

# Summary of comments revision process FOS Wild v.4 and FOS Audit Guidance v.2

## Scope

During the revision process of the standard **FOS Wild v.4** and **FOS Audit Guidance v.2** Friend of the Sea has received and managed the following comments, received by members of our Technical Committee and stakeholders, and reported anonymously.

## Comments

Date	Requirement	Comment received	Answer from Friend of the Sea
23/10/2019	1.1.1	The collection and analysis of fisheries data should be undertaken by independent fisheries science organisations/providers who hold recognised international quality assurance accreditation.	Interesting observation. We consider the RFMOs as the right bodies to collect these data and we believe they meet your request.
23/10/2019	1.1.4	By data I am presuming we mean both measured and model figures. The EU's regulation around the landing obligation and the associated discard plans should be providing validated 'data' of the level of discards. Does this requirement mean in practice that	Yes, we mean measured and model figures. What we request is that the RFMO has to collect data on by-catch, discards, etc. In order to clarify, please consider that our standard is a globally applicable, so is not only about Europe.

		<p>management measures for the stock have to reference by-catch, discards, unobserved mortality, incidental mortality, unreported catch and catch figures or does it allow for an assessment of the accuracy of the presented information? i.e. the estimations are available, determined by a recognised methodology but not validated. The EU landings obligation data are a case in point awareness of compliance levels would suggest that the industry is not complying with either the letter or spirit of the law.</p>	
23/10/2019	1.1.5	I think timely manner should be made more explicit.	We agree with you, but since we are talking about many species in different parts of the world, is difficult to define a general definition of timely manner.
23/10/2019	2.1	Again perhaps a reasonable requirement would be for this requirement to be available at the time of assessment and re-assessment.	What we request in this requirement to the auditor is to collect the most updated data from the competent FMO, based on the best scientific evidence available.
23/10/2019	2.3	I think this is a reasonable requirement but would presumably would not rule out fisheries	We understand your point of view, but our target is to reduce the impact on the seabed as less as possible. If the seabed has already been

		heavily reliant on demersal trawl and dredge gear if the area being fished has already been impacted by these gear types in the recent past. If the driver of this requirement is to encourage the adoption of lower impact gear types it might not be effective.	damaged by other fisheries, and we have knowledge about it, the unit of certification shall adopt lower impact gears to be considered sustainable.
23/10/2019	3.1	No comment to add other than to question the level rating; could this not be essential.	You are right, after an internal meeting we have decided to change the level of the requirement from Important to Essential. Thanks for the suggestion.
23/10/2019	3.3	I guess compliance to this requirement is linked to the quality of the fisheries management measures as well as compliance and monitoring levels and would be captured in previous requirements.	We agree with you, but we want to keep it separated and make clear the maximum level of discards, in order to let the stakeholders find it easily.
23/10/2019	3.4.1	I think with all the impact that FAD's have that some of the next requirements 3.4.1 to 3.4.7 could/should be a requirement. If the aim is to drive improvements and to differentiate FOS certified fisheries from non-certified fisheries this could be done. Understanding that standards can't be	We presume you are asking to change the level of the requirements from Important to Essential. We recognize all the impacts generated by FADs, however, at this stage, we consider that the unit of certifications need more time to get in compliance with these requirements. In this way, instead of being in compliance in three months (timeframe of an essential requirement), the UoC has up to 1 year to get in

		prohibitive then 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 may be a good first step in managing the use and control of FAD's	compliance with these requirements.
23/10/2019	3.5	This should surely be an essential requirement level of every fishery?	Yes, it is applicable to all fisheries, as it is a brutal practice that we want to discourage. Furthermore, the number of sharks that is killed each year just for their fins is incredibly high (about 70 million specimens are killed each year), and this practices has a negative impact on the entire marine ecosystem.
23/10/2019	3.6	Again in this day and age this should perhaps be an essential requirement for a fishery to achieve certification?	We agree, but buying and installing TEDs can take money and time (which can be more than 3 months) and for this reason we want to allow up to 1 year to comply with this requirement.
23/10/2019	4.5	Does the auditor have to cross reference each Countries fisheries laws and how do they judge compliance?	The auditor shall gain knowledge of the applicable fisheries laws before the onsite inspection and verify general compliance of the unit of certification with them. The information and documents related to legal compliance can be gathered during the preliminary audit phase. Fisheries laws and regulations are available at <a href="http://www.fao.org/faolex/en/">http://www.fao.org/faolex/en/</a> . All the following shall be verified also on board the inspected vessels during the on-site audit.

