations. Under Essential Component D.1.07, where the stock under consideration is a transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock, the standard must require the existence of a bilateral, subregional or regional fisheries organization or arrangement (e.g. an RFMO), as appropriate, covering the stock under consideration over its entire area of distribution. This is to make sure that management of these stocks and fleets that fish on them is coordinated at the international level. RFMOs are not generally responsible directly for monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement; this is done by national authorities (i.e. of vessels operating within their waters of national jurisdiction and also of vessels flying their flag when they are fishing outside of those waters). If the Unit of Certification is part of a national fleet fishing on a transboundary stock, then it is still likely to be the effectiveness and suitability of the monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement activities at the national level which is of prime importance for certification. If the Unit of Certification covers all the fishing on the stock under consideration, then the monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement all of the national fleets is of concern. Note also that under Essential Component D.4.02 (assessment of the stock under consideration), the Standard must require assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration to consider total fishing mortality on that stock from all sources, and under Essential Component D.6.01, the stock under consideration must not be overfished. Hence any deficiencies in the monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement of fleets fishing on a stock under consideration that is a transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock that compromise the effective assessment of the status of that stock would need to be of concern for certification. Article 7.7.2 of the CCRF requires states to ensure that laws and regulations provide for sanctions applicable in respect of violations which are adequate in severity to be effective.

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.12 Fishery Compliance

Article 7.7.3 of the CCRF requires states, in conformity with their national laws, to implement effective fisheries monitoring, control, surveillance and law enforcement measures including, where appropriate, observer programs, inspection schemes and vessel monitoring systems. Standards may refer to these mechanisms as appropriate.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 1.2.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification should be conducted in compliance with regulations and arrangements set by national and local governments following effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement.

Indicator(s) 1.2.1 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether an effective fisheries management system, including monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement, for the fishery of which the unite of certification is a part exists in accordance with relevant laws and regulations

- Existence of laws and regulations to effectively manage the fishery of which the unite of certification is a part
- Existence of the effective management system for the fishery of which the unite of certification is a part operates in accordance with relevant laws and regulations

Indicator(s) 1.2.1 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether measures on the penalties against the laws and regulation including the fishery management measures exist and the penalties are appropriately executed to the violation against the laws and regulation including the fishery management measures.

- Existence of the record of appropriate execution of the penalties to the violation

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.1; Indicators 1.2.1 (a) and (b). p. 8-9.

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.12 Fishery Compliance

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.1 (a). p. 46-47. and 1.2.1 (b). p. 48.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.1 (a). p. 20-21. and 1.2.1 (b). p. 22.

D.1.13 Fishery Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the Unit of Certification operates in compliance with the requirements of local, national and international law and regulations.</p>	<p>This requirement covers the compliance of the Unit of Certification with all applicable laws and regulations. Paragraph 28 (35) of the Ecolabelling Guidelines requires compliance both by the fishery and the management system. The requirement for the management system to be in compliance with applicable laws and regulations is addressed in Essential Component D.1.10.</p> <p>Conformance with this Essential Component should be considered alongside Essential Component D.1.12 – the requirement for effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement. Conformance with this Essential Component requires there to be no evidence of systematic (methodical, regular, organized) or systemic (universal, throughout the system) non-compliance by fishers in the unit of certification with the requirements of local, national and international law and regulations. However, a lack of evidence of non-compliance by itself may not be sufficient if the monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement is not effective and suitable for the fishery. Evidence of non-compliance may come from a variety of sources, including local and national monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement programs, regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs), and third party bodies such as industry organizations and non-governmental organizations. The Standard should require all of these sources to be consulted and taken into consideration.</p>

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.13 Fishery Compliance

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 1.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated legally in accordance with national legislation, such as acquiring fishery license and permission necessary for operating the fisheries from the competent authority (i.e. national or prefectural governments).

Indicator(s) 1.1.1 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether the unit of certification is operated legally in accordance with followings.

- Existence of license/permission necessary for operating the fishery by the unit of certification issued by the competent authority such as the relevant national/local government.
- Existence of documents which verifies the legality of the fishery by the unit of certification in case that the unit of certification is not required for the license nor permission.

Requirement 1.2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be a cooperative stock management system (organization) in the regions where the stock under consideration is utilized or in more extensive areas. If the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, for instance in the case of transboundary fish stock, straddling fish stock, highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock, there shall be in compliance with stock management measures set by the competent management authorities.

Indicator(s) 1.2.4 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.13 Fishery Compliance

Whether, in case that the stock under consideration is managed at the international level, the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part is in compliance with stock management measures in accordance with national/local laws and regulations, which are also consistent with relevant regional/international laws and regulations.

- Existence of management measures for the fishery including the penalties against the measures and a report on execution of the penalties as applicable.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.1.1 and 1.2.4; Indicators 1.1.1 (a) p. 4. and 1.2.4 (b). p. 13-14.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.1.1 (a). p. 38-39 and 1.2.4 (b). p. 60.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.1.1 (a). p. 7-8 and 1.2.4 (b). p. 32-34.

D.1.14 Fishery Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the existence of documented management approaches or other management framework covering the unit of certification and the stock under consideration, including management	A documented management approach or other management framework is an important component of the Management System. It provides clarity and transparency with respect to how the system is intended to function. The establishment of management approaches for the stock under consideration may not be entirely within the purview of the fishery management organization or arrangement that manages the fishery of which the Unit of Certification is a part. The stock's distribution may extend beyond its area of jurisdiction and there may be other fisheries targeting the stock under consideration that fall under a separate administrative jurisdiction (potentially in another country). Nevertheless the management measures that apply to the unit of certification should be consistent with achieving management objectives for the stock under consideration.

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.14 Fishery Compliance

measures consistent with achieving management objectives for the stock under consideration.

There is no uniform way that management approaches need to be documented (for example they do not have to be all within one overarching Fishery Management Plan), but the standard must require the various elements of the management system to be present and identifiable and in use by the fishery management organization or arrangement (D.1.01) , including the constitution and rules and procedures of the Fisheries Management Organization or Arrangement and the compliance regime (D.1.01-D.1.03; D.1.07); the legal framework (D.1.11); the management objectives (D.2); methodologies (D.4) although not necessarily all within one overarching Fishery Management Plan. It should be expected that the documentation would be current. The frequency of updates should be consistent with the requirements of meeting the management objectives and implementing management measures.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 1.2.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

A Resource Management Plan for the unit of certification and the stock under consideration shall be developed by fishers in accordance with a Resource Management Policy developed by national and local governments that includes management objectives and measures based on the best scientific evidence available. Alternatively, an equally effective management system that enables compliance with stock management measures shall be established. The state of implementation of the Resource Management Plan (or equivalent) shall be monitored and verified.

Indicator(s) 1.2.2 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether a Resource Management Policy for the comprehensive regulations on fishing efforts and catch amounts and a Resource Management Plan in accordance with the Resource Management Policy (or stock management measures equivalent thereto) for the unit of certification and the stock under consideration are prepared

- Preparation of a Resource Management Policy (including those equivalent thereto)

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.14 Fishery Compliance

- Preparation of a Resource Management Plan (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.2; Indicator 1.2.2 (a). p. 10-11.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.2 (a). p. 49-51.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.2 (a). p. 23-24.

D.1.15 Management Documentation

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Standard requires that the methodology and results of assessments of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration are made publicly available in a timely manner, respecting confidentiality where appropriate.	This Essential Component is included under the Element of Management Documentation, but is essentially about transparency. It is linked with Essential Component D.1.08 that addressed Participatory Management. To meet that Essential Component, the standard must require the fisheries management organization or arrangement to make information and advice used in its decision-making publicly available. The methodology and results of assessments of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration is part of the information and advice used in this decision-making. The publication of this information may be constrained by legitimate rules governing confidentiality .	
Conclusion		References
MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AF-1, A-4</i>

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.15 Management Documentation

Requirement 2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall be conducted based on the data and information collected, and management decisions shall be made accordingly taking into account the assessment results. The methodology and results of the assessment shall be made publicly available in a timely manner.

Indicator(s) 2.4 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(d) Whether the methodology and results of assessments of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration are available to the public in a timely manner.

- Disclosure of the methodology and results of assessments of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.4; Indicators 2.4 (d). p. 24-27.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (d). p. 112.

AF-4: (Kii Channel, Anchovy) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (d). p. 61-62.

D.1.16 Management Documentation

GSSI Component

The Standard requires that the methodology and results of the analysis of the most

Guidance

This Essential Component is included under the Element of Management Documentation, but is essentially about transparency. It is linked with Essential Component D.1.08 that addressed

D . 1 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.1.16 Management Documentation

probable adverse impacts of the unit of certification and any associated culture and enhancement activity on the ecosystem are made publicly available in a timely manner, respecting confidentiality where appropriate.

Participatory Management. To meet that Essential Component, the standard must require the fisheries management organization or arrangement to make information and advice used in its decision-making publicly available. The methodology and results of the analysis of the most probable adverse impacts of the unit of certification and any associated culture and enhancement activity on the ecosystem is part of the information and advice used in this decision-making. The publication of this information may be constrained by legitimate rules governing confidentiality.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall be conducted based on the data and information collected, and management decisions shall be made accordingly taking into account the assessment results. The methodology and results of the assessment shall be made publicly available in a timely manner.

Indicator(s) 2.4 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether the fishery management organization or arrangement receives and responds in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available related to the status of the stock under consideration and the likelihood and magnitude of adverse impacts of the unit of certification on the stock under consideration and the ecosystem,, and the fishery management organization or arrangement convenes regularly, as needed, to manage the integrated process of information collection, stock assessment, planning, formulation of the management objectives and targets, establishing management measures and enforcement of fishery rules and regulations.

- Existence of a comprehensive fishery management organization or arrangement which receives and responds in a timely manner the best scientific evidence available

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.1.16 Management Documentation

- Existence of a fishery management organization or arrangement which conducts comprehensive fishery management.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(d) Whether the methodology and results of the analysis of the most probable adverse impacts of the associated culture and enhancement activity on the ecosystem are made publicly available in a timely manner, respecting confidentiality where appropriate.

- Disclosure of the information on the impact of associated culture and enhancement activity on the ecosystem

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.4, 3.2.3; Indicators 2.4 (c) p. 25-27. and 3.2.3 (d). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (c). p. 110-111.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.4 (c). p. 67-68 and 3.2.3 (d). p. 126-127.

