Northern Brazil Caribbean red snapper - pot/trap

Three-Year Audit Report

Version 1.2, December 2021

## *Purpose*

*The three-year audit report template was developed by FishChoice. The objectives of the three-year audit report are:*

1. *To assess the fishery’s MSC performance indicator scores*
2. *To verify the results of the FIP’s environmental workplan progress as reported on FisheryProgress*
3. *Optional: To provide recommendations to the FIP on environmental workplan actions that should be modified, including recommendations for additional actions/tasks that should be taken or suggested changes to timelines, to help the FIP achieve their stated objectives.*

## *Completing and Submitting the Audit*

*FisheryProgress requires the use of this three-year audit report template and the information must be in submitted in English. FIPs should update the template below with audit results. Note that text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section and should be removed from the final version of this document, and highlighted text should be replaced to reflect the information for your fishery. Save this document as a PDF upon completion and submit to FisheryProgress. Once the audit is complete, FIPs should update all relevant data fields on FisheryProgress based on the audit report, including multi-species/multi-gear excel files.*

## FIP Information

*Fill in the following table. The management authority is the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s)  [state target stock(s), if relevant] | *Lutjanus purpureus*: Caribbean Red Snapper, Pargo Colorado |
| Fishery location | Western Atlantic Ocean |
| Gear type(s) | Pot/ Traps |
| Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons) | 4.500 |
| Vessel type(s) and size(s) | The fleet is artisanal, mainly made of wood (the longest ones can be made of metal), with an average length of 12 meters where approximately 80% of the fleet is less than 12 meters. The tonnage varies between 4.9 and 19.2 tons. |
| Number of vessels | 250 (total estimated fleet) |
| Management authority | Secretaria de Aquicultura e Pesca - SAP/MAPA and Ministério do Meio Ambiente (MMA) (Secretariat for Aquaculture and Fisheries SAP/MAPA and Environment Ministry MMA) |
| Auditor name(s) | Alejandro Karstegl |
| Auditor Organization/Affiliation | Independent |
| Date of report completion | 30 december 2021 |

## FIP Background (Optional)

## *This section is optional. If the auditor completes this section, use it to provide additional information about the context in which the FIP operates.*

## Stakeholder Consultation & Meetings

*In-person and virtual interviews with stakeholders are meant to inform the auditor with regards to the fishery’s performance and to elicit information regarding the contributions that the FIP’s participants have provided in making progress towards the FIP’s objectives. Stakeholders represent the most critical source of information regarding a fishery independent of the FIP lead and FIP participants. Stakeholders can shed light on the diversity of perspectives on the fishery and can highlight any areas of controversy. The stakeholder consultation process allows an auditor to hear a range of perspectives and make an objective and balanced evaluation of the fishery against the MSC Fisheries Standard and the environmental workplan results.*

*A successful stakeholder consultation process will instill confidence in stakeholders that the assessment of a given fishery was well informed by a balanced, accessible, and equitable process to which they were able to contribute meaningfully. It should not be a forum to debate issues, but to identify the full range of relevant information and issues and bring them to the attention of the auditor. It should also help the auditor identify the improvements that have occurred in the fishery as a direct result of the FIP’s activities and provide a foundation upon which the auditor can provide recommendations for potential adjustments that need to be considered for the FIP to fulfill the environmental objectives that they have set out to achieve. For additional guidance on conducting stakeholder consultation, see Annex GPX of the* [*MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements and Guidance Version 2.0*](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/for-business/program-documents/fisheries-program-documents/msc_fisheries_certification_requirements_and_guidance_v2-0.pdf)*.*