23/10/2019	5.1.2	Need to ensure that 'Responsible' is well defined.	Right, we will add to the Audit Guidance the following: "With responsible deep-sea fishers we intend the deep-sea fishers that are certified by Friend of the Sea or other certification schemes recognised by GSSI."
23/10/2019	5.2.1	I think the challenge will be ensuring that the expert advice accessed to define what the precautionary limits are is impartial and balanced	Please have a look of our definition of Precautionary approach to fisheries management in the Audit Guidance (page 16)
23/10/2019	5.3	This presumably would be subject to confirmatory checks by the auditor.	Yes, the auditor has to check that FMO has ensured the compliance with fishery regulations and take a final decision.
23/10/2019	5.4	Good and there would need to be a method of checking accuracy of the records given the widespread flouting of national and international discard bans	In this case, the auditor has to assess the method and report if improvements are needed. We will add this to the related Audit Guidance.
23/10/2019	5.6	If there is no national policy in place or when it is deemed not to be sufficient, I presume that there will be a requirement for the fishery under assessment to have a policy anyway.	Yes, if there is no a national policy or when it is deemed not to be sufficient, the requirement 5.7 covers this gap.
23/10/2019	5.8.1	I would like to question the level here. I understand that standards necessarily have to take a stepwise approach but lost gear and ghost fishing is	Since this is a new requirement, we want to give up to 1 year to the UoC to be in compliance with. We agree with the importance of this requirement.

		incredibly important and this could be an opportunity to drive standards in fisheries under assessment.	
23/10/2019	6.4	I suggest this would be relevant to all vessels under the FOS scheme	We think that at the moment the real impact is coming mainly from large scale vessels. We will consider it for the future.
23/10/2019	8.1.4	The challenge for the auditor will be the scope of assessment i.e. can they be expected to assess all risks and hazards in the work environment.	The auditor shall verify this during the pre audit, and then double check that everything is covered during the on-site audit.
23/10/2019	8.1.9	Should we be asking that they meet the Maritime labour convention (MLC) standards which already sets out the minimal working rights for seafarers.	we agree, we will add reference in the Audit Guidance
18/11/2019	1.1.1	<p>'- Should there is a lack of data and documentation about a fisheries that may result in higher uncertainty about the performance of the fisheries will it result in lower scores ? And will it increases to the cost of assessment</p> <p>'- In the case of small scale fisheries, is there any range of funding sources and opportunites to assists fisheries certification ?</p>	<p>First of all we want to highlight that we do not use any score. A requirement is respected or not (and this is assessed by the auditor). In the case essential and/or important requirement are not respected, non-conformity(ies) is(are) opened. NCs have to be solved, otherwise the company under assessment won't be certified. Usually costs are not increased. Pleas have a look about our certification procedure FOS 0001 v.9.3 (pages 13-14). Regarding your second point, we are open to provide with</p>



		can FOS help to provide with up-to-date advice on relevant funding option in client region	up-to-date advice on relevant funding option in client region.
9/11/2019	1.1.1	OK, BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	Yes, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001
9/11/2019	1.1.4	OK, BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	Yes, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001
9/11/2019	2.1	OK, BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	Yes, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001
9/11/2019	2.3	The evaluation of an exactly defined recovering time can be verified with high uncertainty. We'd rather introduce considerations about the fishing gear type, the seabed and environment characteristics, measures undertaken by the fishery for minimizing the impact.	We agree, we will change it by saying something general in the column parameters and information and specifying what you suggested in the Audit Guidance. Regarding Stage 1 Audit, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001