D.1 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.1.17 Consultation and Review

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the efficacy of management measures and their possible interactions is kept under continuous review, taking into account the multipurpose nature of the use patterns in inland and marine waters.</p>	<p>The purpose of consultation and review regarding the efficacy of conservation and management measures and their possible interactions is to ensure that there is a well based expectation that management will be successful, taking into account uncertainty and imprecision. "Management measures" in this Requirement are the measures referred to in the other Essential Components in this Performance Area. They are regarded as being synonymous with the "conservation and management measures" referred to in CCRF Article 7.6.8.</p> <p>The expression "taking into account the multipurpose nature of the use patterns in inland and marine waters" refers to the uncertainty arising from other (non-fishery) impacts on the fishery. For example, if there are other users from other sectors, fishery management, although not being able to control those sectors, should take their impacts into account when devising the strategy for achieving management objectives. This is akin to taking into account all sources of mortality on the fish stock, from fishing and non-fishing sources. For example, if water is abstracted from rivers at certain times of the year and this has an adverse impact on the fish stock, management of the fishery should address that fact (perhaps by reducing fishing or having a closed season at this time), although not being able to influence when and to what extent the water is abstracted. In a coastal context, the fishery management should be integrated with coastal zone management to the extent necessary to account for non-fishing impacts.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 1.2.7 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) When there are other activities than the fisheries in the same waters where the unit of certification operates, there shall be continuous dialogue among stakeholders about the effectiveness of management measures and a corresponding record of this dialogue shall be maintained.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 1.2.7 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-3</u> • <u>AF-7 *Forum for dialogue is required only when there are other activities in the area. For most cases in Japan, the Sea Surface Utilization Councils are prepared for possible dialogue</u>

D.1.17 Consultation and Review

(a) Whether a room to dialogue the effectiveness of management measures among the stakeholders as applicable and the discussion records exists, taking into account the multipurpose nature of the use pattern in waters

- Existence of a room to dialogue the effectiveness of management measures among the stakeholders besides fishery related stakeholders as applicable
- Existence of the discussion records of the dialogue

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.7; Indicators 1.2.7 (a). p. 17.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.7 (a). p. 64.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.7 (a). p. 37-38.

AF-7: (Ishikari Bay, Herring) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.7 (a). p. 44.

necessity such as request from stakeholders. When there is no need, meetings are not held relating to the utilization adjustment.

D.2 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.2.01 Certified Stocks		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires the existence of management objectives that are applicable to the unit of certification and the stock under consideration and seek outcomes consistent with the long term sustainable use of the fisheries resources under management.</p>	<p>The Standard must show evidence of requiring the existence of clearly stated management objectives that meet the description in the Glossary. The appropriateness of those objectives is tested through the assessment of conformance with Essential Components in other Performance Areas, including, the actions (management measures, monitoring etc.) taken to meet them and the outcomes for the stock under consideration and the ecosystem.</p> <p>The "fishery" referred to in Paragraph 28 of the Guidelines encompasses both the unit of certification and the stock under consideration (as per paragraph 28.1), as do the management objectives referred to in this Essential Component.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 2.5 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-3 	

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.01 Certified Stocks

Whether the management objectives and management measures to achieve the management objectives exist based on the Best Scientific Evidence Available and consistent with the long term sustainable use of the fisheries resources under management and management measures to achieve the management objectives exist.

- Existence of management objectives (including those equivalent thereto)
- Existence of management measures (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (b). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (b). p. 119-122.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (b). p. 62-63.

D.2.02 Certified Stocks

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the management objectives clearly define target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock	The Glossary provides descriptions of target and limit reference points. Reference points must be set at levels consistent with achieving maximum sustainable yield (MSY) (or a suitable proxy) on average, or a lesser fishing mortality if that is optimal in the circumstances of the fishery (e.g. multispecies fisheries) or to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators. To be effective, reference points must be incorporated

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.02 Certified Stocks

under consideration on the basis of the best scientific evidence available and in accordance with the Precautionary Approach. Target reference points must be consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yield, MSY (or a suitable proxy) on average and limit reference points (or proxies) must be consistent with avoiding recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

within a framework of decision rules (See D.5.02) to ensure that the stock does not fall below a limit, Blim, at which recruitment could be significantly impaired, or lead to average recruitment that is significantly lower than it would be with a higher stock biomass. The level of Blim should be set on the basis of historical information, applying an appropriate level of precaution according to the reliability of that information. In addition, an upper limit should be set on fishing mortality, Flim, which is the fishing mortality rate that, if sustained, would drive biomass down to the Blim level.

A proxy is a surrogate or substitute approach that results in acceptable outcomes consistent with the primary approach. In the context of reference points, when data are insufficient to estimate reference points directly other measures of productive capacity can serve as reasonable substitutes or “proxies”. Suitable proxies may be, for example, standardized cpue as a proxy for biomass or specific levels of fishing mortality and biomass which have proven useful in other fisheries and can be used with a reasonable degree of confidence in the absence of better defined levels. It is important to note that the use of a proxy may involve additional uncertainty, and if so, should trigger the use of extra precaution in the setting of biological reference points. The words “or proxies” are a consideration for small scale and/or data limited fisheries, This should not be interpreted to mean that small scale and/or data limited fisheries do not require target and limit reference points, but that the methods used to develop them and monitor the stock status in relation to them may be less data intensive than for large scale fisheries. See also Essential Components D.1.09 and D.3.07.

Conclusion

References

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.03 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires, in the case of enhanced fisheries, the existence of management objectives consistent with avoiding significant negative impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration and any other wild stocks from which the organisms for stocking are being removed..</p>	<p>All Essential Components that address Enhanced Fisheries can be "not applicable" to schemes that do not cover these fisheries. However, it is incumbent on the scheme to explicitly exclude enhanced fisheries (rather than explicitly include them) in order for these requirements to be not applicable. If the scheme remains silent on the issue of enhanced fisheries, then the standard could potentially be applied to fisheries that include enhanced components, but if these are not properly dealt with by the standard (i.e. as per GSSI Essential Components) then the scheme would be deficient when being used to certify such fisheries. In essence, the default position is that a scheme/standard can be applied to enhanced fisheries unless it excludes them explicitly.</p> <p>The term "significant negative impacts" is used in the FAO Inland Guidelines. This was not intended to be equivalent to "severe adverse impacts" (on dependent predators). The FAO consultation that resulted in the drafting of the Inland Guidelines considered that avoidance of "severe adverse impacts" only would not be consistent with a management obligation to manage enhancement in ways that would not impact the productivity and abundance of the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration.</p> <p>Any displacement of the naturally reproductive stock components of enhanced stocks must not reduce the natural reproductive stock components below abundance-based Target Reference Points or their proxies. Note that the Target Reference Points are for the natural reproductive stock component. For example, in the case of salmon fisheries, if the spawning stock is comprised of fish both from enhanced and natural origins, the escapement goal considers only the natural origin component. An example Target Reference Point would be an escapement target based on the natural reproductive stock component.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-5

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.03 Enhanced Fisheries

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.
Requirement 3.2.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) Management objectives shall be developed to maintain the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration at a sustainable level, and management measures shall be implemented that are consistent with achieving these management objectives.

Indicator(s) 3.2.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether management objectives for avoiding significant negative impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration and any other wild stocks from which the organisms for stocking are being removed and management measures designed to achieve the management objectives exist.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):
Requirements 3.2.2; Indicators 3.2.2 (b). p. 50-52.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.2 (b). p. 116-118.

D.2.04 Non-Certified Catches

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires management objectives that seek to ensure that catches and discards by the unit of	This Essential Component covers "non-certified catches" which is everything other than the stock under consideration.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.04 Non-Certified Catches

certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration and any associated culture and enhancement activity do not threaten those stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

This Essential Component is explicitly and deliberately confined to the effects of non-certified catches and discards by the unit of certification on those non-certified species/stocks. Cumulative effects on non-certified species/stocks are not included in the Ecolabelling Guidelines. They are not part of the Essential Components, but they are covered in the Supplemental Components. The part of the component relating to enhancement activity may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries.

Examples of irreversible or very slowly reversible effects on bycatch species include excessive depletion of very long-lived organisms (see Glossary). To mitigate effects that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible requires those effects to be made less severe such that they are no longer likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(1) Management objectives that seek to ensure that non-target catches and discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration does not threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment

References

- [AF-1, AF-2, AF-5](#)

D.2.04 Non-Certified Catches

overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(1) Management objectives that seek to ensure that non-target catches and discards by associated culture and enhancement activity do not threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and management measures designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (1) p. 41-44. and 3.2.3 (c) (1). P. 53-56.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.04 Non-Certified Catches

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p.154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D.2.05 Endangered Species

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the existence of management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with the unit of certification and any associated culture or enhancement activity, including recruitment	The context of this Essential Component is Endangered Species. Endangered species are defined in the Glossary. These species are already adversely impacted at the population level, by definition, and are susceptible to further adverse impacts at this level from which they need to be protected. Where "adverse impacts" is used in the FAO Guidelines ("adverse impacts of the fishery on the ecosystem") there is no further qualification provided (i.e. no "significant" or "severe"). Elsewhere in the Guidelines, the term "adverse impacts" is qualified, but in each case this is in a very specific context. For example, the term "significant negative impacts" is used in the FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines only in relation to enhanced fisheries and "severe adverse impacts" is used only in relation to dependent predators. The term "significant adverse impacts" occurs only in the Deep Sea Guidelines with respect to VMEs.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.05 Endangered Species

overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

The FAO Guidelines acknowledge that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks (paragraph 31 (41)), hence the management objectives to protect endangered species should take into account risk and uncertainty.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(2) Management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with the unit of certification, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with the achieving management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

References

- [AF-1, AF-2, AF-5](#)

D.2.05 Endangered Species

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(2) Management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with associated culture or enhancement activity, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives and management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (2). P. 41-44. and 3.2.3 (c) (2). P. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.06 Habitat		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires the existence of management objectives seeking to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification.</p>	<p>Essential habitats are described in the Glossary. The CCRF (Article 6.8) refers to "critical fisheries habitats in marine and fresh water ecosystems" which can be regarded as substantively the same as essential habitats for the purposes of the practical application of this Essential Component. Critical fisheries habitats in marine and fresh water ecosystems include wetlands, mangroves, reefs, lagoons, nursery and spawning areas. Examples of impacts on habitat that should be avoided include those listed in the CCRF: destruction, degradation, pollution and other significant impacts. In accordance with Paragraph 28.2 of the Ecolabelling Guidelines, in assessing fishery impacts, the full spatial range of the relevant habitat should be considered, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing. The purpose of this is to consider both the degree to which the habitat is rare, or common, and also that there may be impacts on the same habitat in other parts of its spatial range.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-2</u>