*Fill in the following table and include a high-level summary of the subjects that were discussed. Additional rows may need to be added or modified depending on number of participants and meetings completed. Stakeholders may include:* *official participants in the fishery improvement project, as well as government representatives, industry (fishers, processors, exporters, mid supply chain and end buyers, etc.), environmental and social NGOs, and the scientific community, or those who are impacted by the project or have a role in making changes to address environmental challenges in the fishery.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Affiliation | Date and Subjects Discussed |
| Andre Brugger | Netuno USA | 28th October 2021   * Generalities of the fishery and the improvement process. * Description of progress * Description of those involved in the fishery * Description of the management system and stakeholders |
| Martin Dias | OCEANA | 17th December 2021   * Pre-Assessment * FIP overview * Stock assessment and stock status * Harvest strategy development and stock status evaluation * Decision-making processes * Harvest Control Rules * Scientific Research * Habitat and Ecology |
| Natali Piccolo  Murillo Couto de Azevedo  Diego Morroni | -Director Department of Registration, Monitoring and Promotion of Aquaculture and Fisheries (SAP/MAPA)  -General Coordinator of Monitoring  -Coordinator of Monitoring, | 5th January 2022   * Fisheries management system in Brazil: roles, functions and scope * Benchmarks, assessment strategies, and management measures * Monitoring and data collection * Research programs * Management and participation spaces. Coordination between ministries * Management measures projections * Inspection and Control |

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

## *Summarize the progress the FIP has made in the past three years. Optional: provide any recommendations for the FIP (e.g., regarding modifications to FIP actions, or potential gaps in the FIP’s workplan necessary to achieve the FIP’s objectives).*

## Summary of MSC Performance Indicator Scores

*Fill in the “previous score” scoring category (<60, 60-79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) according to the most recent set of scores available on FisheryProgress (see the Improvement Progress tab of the FIP’s profile* — *the most recent scores will be on the right-most column).*

*Fill in the “current score” scoring category (<60, 60-79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) by referring to the* [MSC Fisheries Standard *v2.01*](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/for-business/program-documents/fisheries-program-documents/msc-fisheries-standard-v2-01.pdf?sfvrsn=8ecb3272_19)*.* ***Provide a rationale that explicitly addresses each of the performance indicator’s scoring issues (and references when applicable) only if the current score given is different than the previous score****.*