		For high impact gears, stronger recovery measures shall be asked. In any case, also for this requirement: BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	
9/11/2019	3.4.3	HOW MANY TIMES IS IT FEASIBLE TAKING A PICTURE OF THE MARKER?	Every on-site audit. Please take at least one picture of the marker.
9/11/2019	3.4.4	HOW MANY TIMES IS IT FEASIBLE TAKING A PICTURE OF THE MARKER?	Every on-site audit. Please take at least one picture of the tracking device.
9/11/2019	4.5	OK, BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	Yes, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001
9/11/2019	5.11, 5.11.1, 5.11.3, 5.11.4, 5.11.5	OK, BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	Yes, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001
9/11/2019	5.12	OK, BUT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT DURATION SHALL BE INCREASED	Yes, once we will get the feedback from all our CBs (as written in our document Standard Development and Maintenance Procedures for Seafood Standards, paragraph 7.2 page 3), then we will update our FOS 0001
13/11/2019	1.1.2, 1.1.3	Who monitors it in the three year time? Just in	The auditor, during every audit (initial, surveillance, re-



		surveillance or reassessment?	certification, unannounced and additional if necessary)
13/11/2019	1.1.4	Probably it would be useful to grade the requisite if not all the info are reached	We have used the language requested by GSSI in order to be in compliance with their Essential Components D.1.02, D.3.14.
13/11/2019	2.3	Probably it is useful to supply a classification of all fishing gear and their effect on the seabed leaving to the auditors the evaluation of the measures used to respect the requisite	Yes, we are considering to change it based even on other comments received by an other member of the TC.
13/11/2019	3.2	It is not clear which evidence of conformity it is requested- International practices and standards refer to other certification standard or the domestic legal framework? The second part of the requisite requests a conformity supported by the RFMO assessment for that area? is the aim of the requisite to evaluate a risk or just reporting a conformity to an applied legislation? Is it reasonable to grade it essential gathering an important set of information?	The evidences are coming form the related RFMO
13/11/2019	3.4.1	Who is managing this company's commitment? CB , FOS all together?	We agree that can create confusion. We will change it, specifying that the UoC has to provide a list of FADs deployed during the previous 12 months

			during the audit to the auditor, and not to FOS.
13/11/2019	3.6	Normally Ted is a devise that is applied only on trawlers. why this requisite is classified by species and not by fishing gears. Why not extend to all pelagic trawlers and to the bottom trawlers for shrimps fishing?	Agree, we will update the requirement
13/11/2019	5.1.1b	In order to find out the potential effects of bycatch management and discard reduction measures, States shall also provide an assessment on livelihoods to ascertain the potential effects of their implementation and the support necessary to facilitate their uptake. This part is not clear	We added this phrase to require an assessment of the impacts of bycatch management and discard reduction measures on livelihoods and hence consideration of the uptake of these measures.
13/11/2019	5.8.3	This requisite seems more appropriate for an entire fleet or fishery. Difficult to apply to some single vessel	Sure, that's why we added at the end of the requirement: where appropriate and practically possible. We will add more info in the related Audit Guidance.
13/11/2019	5.8.4	This requisite seems more appropriate for an entire fleet or fishery. Difficult to apply to some single vessel	Agree. We will add: "where appropriate and practically possible" and we will add more info in the related Audit Guidance.
13/11/2019	5.14	I have some doubt about the evidences that should be reported.	The auditor shall verify if the competent RFMO has reported the use of such knowledge. If yes, the auditor shall use this as



			evidence. Please check in the related Audit Guidance (page 90) what is requested and let us know if is still unclear please.
13/11/2019	6.5	difficult to report and verify on artisanal vessels	Agree, we will add "where appropriate and practically possible"
13/11/2019	8.1.2	it should also be considered foreign crew for vessels fishing out of territorial water. In some case the vessel s owner is obliged to hire the crew from the state where the vessel is fishing and this is compulsory to obtain the fishing license. In this case part of the crew is hired according the national flag of the vessel and other part according to the minimum wage of the country/ies where the vessel is fishing. There is also the case where the vessel fishes in international water hiring crew from different countries according to the maritime labour office of their original country. In this case the minimum wage is correlated to every single national country.	Agree, we will add to the requirement the following: " According to the international legal framework.
25/10/2019	1.1.2	Qual è la differenza fra sovrasfruttato e sovrapescato? Questo concetto è al punto	Please refer to the related Audit Guidance for the definitions and explanation. Pages 15, 47, 48