D.2.06 Habitat

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(3) Management objectives seeking to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (3). p. 41-44.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.07 Dependent Predators

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of management objectives that seek to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators resulting from fishing on a stock under consideration that is a key prey species.</p>	<p>This Essential Component is about objectives for fishing mortality on stocks under consideration that are key prey species, not about fishing mortality on Dependent Predators themselves. Where the stock under consideration is a key prey species, the standard must require that fishing mortality on that species/stock is managed so as not to result in severe adverse impacts on Dependent Predators. The FAO Guidelines require that all sources of fishing mortality on the stock under consideration are taken into account (whether or not it is a prey species) in assessing the state of the stock under consideration, including discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catches and catches in other fisheries. Management measures to meet these objectives are required under D.5.08. Severe adverse impacts are mentioned in the Essential Components only in relation to dependent predators. This is in line with the Ecolabelling Guidelines. The severity of adverse impacts is related to their potential reversibility. Severe adverse impacts can be regarded as those that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, which is described in the Glossary.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).</p> <p>Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) (a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-2

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.07 Dependent Predators

(4) Management objectives that seek to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators resulting from fishing on a stock under consideration that is a key prey species and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (4). P 41-44.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

D.2.08 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the existence of management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of the unit of certification, including any associated enhancement activities if applicable, on the structure, processes and	This Essential Component covers adverse impacts on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems. Ecosystem structure, processes and function are described in the Glossary. The Guidelines do not extend consideration of these impacts to all fisheries operating in the ecosystem where the unit of certification is operating and therefore this is not included in this Essential Component. This language is in accordance with Section 4.1.4.1 of the FAO Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, which suggests one of the broad management objectives for a fisheries could be to keep impact on the structure, processes and functions of the ecosystem at an acceptable level.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.08 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

An earlier version of the requirements included an Essential Component on the conservation of biodiversity. Conservation of biodiversity is not mentioned separately in the Guidelines, but it is included in the CCRF Article 7.2.2 (d), which requires that States and sub-regional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should adopt appropriate measures, based on the best scientific evidence available to provide that inter alia biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems is conserved. The structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems includes biodiversity, hence this is considered to be included in this Essential Component.

Examples of irreversible or very slowly reversible indirect effects on the ecosystem include genetic modification and changed ecological role.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (5) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(5) Management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of the unit of certification on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with achieving management objectives, considered that any modifications to the

References

- [AF-1, AF-2, AF-5](#)

D.2.08 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

habitat for enhancing the stock under consideration must be reversible and not cause serious or irreversible harm to the natural ecosystem's structure, processes and function.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(3) Management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of associated enhancement activities if applicable, on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives and management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (5). p. 41-44 and 3.2.3 (c) (3). p. 53-56.

D . 2 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.2.08 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D.2.09 Small scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that management objectives for the unit of certification and the stock under consideration take into account the interests of fishers engaged in subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fisheries, where applicable.</p>	<p>This Essential Component derives from paragraphs 7.2.1 and 7.2.2 of the CCRF. It cuts across the other components covering management objectives and looks for the requirement to take into account the interests of fishers engaged in small scale and artisanal fisheries in the development of these objectives.</p> <p>Section 7.2 of the CCRF is titled "Management Objectives". Paragraph 7.2.1 of the CCRF calls for the adoption of appropriate measures (not objectives), based on the best scientific evidence available, which are designed to maintain or restore stocks at levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield, as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors, including the special requirements of developing countries. Paragraph 7.2.2 states that such measures should provide that the interests of fishers, including those engaged in subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fisheries, are taken into account. While this language refers specifically to "measures", the need for objectives for those measures is implied, particularly given the text is in section 7.2 which is titled "Management Objectives".</p>
Conclusion	References

D.2.09 Small scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.

Indicator(s) 2.5 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, fisheries governance and management systems for those fisheries are prepared, with due consideration to the availability of data and the fact that management systems can differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries.

- Existence of small-scale fisheries or data limited fisheries

Indicator(s) 2.5 (e) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively verified and applied into the fisheries management system.

- Existence of verification methods of the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (d) and (e). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (d). p. 65 and 2.5 (e). p. 66.

- [AF-3](#)

D.3 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.3.01 Certified Stocks	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about the state and trends of the stock under consideration in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.</p>	<p>Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information are those which are commensurate with the development and delivery of the best scientific evidence available. In this case, the requirement for data collection is focused on the assessment of the status and trends of stock under consideration (see Essential Components D.4.01-D.4.03). Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information can include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge, provided its validity can be objectively verified.</p> <p>Some fisheries and/or fish stock are hard to monitor for various reasons, including remoteness of operation/distribution and complexity of fishing operations, posing particular challenges with the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information. To meet this Essential Component the standard must require the fishery to acknowledge and explain these challenges and data collection and maintenance to cover all stages of fishery development, in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.</p> <p>Applicable international standards and practices include the output of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) and the FAO Guidelines for the routine collection of capture fishery data (1998) FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 382.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-2, AF-3

D.3.01 Certified Stocks

Requirement 1.1.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There should be knowledge and documentation of the current state of the unit of certification this includes the following

- (a) Outline of the unit of certification
- (b) Fishing gears and fishing methods
- (c) Catch volume and fishing effort
- (d) Type of business and its business condition

Indicator(s) 1.1.3 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

- (c) Catch amount and fishing effort
 - Collected and maintained information on catch amount and fishing efforts

Requirement 2.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and information based on the best scientific evidence available shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the current status and trends of the stock under consideration.

Indicator(s) 2.2 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

- (a) Whether the following scientific evidence data are collected and maintained for the management of the stock under consideration, based on international standards such as FAO Guidelines for the routine collection of capture fishery data (hereinafter referred to as FAO Guidelines).
 - Existence of collected and maintained data on the catch volume
 - Existence of collected and maintained data on the fishing effort
 - Existence of collected and maintained other data necessary for the assessment of the stock under consideration

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.1.3, 2.2; Indicators 1.1.3 (c). p. 6-7 and 2.2 (a) p. 21-22.

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.01 Certified Stocks

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.1.3 (c). p. 33-34. and 2.2 (a). p. 66-69.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.1.3 (c). p. 18. and 2.2 (a). p. 46-47.

D.3.02 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about the effects of the unit of certification, including any associated enhancement activities, on ecosystem structure, processes and function in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.	Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information is described in the Glossary. In general these are data which are commensurate with the development and delivery of the best scientific evidence available. The requirements for data collection are focused on the effects of the unit of certification on the ecosystem, including direct and indirect effects. The adequacy of data relates primarily to the quantity and type of data collected (including sampling coverage) and depends crucially on the nature of the systems being monitored and purposes to which the data are being put. Some analysis of the precision resulting from sampling coverage would normally be part of an assessment of adequacy and reliability. The currency of data is important inter alia because its capacity for supporting reliable assessment of current status and trends declines as it gets older. Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information can include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge, provided its validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not just hearsay).

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.02 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

The requirements for data collection are focused on the effects of the unit of certification on the ecosystem structure, processes and function. The component relating to enhancement activities may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries.

Ecosystem structure, processes and function are described in the Glossary. This language is in accordance with Section 4.1.4.1 of the FAO Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, which suggests one of the broad management objectives for a fisheries could be to keep impact on the structure, processes and functions of the ecosystem at an acceptable level.

Applicable international standards and practices include the output of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) and the FAO Guidelines for the routine collection of capture fishery data (1998) FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 382.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.3.02 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (5) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(5) Analysis of the effects of the unit of certification on ecosystem structure, processes and function to develop timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of impacts with appropriate related data/information in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(4) Analysis of the effects of associated culture and enhancement activities on ecosystem structure, processes and function to develop timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of impacts with appropriate related data/information in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.
- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) – (4) above.

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.02 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.1, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (5). p. 37-40. and 3.2.3 (b) (4). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 86-93. and 3.2.3 (b). p. 122-123.

D.3.03 Non-Certified Catches

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information on non-certified catches and discards in the unit of certification.</p>	<p>Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information is described in the Glossary. In general these are data which are commensurate with the development and delivery of the best scientific evidence available. The requirements for data collection are focused on the need to assess the effects of the unit of certification on non-target stocks. Non-certified catches and discards refers to species/stocks that are taken by the unit of certification other than the stock for which certification is being sought (see Glossary).</p> <p>The adequacy of data relates primarily to the quantity and type of data collected (including sampling coverage) and depends crucially on the nature of the systems being monitored and purposes to which the data are being put. Some analysis of the precision resulting from sampling coverage would normally be part of an assessment of adequacy and reliability. The currency of data is important inter alia because its capacity for supporting reliable assessment of current status and trends declines as it gets older. Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information can include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge,</p>

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.03 Non-Certified Catches

provided its validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not just hearsay).

The requirements for data collection in this Essential Component are focused on the effects of the unit of certification on non-certified species/stocks. Non-certified catches/stocks are described in the Glossary. Catches of Endangered species are covered in Essential Component D.3.04.

Applicable international standards and practices include the output of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) and the FAO Guidelines for the routine collection of capture fishery data (1998) FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 382.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

References

- [AF-1, AF-2](#)

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.03 Non-Certified Catches

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(1) Assessment of the extent to which non-target catches and discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible with appropriate related data/information.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.1; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (1). p. 37-40.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145--153.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 102-108.

D.3.04 Endangered Species

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about the	Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information is described in the Glossary. In general these are data which are commensurate with the development and delivery of the best scientific evidence available. The requirements for data collection are focused on the effects of the unit of certification on the ecosystem, including direct and indirect effects. The adequacy of data relates primarily to the quantity and type of data collected (including sampling coverage) and depends crucially on the nature of the systems being monitored and purposes to which the data are being put. Some analysis of the precision resulting from sampling coverage would normally be

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.04 Endangered Species

effects of the unit of certification, including any associated enhancement activities, on endangered species in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

part of an assessment of adequacy and reliability. The currency of data is important inter alia because its capacity for supporting reliable assessment of current status and trends declines as it gets older. Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information can include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge, provided its validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not just hearsay).

The requirements for data collection are focused on the effects of the unit of certification on endangered species. The component relating to enhancement activities may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries. Endangered species are described in the Glossary.