*Fisheries that contain combinations of multiple target species, gear types, and/or governing jurisdictions (UoAs) should complete the* [*Multi-species/Gear/Jurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet*](https://fisheryprogress.org/sites/default/files/Multissptool_Jan_2020.xlsx) *and use the table below to provide the lowest score for each performance indicator. If a rationale is provided, the auditor may choose to address only the scoring issues for the lowest scoring UoA for that performance indicator.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principle | Component | Performance Indicator | | Previous Score [2018] | Current Score [2021] | Rationale or Key Points |
| 1 | Outcome | 1.1.1 | Stock status | 60-79 | 60-79 | 1.1.1a: At the date of this review, only a preliminary stock assessment is available, carried out with only two years of data collection from the FIP-Pargo Project, indicates a evident state of overfishing (exploitation rate E = 0.71; fishing mortality F = 0.82) with a high level of uncertainty.  On the other hand, there is an analysis of the impact of uncertainty on the biological parameters of the various fishing management strategies (Feltrim, 2019). In this study, various scenarios are analyzed, method consists of simulating the population, fleet dynamics, observations and management implementation based on predefined parameters and thus assessing the efficiency of management strategies with performance indicators and  their behavior against uncertainty.  The results show that despite stable catches over the past)  25 years, the average values ​​of this period may pose a high risk of overfishing and unwanted  population levels, especially if stocks are at high depletion levels. The strategy that provided  the best responses in both its performance assessment and sensitivity analysis suggests shares  of 4.5 thousand tons, with a 75% probability of maintaining sustainable stocks and 82% of  not promoting overfishing.  In this case, with great generosity and considering the difficulty of obtaining information and implementing more robust methods, these values ​​could be assimilated as MSY proxies.  Therefore, considering the high variability and temporal restrictions of the stock assessment, and the uncertainty analysis of the management measures, where it is contemplated that the landing has not exceeded the recommendations, it could be said that it is possible that the stock is below above the point from which recruitment could be affected, but it is not clear that the stock is around the MSY. In this case it reaches 60, but not 80.  1.1.1b Clearly there is no consistent opinion on the condition of the stock, and the first very preliminary approximation accounts for an over-exploitation condition, however, based on the trajectory of total landings according to the study by Feltrim (2019), the stock It could be in better condition, so the probability that it is around the MSY is not known. Therefore, given the condition, it can NOT be determined if the population is, or fluctuates, around a point consistent with the MRS, however, with the available evidence, it cannot be stated otherwise. Given the improvement in risk assessment and analysis, a score of only 60 is awarded.  In the interview with “Secretaria de Aquicultura e Pesca”, they inform that a stock assessment is being developed for the target species, which will be financed by the government and should be available by the end of  2022.  Based on the evidence and available antecedents, it is possible to point out that this PI slightly exceeds 60, showing a significant improvement compared to the initial Pre-Assessment, however, there are improvements to reach 80. |
| 1.1.2 | Stock rebuilding | 60-79 | 60-79 | The fishery has a recovery plan formalized in 2018, which has been built by the fishing authority, with contributions from the FIP. The general objective of the recovery plan is to “Recover the population of the Red Snapper, *Lutjanus Purpureus*, categorized as an endangered species of extinction in the “Vulnerable” category (Ordinance MMA 445/2014) throughout its occurrence on the coast North and Northeast of Brazil”.  The specific objectives contemplate the following:  1. Implement sustainable fisheries management and ordering norms that reduce and control the fishing effort on snapper and ensure its reproduction and recruitment.  2. Adopt measures to ensure that biomass remains at levels compatible with the maximum sustainable yield.  3. Permanently monitor the fishing activity and generate information to fill gaps in knowledge about the species, fisheries and the level of exploitation of the stock;  4. Strengthen inspection and monitoring of measures implemented through the Recovery Plan.  The developed plan contemplates various aspects, in relation to the stock situation, commits concrete actions to improve the fleet and landing control measures, the monitoring of performance indicators and the evaluation of the stock consistent with the MSY in the medium term.  In strict terms, the plan does not contemplate a specific period for the recovery of the stock in terms of status, but it is entirely logical to assume that if the plan proposes a period of between 3 to 5 years for the fulfillment of the committed actions, and that The same period could be required for a second evaluation, considering the biological, ecological and growth parameters indicated in the plan, and that the control and ordering actions would be implemented immediately, it should be reviewed again in the same period, therefore the review should not exceed 3 to 5 years. then, the term to recover the stock would be between 6 and 10 years from the beginning of the recovery plan.  PI 1.1.2a At the time of the evaluation, there is a formalized recovery plan agreed between the stakeholders, which was clearly developed within the FIP. The Action Plan contemplates actions and terms consistent with the reference to the MSY, however it states that processes must be specified and defined, such as ordering the effort, monitoring and stock evaluation, and establishes deadlines. It is not explicit in the recovery times, but it is possible to assume that recovery should be expected within the period of the second review.  Regarding the situation in the initial Pre-Assessment, the progress here is significant and the fishery exceeds 60, but since the recovery period has not yet been established, it is not possible to reach 80, therefore 60-79 is the recommended score. |