		1.1.3; Fmsy (maximum sustainable yield) da mettere anche per esteso dato che è la prima volta che si presenta nel documento.	
25/10/2019	2.1, 3.2	Ci sono alcuni requisiti molto lunghi nella check list: si possono ridurre un po'?	No, unfortunately we cannot reduce them, because otherwise we will risk to missing some essential information and cause confusion to the auditor...our apologies
25/10/2019	2.2	VMS: si può mettere anche per esteso?	Sure, we will update it!
25/10/2019	3.4.1	Punti da 3.4.1 a 3.4.7 sul tema FADs: va chiesto se sono stati considerati anche i due documenti emessi da ISSF nei mesi scorsi: vedi 3.4.2 e 3.4.3	Thanks for the suggestion. We have developed the requirements based on the inputs and recommendations of GGGI (Global Ghost Gear Initiative) and World Animal Protection, with which we cooperate. We have updated the standard before the issue of this document. We will take into account this document for the next revision of the Wild standard.
25/10/2019	3.4.2	Recommended best practices for FAD management in tropical tuna purse seine fisheries (Luglio 2019)	Thanks for the suggestion. We have developed the requirements based on the inputs and recommendations of GGGI (Global Ghost Gear Initiative) and World Animal Protection, with which we cooperate. We have updated the standard before the issue of this document. We will take into account this document for the next revision of the Wild standard.

25/10/2019	4.5.1	Qual è la domanda (o il requisito che si vuole sia tenuto in considerazione)?	This requirement is connected with the requirement 4.5, so you have to read both as a unique requirement.
25/10/2019	4.5.4	Qual è la differenza con 4.5.3 ? Sembrano analoghe.	There is a difference. Please refer to the Audit Guidance at page 64, 65, 66
25/10/2019	6.4	Perche non è applicabile a tutte le imbarcazioni ? Forse avrebbe più senso.	We think that at the moment the real impact is coming mainly from large scale vessels. We will consider it for the future.
25/10/2019	7.2	Dovrebbe essere definito, per ogni organizzazione auditata, un momento zero, un punto di partenza da prendere come riferimento per verificare i successivi progressi.	This is done. We consider as "momento zero" the initial audit.
25/10/2019	8.1.1	Vanno bene le regole ILO sul lavoro minorile, ma sono state considerate anche le regole ILO sul lavoro in generale ? Oppure queste sono già comprese fra i punti 8.1.2 e 8.1. 9 ?	We refer to ILO for all the social accountability requirements. So the answer is yes.
22/10/2019	N.A.	I have review the documents as you requested. They appear to be in order, and nothing seems to need amending.	
3/11/2019	N.A.	I have read the documentation. It is very thorough, detailed and comprehensive. I do not feel I can make	

		additional improvements.	
19/11/2019	N.A.	I have reviewed the documentation and actually find it very detailed already. I have nothing more to add except to wish FOS more success.	
22/09/2019	N.A.	Buenos días No tenéis la versión en castellano de las revisiones?	unfortunately at the moment we don't have a Spanish version, but we are glad to help you if you need more info about the new version. A colleague of mine speaks Spanish, and can give you the answers in Spanish if you wish.
13/12/2019	N.A.	After we discussed, the mandays is already suit with what auditor does on audit. So from us, we don't add any comment regarding the mandays. The comment from Technical Committee is really good input for onsite audit. We wait for the final version. And thank you for letting us comment.	