Applicable international standards and practices include the output of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) and the FAO Guidelines for the routine collection of capture fishery data (1998) FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 382.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.3.04 Endangered Species

(6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(2) Assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species with appropriate related data/information collected in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(2) Assessment of the impacts of associated culture and enhancement activities on endangered species with appropriate related data/information collected in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.
- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) – (4) above.

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.04 Endangered Species

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):
Requirements 3.1.1, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (2). p. 37–40 and 3.2.3 (b) (2). p. 53–55.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145–153.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 86–93. and 3.2.3 (b). p. 122–123.

D.3.05 Habitat

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that there is knowledge within the fishery management system of the essential habitats for the stock under consideration and habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification. This includes knowledge of the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing.</p>	<p>The level of knowledge of the essential habitats for the stock under consideration and habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification should provide sufficient understanding to enable impacts of the unit of certification on those habitats to be avoided, minimized or mitigated; i.e. for the management objective with respect to habitat (D.2.06) to be achieved. The achievement of this Essential Component should be considered alongside D.4.08 and D.6.07. In particular, the FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines acknowledge the importance of a “risk assessment/risk management approach” to address the issue of greater scientific uncertainty associated with ecosystem impacts; also that the most probable adverse impacts should be considered, taking into account available scientific information, and traditional, fisher or community knowledge provided that its validity can be objectively verified. The knowledge of the habitats in question can therefore include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge, provided its validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not just hearsay).</p>
Conclusion	References

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.05 Habitat

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(3) Assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification in the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing with appropriate related data/information.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.1.1; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (3). p. 37-40.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

- [AF-1, AF-2](#)

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.05 Habitat

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 102-108.

D.3.06 Dependent Predators

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that data and information are collected on the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web to enable determination of whether it is a key prey species in the ecosystem, and if so whether fishing on that stock might result in severe adverse impacts on dependent predators.</p>	<p>The data and information collected must be sufficient to provide adequate knowledge of the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web to determine whether it is a key prey species and, if so, whether fishing on that stock under consideration might result in severe adverse impacts on dependent predators. Where the stock under consideration is a key prey species, the standard must require that fishing mortality on that species/stock is managed so as not to result in severe adverse impacts on Dependent Predators. The FAO Guidelines require that all sources of fishing mortality on the stock under consideration are taken into account (whether or not it is a prey species) in assessing the state of the stock under consideration, including discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catches and catches in other fisheries.</p> <p>Data and information on the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web can include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge, provided its validity can be objectively verified (i.e. the knowledge has been collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not just hearsay).</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-2

D.3.06 Dependent Predators

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(4) Assessment of the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web to determine whether it is a key prey species in the ecosystem and severe adverse impacts of fishing on that stock on dependent predators as applicable, with appropriate related data/information

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.1.1; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (4). p. 37-40.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 102-108.

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.07 Small Scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that any traditional, fisher or community knowledge used within the management system can be objectively verified.</p>	<p>The methods by which traditional, fisher or community knowledge can be objectively verified will vary between fisheries, and will need to be assessed by the auditors. Elsewhere in the Benchmark there is the general suggestion that the knowledge should be collected and analyzed through a systematic, objective and well-designed process, and is not be just hearsay. Scientific uncertainty associated with the use of traditional, fisher or community knowledge can be assessed using a risk assessment/risk management approach, as specified in the Guidelines. In all cases, the management measures implemented by the management system must be based on the best scientific evidence available (Essential Components D.1.03 to D.1.04).</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 2.5 (e) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) (e) Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively verified and applied into the fisheries management system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Existence of verification methods of the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively <p>Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (e). p. 28-31.</p> <p>Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-7 • AF-3

D . 3 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.3.07 Small Scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (e). p. 66.

AF-7: (Ishikari Bay, Herring) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (e). p. 72.

D.3.08 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
In the case of enhanced fisheries, the standard requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about enhanced components of the stock under consideration in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.	Collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about enhanced components of the stock under consideration is necessary to assess whether Enhanced Fisheries meet the criteria specified in the Inland Guidelines (starting with paragraph 38) necessary for them to be within scope. Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information are those which are commensurate with the development and delivery of the best scientific evidence available. In this case, the requirement for data collection is focused on any enhanced components of the stock under consideration. Adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information can include relevant traditional, fisher or community knowledge, provided its validity can be objectively verified. Applicable international standards and practices include the output of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) and the FAO Guidelines for the routine collection of capture fishery data (1998) FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 382.
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.</p> <p>Requirement 3.2.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-5

D.3.08 Enhanced Fisheries

Production and release of artificial seedlings shall be conducted with due consideration given for maintaining the biological characteristics and genetic diversity.

Indicator(s) 3.2.1 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(d) Whether the records of release (the number of releases, timing, size, etc.) are collected. Whether appropriate release methods (released size, appropriate growth stage, etc.) are implemented.

- Record of release data (the number of releases, release date, size, etc.)
- Considerations of appropriate release methods (growth stage, etc.)

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the stock under consideration is biologically and genetically monitored and confirmed that there are no morphological changes in the stock under consideration.

- Biological (fish size, age, number of roes, timing of migration) and implementation of genetic monitoring.
- Confirmation of morphological changes to the stock under consideration.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.2.1 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.2.1(d) p. 46-49 and 3.2.3 (a) p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.1 (d). p.109-110. and 3.2.3 (a). p. 120-121.

D.4 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.4.01 Certified Stocks	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires management decisions by the Designated Authority (D.1.01) to be based on an assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration, using adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information. Other information may include generic evidence based on similar stocks, when specific information on the stock under consideration is not available, providing there is low risk to the stock under consideration in accordance with the Precautionary Approach.</p>	<p>This is a partner Essential Component to D.3.01 which covers the collection and maintenance of the data to be used in the stock assessment referred to in this Essential Component. The purpose of the stock assessment is to contribute to the best scientific evidence available which is used by the fishery management organization or arrangement (D.1.03 - D.1.05) to establish management objectives for the stock under consideration (D.2), management measures (D.5) to meet those objectives and evidence regarding outcome status (D.6) - i.e. whether the objectives have been met.</p> <p>The Ecolabelling Guidelines provide additional guidance on the use of data in the stock assessment. Specifically, in the absence of specific information on the stock under consideration, generic evidence based on similar stocks can be used for fisheries with low risk to that stock under consideration. The language of the Essential Component aligns with this text, however, it raises a concern that this approach could be used inappropriately in cases where the risk to the stock under consideration is not "low". The greater the risk, the more specific evidence is necessary to assess sustainability. In principle, 'generic evidence based on similar stocks' should not suffice, but it may be adequate where there is low risk to the stock under consideration. In general, "Low risk to the stock under consideration" would suggest that there is very little chance of the stock becoming overfished, for example where the exploitation rate is very low and the resilience of the stock is high (see Essential Component D.4.03). However, the Standard should make it clear that the evidence for low risk and the justification for using surrogate data must come from the stock assessment itself.</p>

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.01 Certified Stocks

The aim of this Essential Component, in conjunction with Essential Component D.4.04, is to avoid the use of less elaborate methods of stock assessment automatically precluding fisheries from potential certification. Nevertheless, to the extent that the application of such methods results in greater uncertainty about the state of the stock under consideration, more precaution must be applied in managing fisheries on such stocks. This may, for example, necessitate lower levels of utilization of the resource than would be possible with lower levels of uncertainty, in accordance with the Essential Components covering the Precautionary Approach (D.1.06) and the Best Scientific Evidence Available (D.1.03 – D.1.05).

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 1.2.6 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Taking due account of various uncertainty inherent in fisheries stocks, ecosystem and stock management, precautional fisheries management is undertaken. There shall be a mechanism to change and improve management measures in an adaptive manner depending on the status of the stock under consideration and of the ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 1.2.6 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether a mechanism exists in order to change and improve management measures in an adaptive manner to unexpected changes of the situation on the stock under consideration and relative matters due to environmental changes, etc.

- Existence of the mechanism of precautionary measures and adaptive management

Requirement 2.4 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall be conducted based on the data and information collected, and management decisions shall be made accordingly taking into account the

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.01 Certified Stocks

assessment results. The methodology and results of the assessment shall be made publicly available in a timely manner.

Indicator(s) 2.4 (a) and (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether an assessment is conducted with the best scientific evidence available. Further, whether an adaptive management with precautionary approach is implemented with regard to the result of the assessment.

- Implementation of a assessment with the best scientific evidence available
- Implementation of the adaptive management with precautionary approach based on the assessment above

(b) Whether the assessment is reflected in decision-making process to formulate a stock management guideline and a stock management plan.

- Existence of a report or minutes showing the reflection

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 1.2.6 and 2.4; Indicators 1.2.6 (a). p. 16. and 2.4 (a) (b). p. 25-27.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.6 (a). p. 62-63., 2.4 (a) p. 98-107. and 2.4 (b). p. 108-109.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 1.2.6 (a). p. 34-36., 2.4 (a) p. 53-54. and 2.4 (b). p. 55-56.

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.02 Certified Stocks

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration considers total fishing mortality on that stock from all sources including discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catches and catches in all fisheries over its entire area of distribution.</p>	<p>This is a partner Essential Component to D.5.01. Management measures for the stock under consideration must be based on an assessment of that stock which takes account of all removals from the stock over its entire area of distribution, i.e. not just by the unit of certification but by all fisheries that utilize that stock, including bycatch, discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catches, and catches taken outside of the unit of certification. Note that these terms are not defined here, or in the Glossary. They are used collectively in this context to cover all possible descriptions of fishery removals of the stock under consideration. See also Essential Component D.1.12 covering the effective and suitable monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement of the fishery of which the unit of certification is a part.</p> <p>Area of Distribution is described in the Glossary based on a CITES reference for species, but in the context of fish and fisheries, this can be used for stocks.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall take into account the total fishing mortality caused by other fisheries utilizing the stock under consideration within the distribution area of the stock under consideration, as well as resilience of the stock.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 2.3 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) (a) Whether the assessment of the stock under consideration considers trend and status on catch by fishery of which the unit of certification is a part and others and this assessment considers total fishing mortality on that stock from all sources such as discards, incidental mortality and catches in all fisheries over its entire area of distribution.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-2</u>

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.02 Certified Stocks

- Data on the trend and status by fishery of which the unit of certification is a part
- Data on the trend and status by other fisheries

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.3; Indicators 2.3 (a). p. 23–24.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.3 (a). p. 86–87.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.3 (a). p. 70–72.

D.4.03 Certified Stocks

GSSI Component

The standard requires that the assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration takes into account the structure and composition of that stock which contribute to its resilience.

