

Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch®

Seafood Watch® Criteria for Salmon Fisheries

Summary of comments from Public Consultation 1 and Responses

Preamble

Seafood Watch assesses the environmental sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture by compiling relevant science-based information and evaluating that information against our standards (called 'Criteria' elsewhere on this website). We periodically revise our standards to ensure we account for developments in the scientific understanding of the ecological impacts of fisheries and aquaculture operations, as well as in our understanding of what producers and managers can do to mitigate those impacts. Seafood Watch initiated a public comment period from October 27, 2014 to January 16, 2015 and received comments from ENGO's, producers, certification schemes, and other interested stakeholders.

The comments received have been summarized, grouped together by similar themes or by criterion and are presented in the left hand columns of each table below, with Seafood Watch responses in the right column. Seafood Watch has carefully considered all comments received in addition to reviewing many of them with our Technical Advisory Committee and/or Expert Working Groups. Below we present our responses to all comments received as part of the official Public Comment Period as per the requirements of the ISEAL Code of Good Practice Standards-Setting Code¹.

General Comments

Comment	Response
An assessment of aquaculture related impacts should be included in the standard, utilizing specific criteria from the aquaculture standard to assess the impacts. Issues that were identified	These comments were discussed at length during meeting of the Expert Working Group and internally. It was decided that assessment using the aquaculture criterion was not necessary for a

¹ <http://www.isealalliance.org/our-work/defining-credibility/codes-of-good-practice/standard-setting-code>

<p>were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feed use - Antibiotic and chemical use - Effluent - Habitat impacts - Effectiveness of management 	<p>number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seafood Watch assesses the environmental concerns associated with the production of seafood products; hatcheries represent a minor part of the production of seafood (typically <1% of adult weight). We therefore assess environmental impacts associated with production of the adult fish and their harvest. - This approach is consistent with our aquaculture assessments which do not consider impacts during the hatchery stage as they are a minor component of the overall impact associated with farmed seafood production. - Ongoing habitat impacts associated with artificial production are thought to be minimal due to the short duration of any impact and the potential for habitats to recover. There may be long term impacts associated with the building of hatchery facilities, spawning channels, and weirs; however the expert working group thought it was important to consider that artificial production facilities are typically developed in habitats that have already been modified by other human activities. <p>Compliance with local, regional and national regulations relating to environmental impact will be assessed in Factor 3.4, 'Enforcement of Management Regulations'. Management of chemical use and effluent, and compliance with such regulations have been identified as key characteristics of effective artificial production management.</p>
--	---

Criterion 1

Comment	Response
<p>Assessing Wild Stock Status: Some salmonid fisheries have limit reference points, generally considered to be 50% of the escapement goal. Any assessment needs to be consistent with the Wild Capture Standard with respect to what is considered an</p>	<p>There are a number of different strategies for managing salmonid stock abundance and a range of reference point types. Additional guidance has been added to the Standard to ensure that there is consistency across all wild-capture fisheries with respect to assessing different reference points,</p>

overfished/depleted stock.	which includes specific guidance for salmonid fisheries.
Abundance should be assessed over a timeframe; suggest 10 years	The expert working group agreed that abundance should be assessed over time; some thought that 15 years was appropriate and others thought 10 years would be more appropriate. Fifteen years has been chosen as it represents 3 generations of the longest lived salmon species (Chinook) and is consistent with other assessment schemes.
Assessment at the stock management unit level makes sense.	Assessment of abundance will be done at the level of the stock management unit.
Assessing Artificial Production: It seems as though artificial production is assessed in several places, it will be important to ensure that fisheries are not penalized for the same issues a number of times.	There are a number of different impacts associated with artificial production and the aim of the standard is to address the different impacts in the different areas, for example impacts on natural stocks, impacts associated with management systems. Seafood Watch will aim to ensure that fisheries are not penalized twice for the same issue and pilot testing will enable us to check this.
Some salmonid fisheries have fishing mortality based reference points but there is no place for this to be assessed.	Fishing mortality or exploitation rates are sometimes calculated for salmonid fisheries, however the use of fishing mortality reference points is rare. We believe that the current abundance based assessment captures the concerns associated with the health of a stock and the impact of a fishery.
If there is no artificial production is fishing mortality assessed instead? This approach seems inconsistent.	All salmonid fisheries will be assessed using the same scoring factor. No artificial production will be a scoring option in this scoring factor.

Criterion 4

Comment	Response
Feedback from public comments and the expert working group suggests that the guidance needed to be more focused and more explicit to ensure consistent application of the criteria.	Guidance has been edited and more detail has been added. Additional guidance has also been added in response to points raised at the expert working group.