Guidance

Resilience is described in the Glossary. Understanding the resilience of a stock (i.e. its ability to recover from a disturbance) is an important part of assessing that stock's status and trends and contributes to an assessment of the level of risk to that stock (see Essential Component D.4.01).

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.03 Certified Stocks

The assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall take into account the total fishing mortality caused by other fisheries utilizing the stock under consideration within the distribution area of the stock under consideration, as well as resilience of the stock.

Indicator(s) 2.3 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether the assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration takes into account the structure and composition of that stock which contribute to its resilience.

- Consideration of the structure and composition of that stock which contribute to its resilience.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.3; Indicators 2.3 (c). p. 23-24.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.3 (c). p. 90-97.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.3 (c). p. 51-52.

D.4.04 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
In the case of enhanced fisheries, the standard requires that the assessment of current status and trends of the	This Essential Component addresses the need for standards to require an assessment to support the achievement of management objectives specified in Essential Component D.2.05. It refers to Enhanced Fisheries, hence it may be regarded as not applicable if the Scheme/Standard explicitly excludes enhanced fisheries (see also Guidance for D.2.05) The term natural reproductive stock components is explained in the Glossary. The term "significant negative impacts" is used in the Inland Guidelines. This was not intended to be equivalent to severe

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.04 Enhanced Fisheries

stock under consideration includes an evaluation of whether there are significant negative impacts of enhancement activities on the naturally reproductive component of the stock under consideration.

adverse impacts (on dependent predators). The consultation that resulted in the drafting of the Inland Guidelines considered that avoidance of "severe adverse impacts" only would not be consistent with a management obligation to manage enhancement in ways that would not impact the productivity and abundance of the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration.

The Guidelines specifically require that naturally reproductive components of enhanced stocks are not substantially displaced by stocked components. In particular, displacement must not result in a reduction of the natural reproductive stock component below abundance-based target reference points (or their proxies). With respect to aquaculture production of organisms for stocking, there should be an advance evaluation of the effects of aquaculture development on genetic diversity and ecosystem integrity, based on the best scientific information available.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the stock under consideration is biologically and genetically monitored and confirmed that there are no morphological changes in the stock under consideration.

References

- [AF-5](#)

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.04 Enhanced Fisheries

- Biological (fish size, age, number of roes, timing of migration) and implementation of genetic monitoring.
- Confirmation of morphological changes to the stock under consideration.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.2.3; Indicators 3.2.3 (a). p. 53–56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s): AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.3 (a). p. 120–121.

D.4.05 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance	
In the case of fisheries that are enhanced through aquaculture inputs, the standard requires that the stock assessment of the stock under consideration must consider the separate contributions from aquaculture and natural production.	<p>This is a technical requirement applicable to stock assessments of fisheries that are enhanced through aquaculture inputs. If fisheries that are enhanced through aquaculture inputs are explicitly out of scope for the scheme, then this Essential Component is not applicable.</p> <p>The glossary entry for Enhanced Fisheries explains that enhancement may entail stocking with material originating from aquaculture installations, translocations from the wild and habitat modification. Accordingly, aquaculture inputs refers to any stocking with material originating from aquaculture installations.</p>	
Conclusion		References
MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-5

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.05 Enhanced Fisheries

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) Management objectives shall be developed to maintain the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration at a sustainable level, and management measures shall be implemented that are consistent with achieving these management objectives.

Indicator(s) 3.2.2 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether such measures as tagging of released fish enable individual assessment of released and naturally-reproduced populations and hence the effect of releasing is assessed. (Whether the naturally-reproduced population is assessed)

- The effect of releasing is assessed by taking such measures as tagging of released fish

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.2.2; Indicators 3.2.2 (a). p. 50-52.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.2 (a). p. 113-115.

D.4.06 Non-Certified Catches

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires an assessment of the extent to which catches and	This is the partner Essential Component of D.3.03 that requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information on non-target catches and discards in the unit of certification. Non-

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.06 Non-Certified Catches

discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration and any associated culture and enhancement activities threaten those stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

target catches and discards refers to species/stocks that are taken by the unit of certification other than the stock for which certification is being sought (see Glossary).

This Essential Component addresses the need for standards to require an assessment to support the achievement of management objectives specified in Essential Component D.2.06. This Essential Component is explicitly and deliberately confined to the effects of non-target catches and discards by the unit of certification on those non-target species/stocks. Cumulative effects on non-target species/stocks are not included in the Ecolabelling Guidelines. They are not part of the Essential Components, but they are covered in the Supplemental Components. The component relating to enhancement activity may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries. Non-target catches/stocks are described in the Glossary.

Examples of irreversible or very slowly reversible effects on bycatch species include excessive depletion of very long-lived organisms (see Glossary).

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.4.06 Non-Certified Catches

(6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(1) Assessment of the extent to which non-target catches and discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible with appropriate related data/information.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(1) Assessment of the extent to which non-target catches and discards by associated culture and enhancement activities threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) – (4) above.

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.06 Non-Certified Catches

· Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.1 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (1). p. 37-40. and 3.2.3 (b) (1). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 86-93. and 3.2.3 (b). p. 122-123.

D.4.07 Eco-System Structure, Processes and Function

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires an analysis of the effects of the unit of certification, including any associated	This is the partner Essential Component of D.3.02 that requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about the effects of the unit of certification, including any enhancement activities, on ecosystem structure, processes and function. The component relating to enhancement activity may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries. Ecosystem structure, processes and function are described in the Glossary. This language is in accordance with Section 4.1.4.1 of the FAO Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, which suggests one of the broad management objectives for a fisheries could be to keep impact on the structure, processes and functions of the ecosystem at an acceptable level.

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.07 Eco-System Structure, Processes and Function

enhancement activities where applicable, on ecosystem structure, processes and function to develop timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of impacts.

This requirement is about the analysis of these data to develop the best scientific evidence available regarding the ecosystem effects of fishing, which is used by the fishery management organization or arrangement (D.1.03 - D.1.05) to establish management objectives (D.2) and management measures (D.5) to meet those objectives..

The data and analysis may include local, traditional or indigenous knowledge and research, providing its validity can be objectively verified.

As expressed in the Guidance relating to the Essential Component on the precautionary approach (D.1.06), much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks. This issue can be addressed by taking a risk assessment/risk management approach. Note that some ecosystem impacts such as those on bycatch species are often more readily quantifiable than others, such as those on habitat. While a risk assessment approach may mitigate a lack of quantitative information, the management system must still ensure adequate mitigation of adverse impacts.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.4.07 Eco-System Structure, Processes and Function

- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (5) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(5) Analysis of the effects of the unit of certification on ecosystem structure, processes and function to develop timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of impacts with appropriate related data/information in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(4) Analysis of the effects of associated culture and enhancement activities on ecosystem structure, processes and function to develop timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of impacts with appropriate related data/information in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.07 Eco-System Structure, Processes and Function

- Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.
- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) - (4) above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.1, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (5). p. 37-40 and 3.2.3 (b) (4). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 86-93. and 3.2.3 (b). p. 122-123.

D.4.08 Habitat

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires an assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification, including any associated enhancement activities where applicable, on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of	This is the partner Essential Component of D.3.05 that requires knowledge within the fishery management system of the essential habitats for the stock under consideration and habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification. Under this Essential Component the standard must require and assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on these habitats. The component relating to enhancement activity may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries. The results of the assessment should provide sufficient understanding of the relevant habitats and fishery impacts on them to enable those impacts to be avoided, minimized or mitigated; i.e. for the management objective with respect to habitat (D.2.06) to be achieved. The achievement of this Essential Component should be considered alongside D.3.05 and D.6.07. In

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.08 Habitat

certification. The assessment should consider the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing.

particular, the FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines acknowledge the importance of a “risk assessment/risk management approach” to address the issue of greater scientific uncertainty; also that the most probable adverse impacts should be considered, taking into account available scientific information, and traditional, fisher or community knowledge provided that its validity can be objectively verified.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

- (a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:
 - (3) Assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification in the full spatial

References

- Reference
 - [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.4.08 Habitat

range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing with appropriate related data/information.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(3) Assessment of the impacts of associated culture and enhancement activities on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification in the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing

- Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.

- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) – (4) above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.1 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (3). p. 37-40 and 3.2.3 (b) (3). p. 53-56.

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.08 Habitat

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 86-93. and 3.2.3 (b). p. 122-123.

D.4.09 Dependent Predators

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that data and information on the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web are assessed to determine whether it is a key prey species in the ecosystem, and if so whether fishing on that stock might result in severe adverse impacts on dependent predators.</p>	<p>The purpose of assessing the data and information is to provide adequate knowledge of the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web. Adequate knowledge means there is enough understanding of the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web to determine whether it is a key prey species and, if so, whether fishing on that stock under consideration might result in severe adverse impacts on dependent predators.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem: (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-2</u>

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.09 Dependent Predators

- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(4) Assessment of the role of the stock under consideration in the food-web to determine whether it is a key prey species in the ecosystem and severe adverse impacts of fishing on that stock on dependent predators as applicable, with appropriate related data/information

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):
Requirements 3.1.1; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (4). p. 37-40.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 102-108.

D.4.10 Endangered Species

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires an	This is the partner Essential Component of D.3.04 that requires the collection and maintenance of adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information about the effects of the unit of certification, including any enhancement activities,

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.10 Endangered Species

assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification, including any associated enhancement activities where applicable, on endangered species.

on endangered species. Under this Essential Component the standard must require and assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on these species. The component relating to enhancement activity may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries. The results of the assessment should provide sufficient understanding of the relevant endangered species and fishery impacts on them to enable their protection from those impacts; i.e. for the management objective with respect to endangered species (D.2.05) to be achieved.

The achievement of this Essential Component should be considered alongside D.3.04 and D.6.06. In particular, the FAO Guidelines acknowledge the importance of a "risk assessment/risk management approach" to address the issue of greater scientific uncertainty associated with ecosystem impacts; also that the most probable adverse impacts should be considered, taking into account available scientific information, and traditional, fisher or community knowledge provided that its validity can be objectively verified.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:

- (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks
- (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species
- (3) Information on the essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery sites)
- (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed)
- (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web
- (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem)

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.4.10 Endangered Species

Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(2) Assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species with appropriate related data/information collected in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) – (5) above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(2) Assessment of the impacts of associated culture and enhancement activities on endangered species with appropriate related data/information collected in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.
- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) – (4) above.

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.10 Endangered Species

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):
Requirements 3.1.1, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (2). p. 37-40. and 3.2.3 (b) (2). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 86-93. and 3.2.3 (b). p. 122-123.

D.4.11 Small Scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard does not preclude small scale fisheries from possible certification for ecolabelling due to the use of less elaborate methods of stock assessment.	This Essential Component derives from paragraph 32 of the Marine Ecolabelling Guidelines. Specifically, that paragraph deals with the ways in which certification standards address the use of less elaborate methods of stock assessment in small scale fisheries, noting that with higher uncertainty more precautionary approaches to managing fisheries on such resources will be required which may necessitate lower levels of utilization of the resource.	
Conclusion		References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 2.5 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-3

D . 4 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.4.11 Small Scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, fisheries governance and management systems for those fisheries are prepared, with due consideration to the availability of data and the fact that management systems can differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries.

- Existence of small-scale fisheries or data limited fisheries

Indicator(s) 2.5 (e) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively verified and applied into the fisheries management system.

- Existence of verification methods of the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (d) and (e). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (d). p. 65 and 2.5 (e). p. 66.

D.5 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.5.01 Certified Stocks	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that management measures for the stock under consideration consider the impacts on the stock under consideration of all the fisheries utilizing that stock under consideration over its entire area of distribution.</p>	<p>This Essential Component addresses cumulative impacts of fishing mortality from all sources on the stock under consideration as specified in the Ecolabelling Guidelines. Management measures for the stock under consideration must be based on an assessment of that stock which takes account of all removals from the stock over its entire area of distribution, i.e. not just by the unit of certification but by all fisheries that utilize that stock and all other sources of fishing mortality, including (but not limited to) bycatch, discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catches, recreational fisheries, catches taken for research purposes and catches taken outside of the unit of certification. These terms are not defined here, or in the Glossary. They are used collectively in this context to cover all possible descriptions of fishery removals of the stock under consideration.</p> <p>Area of Distribution is described in the Glossary based on a CITES reference for species, but this can apply to stocks in a fisheries context.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The assessment of the current status and trends of the stock under consideration shall take into account the total fishing mortality caused by other fisheries utilizing the stock under consideration within the distribution area of the stock under consideration, as well as resilience of the stock.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-2

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.01 Certified Stocks

Indicator(s) 2.3 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether management measures for the stock under consideration consider the impacts on the stock under consideration of all the fisheries utilizing that stock under consideration over its entire area of distribution.

- Consideration of the impacts on the stock under consideration of all the fisheries utilizing that stock under consideration over its entire area of distribution

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.3; Indicators 2.3 (b). p. 23-24.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.3 (b). p. 88-89.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.3 (b). p. 73.

D.5.02 Certified Stocks

GSSI Component

The standard requires that management measures specify the actions to be taken in the event that the status of the stock under consideration drops below levels consistent with achieving management objectives, that allow for the restoration of the stock to such levels within a reasonable time frame. This requirement also pertains to species introductions or translocations that have occurred historically and which have become established as part of the natural ecosystem.

Guidance

This requires the specification in advance of decision rules that mandate remedial management actions to be taken if target reference points are exceeded and/or limit reference points are approached or exceeded or the desired directions in key indicators of stock status are not achieved. For example, decreasing fishing mortality (or its proxy) if the stock size approaches its limit reference point. This is a central component of the Precautionary Approach (see D.1.06).

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.02 Certified Stocks

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.

Indicator(s) 2.5 (a) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether stock under consideration and “limit reference point” or a suitable proxy are defined with precautionary approach and based on the best scientific evidence available in the management objectives. In addition, whether the “target reference point” is set to achieve the MSY or a suitable proxy in average and the “limit reference point” is defined to avoid recruitment overfishing and irreversible or very slowly reversible influence. Existence of the appropriate definitions of stock under consideration and limit reference target reference point or those substitute proxies under the management objectives

Requirement 2.7 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The stock under consideration is not overfished. In the event that the status of the stock drops below levels at which remedial actions should be undertaken, necessary measures shall be implemented in a timely manner in order to avoid recruitment overfishing.

Indicator(s) 2.7 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether management measures specify the actions to be taken in the event that the status of the stock under consideration drops below levels consistent with achieving management objectives that allow for the restoration of the stock to such levels within a reasonable time frame. This consideration is required to pertain to species introductions or translocations that have occurred historically and which have become established as part of the natural ecosystem.

References

- [AF-1, AF-3](#)

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.02 Certified Stocks

- Preparation of management measures specify the actions to be taken in the event that the status of the stock under consideration drops below levels consistent with achieving management objectives (including those equivalent thereto).

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the Guidelines for Auditors of the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (a). p. 28, Requirements 2.7; Indicators 2.7 (c). p. 34-36.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (a). p.113-118. and 2.7 (c). p. 142-144.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (a). p.60-61. and 2.7 (c). p. 71.

D.5.03 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires, in the case of enhanced fisheries, management measures designed to achieve management objectives (see D.2.05) seeking to avoid significant negative impacts of	This Essential Component addresses the need for standards to require management measures to achieve the management objectives in Essential Component D.2.05. It refers to Enhanced Fisheries, hence it may be regarded as not applicable if the Scheme/Standard explicitly excludes enhanced fisheries (see also Guidance for D.2.05) The term natural reproductive stock components is explained in the Glossary. The term "significant negative impacts" is used in the Inland Guidelines. This was not intended to be equivalent to severe adverse impacts (on dependent predators). The consultation that resulted in the drafting of the Inland Guidelines considered that avoidance of "severe adverse impacts" only would not be consistent with a management obligation to manage enhancement in ways that would not impact the productivity and abundance of the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration.

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.03 Enhanced Fisheries

enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and any other wild stocks from which the organisms for stocking are being removed.

In the case where organisms for stocking originate from wild stocks other than the stock under consideration, those stocks should be managed according to the provisions of Article 7 of the CCRF. In particular, those stocks should be within biologically based limits , or if outside those limits, the removal of organisms for stocking purposes does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of those stocks

Standards that apply to enhanced components of the stock under consideration require that stocking of enhanced fisheries, whether sourced from aquaculture facilities or wild stocks, is undertaken in such a way as to maintain inter alia:

- i) The integrity of the environment;
- ii) The conservation of genetic diversity;
- iii) Disease control; and
- iv) Quality of stocking material
- v) The donor wild stocks

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement. Requirement 3.2.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) (In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) Management objectives shall be developed to maintain the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration at a sustainable level, and management measures shall be implemented that are consistent with achieving these management objectives.

Indicator(s) 3.2.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

References

- [AF-5](#)

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.03 Enhanced Fisheries

(b) Whether management objectives for avoiding significant negative impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration and any other wild stocks from which the organisms for stocking are being removed and management measures designed to achieve the management objectives exist.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.2.2; Indicators 3.2.2 (b). p. 50-52.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s): AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.2 (b). p. 116-118.

D.5.04 Non-Certified Catches

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that management measures are designed to achieve management objectives (see D.2.04) seeking to ensure that catches and discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration and any associated culture and enhancement activity do not threaten those stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.</p>	<p>This is the partner Essential Component of D.2.04. Non-target catches and discards refers to species/stocks that are taken by the unit of certification other than the stock for which certification is being sought (see Glossary). Examples of irreversible or very slowly reversible effects on bycatch species include recruitment overfishing or excessive depletion of very long-lived organisms. Management measures should mitigate effects that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible by making those effects less severe such that they are no longer likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.</p>
Conclusion	References

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.04 Non-Certified Catches

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the Guidelines for Auditors of the Fisheries Management Standard state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(1) Management objectives that seek to ensure that non-target catches and discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration does not threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether management measures designed to achieve the management objectives referred in 3.1.2 (a) (1) - (5) and management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable exist.

- Existence of appropriate management measures above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.5.04 Non-Certified Catches

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(1) Management objectives that seek to ensure that non-target catches and discards by associated culture and enhancement activity do not threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and management measures designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.1.2, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (1). p. 41-44. and (b), 3.2.3 (c) (1). P. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157. and 3.1.2 (b). p. 158-159.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 94-97, 3.1.2 (b). p. 98-99. and 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.05 Non-Certified Catches

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable.</p>	<p>This Essential Component is related to D.5.04 in that minimizing unwanted catch and discards and reducing post-released mortality can help to reduce the impact of non-certified catches and discards by the unit of certification. Under the CCRF, users of aquatic ecosystems should minimize waste and catch of non-target species, both fish and non-fish species. Non-certified catches and discards refers to species/stocks that are taken by the unit of certification other than the stock for which certification is being sought (see Glossary).</p> <p>The words “where appropriate” give a scheme the flexibility not to require a fishery to have bycatch avoidance if there is no risk of bycatch in the fishery.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).</p> <p>Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) Whether management measures designed to achieve the management objectives referred in 3.1.2 (a) (1) - (5) and management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable exist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Existence of appropriate management measures above. <p>Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (b). p. 41-44.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-6

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.05 Non-Certified Catches

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):
 AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (b). p. 158-159.
 AF-6: (Fukushima, Mackerel) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (b). p. 51-52.

D.5.06 Endangered Species

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives (D.2.06) that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with the unit of certification and any associated culture or enhancement activity, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.</p>	<p>The context of this Essential Component is Endangered Species. Endangered species are defined in the Glossary. These species are already adversely impacted at the population level, by definition, and are susceptible to further adverse impacts at this level from which they need to be protected. Where "adverse impacts" is used in relation to Endangered Species in the FAO Guidelines there is no further qualification provided (i.e. no "significant" or "severe"). Elsewhere in the Guidelines, the term "adverse impacts" is qualified, but in each case this is in a very specific context. For example, the term "significant negative impacts" is used in the FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines only in relation to enhanced fisheries and "severe adverse impacts" is used only in relation to dependent predators. The term "significant adverse impacts" occurs only in the Deep Sea Guidelines with respect to VMEs.</p> <p>The FAO Guidelines acknowledge that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks (paragraph 31 (41)), hence the management measures to meet the objectives to protect endangered species should take into account risk and uncertainty.</p>
Conclusion	References

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.06 Endangered Species

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(2) Management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with the unit of certification, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with the achieving management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether management measures designed to achieve the management objectives referred in 3.1.2 (a) (1) - (5) and management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable exist.

- Existence of appropriate management measures above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D.5.06 Endangered Species

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(2) Management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with associated culture or enhancement activity, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives and management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.1.2, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (2). p. 41-44. and (b), 3.2.3 (c) (2). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 94-97. and 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.07 Habitat

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives (D.2.06) seeking to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the “stock under consideration” and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification. In assessing fishery impacts, the Standard requires consideration of the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing.</p>	<p>Essential habitats are described in the Glossary. There is no reason to regard them as being significantly different from the “critical fisheries habitats in marine and fresh water ecosystems” referred to in the CCRF (Article 6.8), which include wetlands, mangroves, reefs, lagoons, nursery and spawning areas. Examples of impacts on habitat that should be avoided include those listed in this paragraph: destruction, degradation, pollution and other significant impacts. The purpose of the requirement to consider the full spatial range of the relevant habitat in assessing fishery impacts may be to consider both the degree to which the habitat is rare, or common, and also that there may be impacts on the same habitat in other parts of its spatial range.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.1 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) Data and/or other information based on the best scientific evidence available covering the following factors shall be collected and maintained in order to assess the impacts of the unit of certification on non-target stocks and ecosystem:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Catches and discard of non-target stocks (2) Impacts of the unit of certification on endangered species, and efforts to conserve and protect those species as well as to avoid by-catch of those species (3) Information on essential habitat for stock under consideration (e.g. spawning and nursery) (4) Impacts of fishing gear used by the unit of certification on ecosystem (including the seabed) (5) Prey-predator relationship of the stock under consideration in the food-web (6) Balance of whole ecosystem (i.e. whether there is any severe disturbance by the unit of certification on ecosystem) <p>Indicator(s) 3.1.1 (a) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-6</u>

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.07 Habitat

(a) Whether adequate, reliable and current data and/or other information of followings exist:

(3) Assessment of the impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification in the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing with appropriate related data/information.

- Existence of collected and maintained information referred in (1) - (5) above.

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(3) Management objectives seeking to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether management measures designed to achieve the management objectives referred in 3.1.2 (a) (1) - (5) and management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable exist.

- Existence of appropriate management measures above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.1.1 and 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.1 (a) (3). p. 37-40., 3.1.2 (a) (3) and 3.1.2 (b). p. 41-44.

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.07 Habitat

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 145-153. and 3.1.2 (a) (b). p. 154-159.

AF-6: (Fukushima, Mackerel) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.1 (a). p. 44-47. and 3.1.2 (a) (b). p. 48-52.

D.5.08 Dependent Predators

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of management measures, as necessary, designed to meet the objectives (D.2.07) that seek to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators resulting from fishing on a stock under consideration that is a key prey species.</p>	<p>This is the partner Essential Component of D.2.07. Where the stock under consideration is a key prey species, the standard must require that fishing mortality on that species/stock is managed so as not to result in severe adverse impacts on Dependent Predators. The FAO Guidelines require that all sources of fishing mortality on the stock under consideration are taken into account (whether or not it is a prey species) in assessing the state of the stock under consideration, including discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catches and catches in other fisheries. Severe adverse impacts are mentioned in the Essential Components only in relation to dependent predators. This is in line with the Ecolabelling Guidelines. The severity of adverse impacts is related to their potential reversibility. Severe adverse impacts can be regarded as those that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, which is described in the Glossary.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the Guidelines for Auditors of the Fisheries Management Standard state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-6

D.5.08 Dependent Predators

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(4) Management objectives that seek to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators resulting from fishing on a stock under consideration that is a key prey species and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether management measures designed to achieve the management objectives referred in 3.1.2 (a) (1) – (5) and management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable exist.

- Existence of appropriate management measures above.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (4) and (b). p. 41-44.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157. and 3.1.2 (b). p. 158-159.

AF-6: (Fukushima, Mackerel) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 48-50. and 3.1.2 (b). p. 51-52.

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.09 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives (D.2.08) that seek to minimize adverse impacts of the unit of certification, including any associated enhancement activities, on the structure, processes and functions of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.</p>	<p>Ecosystem structure, processes and function are described in the Glossary. This language is in accordance with Section 4.1.4.1 of the FAO Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, which suggests one of the broad management objectives for a fisheries could be to keep impact on the structure, processes and functions of the ecosystem at an acceptable level.</p> <p>Adverse impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible are discussed in the Glossary. These may include genetic modification and changed ecological role.</p> <p>An earlier version of the requirements included an Essential Component on the conservation of biodiversity. Conservation of biodiversity is not mentioned separately in the Guidelines, but it is included in the CCRF Article 7.2.2 (d), which requires that States and sub-regional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should adopt appropriate measures, based on the best scientific evidence available to provide that inter alia biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems is conserved. The structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems includes biodiversity, hence this is considered to be included in this Essential Component.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).</p> <p>Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (5) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AF-1, AF-5</u>

D.5.09 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(5) Management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of the unit of certification on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with achieving management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether management measures designed to achieve the management objectives referred in 3.1.2 (a) (1) – (5) and management measures that minimize unwanted catch and discards, where appropriate, and reduce post-released mortality where incidental catch is unavoidable exist.

- Existence of appropriate management measures above.

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.09 Ecosystem Structure, Processes and Function

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(3) Management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of associated enhancement activities if applicable, on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives and management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2, 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (5) and (b). p. 41-44 and 3.2.3 (c) (3). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 94-97 and 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D.5.10 Small-Scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard recognizes management measures commonly used in small scale fisheries can achieve adequate levels of protection for stocks in the face of uncertainty about the state of the resource and that a past record of good management performance could be considered as supporting evidence of the adequacy of the management measures and the management system.</p>	<p>This Essential Component derives from paragraph 32 of the Marine Ecolabelling Guidelines. It cuts across the other components covering management measures and seeks recognition within the certification scheme that less sophisticated management measures commonly used in small scale fisheries can still achieve adequate protection of stocks, providing uncertainty is properly addressed. The scheme could,</p>

D . 5 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.5.10 Small-Scale and/or Data Limited Fisheries

for example, accept a past record of good outcomes under such management measures as evidence of their adequacy.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.

Indicator(s) 2.5 (d) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, fisheries governance and management systems for those fisheries are prepared, with due consideration to the availability of data and the fact that management systems can differ substantially for different types and scales of fisheries.

- Existence of small-scale fisheries or data limited fisheries

Indicator(s) 2.5 (e) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

Whether, in the case of small-scale and/or data limited fisheries, the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively verified and applied into the fisheries management system.

- Existence of verification methods of the knowledge of traditional fisheries, fishers and fishery regions is objectively

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (d) and (e). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (d). p. 65 and 2.5 (e). p. 66.

References

- [AF-3](#)

D.6 FISHERIES STANDARD

D.6.01 Certified Stocks

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the stock under consideration is not overfished.</p>	<p>The stock under consideration is considered to be overfished if its stock size is below its limit reference point (or its proxy). Decision rules should avoid stocks falling below Blim but sometimes they do not for reasons that may or may not be wholly or partly due to the fishery and/or the management of the fishery. Nevertheless, the language in the Guidelines states that "the stock under consideration is not overfished, and is maintained at a level which promotes the objective of optimal utilization and maintains its availability for present and future generations." If the stock under consideration of a certified fishery becomes overfished, the scheme should cause the certification of this fishery to be suspended or revoked.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.7 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The stock under consideration is not overfished. In the event that the status of the stock drops below levels at which remedial actions should be undertaken, necessary measures shall be implemented in a timely manner in order to avoid recruitment overfishing.</p> <p>Indicator(s) 2.7 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) (b) Whether the stock under consideration is not overfished.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of the stock under consideration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF-1, AF-3

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.01 Certified Stocks

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):
Requirements 2.7; Indicators 2.7 (b). p. 34–36.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):
AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.7 (b). p. 138–141.
AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.7 (b). p. 69–70.

D.6.02 Certified Stocks

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the existence of outcome indicator(s) consistent with achieving management objectives for the stock under consideration (D.2.01, - D.2.03).	The relevant management objectives are those referred to in Performance Area 2 and are for the whole of the stock under consideration. The outcome indicators should be consistent with demonstrating that the management objectives have been effectively achieved. Outcome indicators are required for all management objectives for the stock under consideration, which may include, for example, target reference points that take into account the requirements of dependent predators, where appropriate (D.2.07).
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 2.5 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) There shall be publicly-defined target and limit reference points, or proxies for the stock under consideration set on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, in order to maintain or recover the stock at levels consistent with achieving Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) or a suitable proxy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>AF-1, AF-3</i>

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.02 Certified Stocks

Indicator(s) 2.5 (c) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether outcome indicators exist to achieve management objectives of the stock under consideration concerning "limit reference point," "target reference point" or those substitute proxies for the sustainable fisheries.

- Existence of outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.5; Indicators 2.5 (c). p. 28-31.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (c). p. 123-127.

AF-3: (Tomakomai, Surf Calm) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.5 (c). p. 64.

D.6.03 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the natural reproductive stock components of enhanced stocks are not overfished.	<p>All Essential Components that address Enhanced Fisheries can be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover these fisheries. In the case of enhanced fisheries, the stock under consideration may comprise naturally reproductive components and components maintained by stocking. The natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is described in the Glossary.</p> <p>In the context of avoiding significant negative impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive components of the stock under consideration, the Inland Ecolabelling Guidelines state that displacement [of the naturally reproductive</p>

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.03 Enhanced Fisheries

components of enhanced stocks by stocked components] must not result in a reduction of the natural reproductive stock component below abundance-based target reference points (or their proxies).

Decision rules (D.5.03) should avoid stocks falling below Blim but sometimes they do not for reasons that may or may not be wholly or partly due to the fishery and/or the management of the fishery. Nevertheless, the language in the Guidelines states that both the stock under consideration and the naturally reproductive components of enhanced stocks are not overfished. In addition, naturally reproductive components of enhanced stocks are not substantially displaced by stocked components. If the stock under consideration of a certified fishery becomes overfished, the scheme should cause the certification of this fishery to be suspended or revoked.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 2.7 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The stock under consideration is not overfished. In the event that the status of the stock drops below levels at which remedial actions should be undertaken, necessary measures shall be implemented in a timely manner in order to avoid recruitment overfishing.

Indicator(s) 2.7 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether the stock under consideration is not overfished.

- Status of the stock under consideration

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

References

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.03 Enhanced Fisheries

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) Management objectives shall be developed to maintain the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration at a sustainable level, and management measures shall be implemented that are consistent with achieving these management objectives.

Indicator(s) 3.2.2 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(b) Whether management objectives for avoiding significant negative impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock component of the stock under consideration and any other wild stocks from which the organisms for stocking are being removed and management measures designed to achieve the management objectives exist.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures (including those equivalent thereto)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 2.7 and 3.2.2; Indicators 2.7 (b). p. 34-36 and 3.2.2 (b). p. 50-52.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.7 (b). p. 138-141.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 2.7 (b). p. 82-84. and 3.2.2 (b). p. 116-118.

D.6.04 Enhanced Fisheries

GSSI Component	Guidance
In the case of enhanced fisheries, the standard requires that the natural	All Essential Components that address Enhanced Fisheries can be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover these fisheries. In the case of enhanced fisheries, the stock under consideration may comprise naturally

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.04 Enhanced Fisheries

reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.

reproductive components and components maintained by stocking. The natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is described in the Glossary.

With respect to "substantially displaced", in particular, displacement must not result in a reduction of the natural reproductive stock component below abundance-based target reference points (or their proxies).

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement. Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)
(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (b) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether following information about the impacts of release of artificial seedling on other species and the ecosystem exists:

(1) Assessment of the extent to which non-target catches and discards by associated culture and enhancement activities threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

(2) Assessment of the impacts of associated culture and enhancement activities on endangered species with appropriate related data/information collected in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

(3) Assessment of the impacts of associated culture and enhancement activities on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification in the full spatial range of the relevant habitat, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing.

References

- [AF-5](#)

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.04 Enhanced Fisheries

(4) Analysis of the effects of associated culture and enhancement activities on ecosystem structure, processes and function to develop timely scientific advice on the likelihood and magnitude of impacts with appropriate related data/information in accordance with applicable international standards and practices.

- Existence of information about impacts on other species and the ecosystem referred in (1) - (4) above.
- Existence of information about the distributional area of seedling and growth after the seedling is released, including information to confirm that the natural reproductive stock component of enhanced stocks is not substantially displaced by stocked components.

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.2.3; Indicators 3.2.3 (b). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s): AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.2.3 (b). p. 122-123.

D.6.05 Non-Certified Catches

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of outcome indicator(s) consistent with achieving management objectives for non-certified stocks (i.e. stocks/species in the catch that</p>	<p>The relevant management objectives are those referred to in Performance Area 2 and are for non-certified species/stocks. The outcome indicators should be consistent with demonstrating that the management objectives (D.2.04) have been effectively achieved. Non-certified catches refers to species/stocks that are taken by the unit of certification other than the stock for which certification is being sought (see Glossary).</p> <p>Examples of irreversible or very slowly reversible effects on bycatch species include excessive depletion of very long-lived organisms (see Glossary). To mitigate effects that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly</p>

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.05 Non-Certified Catches

are other than the stock under consideration) (D.2.04).

reversible requires those effects to be made less severe such that they are no longer likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (1) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(1) Management objectives that seek to ensure that non-target catches and discards by the unit of certification of stocks other than the stock under consideration does not threaten those non-target stocks with recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (1). p. 41-44.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

References

- [AF-1, AF-2](#)

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.05 Non-Certified Catches

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

D.6.06 COMTitle

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of outcome indicator(s) consistent with achieving management objectives (D.2.05) that seek to ensure that Endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with the unit of certification and any associated culture or enhancement activity, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible.</p>	<p>The context of this Essential Component is Endangered Species. Endangered species are defined in the Glossary. These species are already adversely impacted at the population level, by definition, and are susceptible to further adverse impacts at this level from which they need to be protected. Where "adverse impacts" is used in relation to Endangered Species in the FAO Guidelines there is no further qualification provided (i.e. no "significant" or "severe"). Elsewhere in the Guidelines, the term "adverse impacts" is qualified, but in each case this is in a very specific context. For example. The term "significant negative impacts" is used in the FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines only in relation to enhanced fisheries and "severe adverse impacts" is used only in relation to dependent predators. The term "significant adverse impacts" occurs only in the Deep Sea Guidelines with respect to VMEs.</p> <p>The outcome indicators required by the standard should be consistent with demonstrating that the management objectives for Endangered Species (D.2.05) have been effectively achieved. The actual outcome would be measured by an assessment required under D.4.10.</p> <p>The FAO Ecolabelling Guidelines acknowledge that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks (paragraph 31 (41)), hence the outcome indicators necessary to meet this Essential Component should take into account risk and uncertainty.</p>
Conclusion	References

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.06 COMPTitle

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(2) Management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with the unit of certification, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with the achieving management objectives.

· Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto
(information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (2) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

- [AF-1, AF-5](#)

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.06 COMPTitle

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(2) Management objectives that seek to ensure that endangered species are protected from adverse impacts resulting from interactions with associated culture or enhancement activity, including recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives and management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (2). p. 41-44 and 3.2.3 (c) (2). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 157-157.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 94-97. and 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.

D.6.07 COMPTitle

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the existence of outcome indicator(s) consistent with achieving management	The outcome indicators should be consistent with demonstrating that the management objectives have been effectively achieved for habitat (D.2.06).

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.07 COMPTitle

objectives (D.2.06) for avoiding, minimizing or mitigating the impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the “stock under consideration” and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification.

Essential habitats are described in the Glossary. Examples of impacts on habitat that should be avoided include the destruction or severe modification of rare and/or vulnerable habitats. In assessing fishery impacts, the full spatial range of the relevant habitat should be considered, not just that part of the spatial range that is potentially affected by fishing.

The FAO Guidelines acknowledge that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks (paragraph 31 (41)), hence the outcome indicators necessary to meet this Essential Component should take into consideration risk and uncertainty.

Conclusion

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(3) Management objectives seeking to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of the unit of certification on essential habitats for the stock under consideration and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear of the unit of certification and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives

References

- [AF-1, AF-2](#)

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.07 COMPTitle

· Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (3). p. 41-44.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

D.6.08 COMPTitle

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard includes outcome indicator(s) consistent with achieving management objectives (D.2.07) that seek to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators resulting from fishing on a stock under consideration that is a key prey species.</p>	<p>The outcome indicators should be consistent with demonstrating that the management objectives have been effectively achieved for dependent predators (D.2.07). Dependent predators are described in the Glossary.</p> <p>The FAO Guidelines acknowledge that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks (paragraph 31 (41)), hence the outcome indicators should take into account risk and uncertainty.</p>
Conclusion	References

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.08 COMPTitle

MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;

Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).

Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (4) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(4) Management objectives that seek to avoid severe adverse impacts on dependent predators resulting from fishing on a stock under consideration that is a key prey species and outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives.

· Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1):

Requirements 3.1.2; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (4). p. 41-44.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113.

- [AF-1, AF-2](#)

D . 6 F I S H E R I E S S T A N D A R D

D.6.09 COMPTitle	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires the existence of outcome indicator(s) consistent with achieving management objectives (D.2.08) that seek to minimize adverse impacts of the unit of certification, including any enhancement activities, on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible. Any modifications to the habitat for enhancing the stock under consideration must be reversible and not cause serious or irreversible harm to the natural ecosystem’s structure, processes and function.</p>	<p>The outcome indicators should be consistent with demonstrating that the management objectives for impacts on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems (D.2.08) have been effectively achieved. The component relating to enhancement activity may be "not applicable" to schemes that explicitly do not cover enhanced fisheries.</p> <p>Ecosystem structure, processes and function are described in the Glossary. This language is in accordance with Section 4.1.4.1 of the FAO Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, which suggests one of the broad management objectives for a fisheries could be to keep impact on the structure, processes and functions of the ecosystem at an acceptable level.</p> <p>The FAO Guidelines acknowledge that much greater scientific uncertainty is to be expected in assessing possible adverse ecosystem impacts of fisheries than in assessing the state of target stocks (paragraph 31 (41)), hence the outcome indicators necessary to meet this Essential Component should take into account risk and uncertainty.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>MEL is in alignment because requirement(s) in the FMS (Ver 2.0) and indicator(s) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1) state as follows;</p> <p>Requirement 3.1.2 in the FMS (Ver 2.0) The unit of certification shall be operated in ways to minimize adverse impacts on non-target stocks and ecosystem, taking into account the assessment results of above 3.1.1(a) (1) - (5).</p> <p>Indicator(s) 3.1.2 (a) (5) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AF-1, AF-2, AF-5</i>

D.6.09 COMPTitle

(a) Whether the unit of certification operates the fishery with consideration to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts on non-target stocks, endangered species and ecosystem with following management objectives and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto), taking into account the assessment results of 3.1.1.

(5) Management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of the unit of certification on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible and outcome indicators consistent with achieving management objectives, considered that any modifications to the habitat for enhancing the stock under consideration must be reversible and not cause serious or irreversible harm to the natural ecosystem's structure, processes and function.

- Existence of management objectives and outcome indicators above including those equivalent thereto (information/data on non-target species, ecosystem)

Standard 3.2 particularly requires the consideration of ecosystem in the associated fish farming and resource enhancement.

Requirement 3.2.3 in the FMS (Ver 2.0)

(In case of the associated fish farming and resource enhancement,) There shall be continuous monitoring of the state of the stock under consideration and its habitat, and measures shall be implemented in order to avoid significant adverse impacts of enhancement activities on the natural reproductive stock components of the stock under consideration and ecosystem.

Indicator(s) 3.2.3 (c) (3) in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1)

(c) Whether following management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) exist to avoid severe adverse impacts of release of artificial seedling on the natural reproduction of the stock under consideration and on the ecosystem:

(3) Management objectives that seek to minimize adverse impacts of associated enhancement activities if applicable, on the structure, processes and function of aquatic ecosystems that are likely to be irreversible or very

D.6.09 COMTitle

slowly reversible, outcome indicators consistent with achieving the management objectives and management measures, as necessary, designed to achieve the management objectives.

- Existence of management objectives, management measures and outcome indicators (including those equivalent thereto) referred in (1) – (3) above

Additional information for the above requirement(s) and indicator(s) can be found in the FMS Guidelines (Ver 2.1): Requirements 3.1.2 and 3.2.3; Indicators 3.1.2 (a) (5). p. 41-44. and 3.2.3 (c) (3). p. 53-56.

Examples of the requirement(s) in use can be found in the Assessment Report(s):

AF-1: (Wajima, Purse Seine) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 154-157.

AF-2: (Sea of Japan, Red Snow Crab) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 109-113. and 3.2.3 (c). p. 104-105.

AF-5: (Hokkaido, Chum Salmon) Summary Evidence and Evidence 3.1.2 (a). p. 94-97. and 3.2.3 (c). p. 124-125.