| Management | 1.2.1 | Harvest Strategy | <60 | 60-79 | Regarding the harvest control rules and tools, it is expected that the harvest strategy capture meets the stock management objectives and responds to the status of the stock and the elements of the capture strategy work together to achieve stock management objectives.    In the fishery there are control rules: Fishing for red snapper is regulated mainly by the Interministerial Normative Instruction MPA / MMA No. 08/2012, which: (i) allows fishing activity in the area between the northern limit of Amapá to the border of the states of Alagoas and Sergipe (Foz do Rio São Francisco), from the fifty-meter-deep isobath; (ii) Establishes the closed period from December 15 to April 30, each year disembarkation is allowed until December 18.  The fishing fleet is made up of 184 vessels licenses, with 140 vessels ≤ 15 meters and 44 vessels> 15 meters, as established in the MMA Normative Instruction No. 04, of March 11, 2004, regulated by IN SEAP No. 22 of October 18, 2007, which considers the possibility of conversion established in IBAMA Normative Instruction No. 168, of September 4, 2007.  The ships were also subject to adherence to the satellite monitoring system (PREPS), today an essential condition for the authorization of vessels operating in the activity.  There is evidence that some of the rules adopted consider scientific research. However, no evidence was found that the main sources of uncertainty are considered in this rule. This problem appears clearly when it is questioned which criteria define the number of vessels authorized to fish. There is no technical evidence that clearly shows that the fleet defined in a specific number of vessels considers the main uncertainties related to the fishing power, the annual and seasonal catches of the fleet, the state of the tec stocks.  In general terms, the existing HCRs tend to maintain the levels of catch and fishing effort that have been observed historically, where there is a regulation of effort and fishing season, which have managed to keep the levels relatively constant. However, there is no ability to adjust the measurements in the event of a stock drop. According to the work of Feltrim (2019) at landing levels like those of the current fishery (suggests shares of 4.5 thousand tons), it is considered: a 75% probability of maintaining sustainable stocks and 82% of not promoting overfishing.    According to what was reported by the secretariat, HCR is in construction.  In this PI, a score of 60 is awarded as the strategy has worked and the evidence indicates that the stock has not suffered significant damage.  Therefore, the fishery gets SG 60, but not get 80. |
| 1.2.2 | Harvest control rules and tools | <60 | <60 | The main control rules adopted are based on scientific research that addresses first maturation sizes, population distribution along the bathymetric strata, first catch sizes, among others. These rules appear to be appropriate for population and fishing.  The Secretaria de Aquicultura e Pesca informs that they are evaluating and developing management options, some of which have been discussed within the framework of the FIP. In this case, the option to control landing and effort is being evaluated, but there is still a lack of internal and cross-sectional discussion.  However, the lack of inspection and control mechanisms does not allow them to be classified as effective in controlling exploitation levels, in this sense the fishery should not reach SG 60. |
| 1.2.3 | Information and monitoring | >80 | >80 | Currently, fisheries information has been compiled and studies and diagnoses of the resource have been carried out. There are regulations for the delivery of Logbooks by the fleet and it is currently information that is available and accessible online.  The published data were extracted from the maps on board of the fishing modalities: 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10, having as target species the Snapper (Lutjanus purpureus) and area of ​​operation in the territorial sea N / NE (AP to AL); and Zee N / NE (AP to AL), collected in the MPA / MMA Interministerial Normative Instruction No. 10, of June 10, 2011, delivered by the legal guardians of the vessels in the Federal Superintendencies of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply - SFA's in 2020 or digitally through AGROFORM, directly to SAP due to the COVID-19 pandemic and complying with MPA Normative Instruction No. 20, of September 10, 2014, which establishes criteria and procedures for the completion and delivery of Maps on Board of vessels registered and authorized in the General Registry of Fishing Activity (RGP).  Online information is available on https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/aquicultura-e-pesca/registro-monitoramento-e-cadastro/monitoramento-e- Ordenmento-da-pesca-do-pargo/monitoramento-e- ordinance-of-fishing-do-snapper  Additionally, information obtained directly from the Satellite Fishing Vessel Tracking Program - PREPS system of all vessels of fishing modalities 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10 for the year 2020 was included.  Likewise, some compilations and diagnoses have been carried out within the framework of the development of the FIP.  Even though there is not yet a clear catch control strategy, the actions and mandates for the collection of information are versatile to record landings and effort, it is complemented with spatial information. however, there is great uncertainty in the volumes landed and the size of the fleet. Likewise, the impact of other fleets on total landings has not been measured.  In this sense, it is considered that the collection of information and data exists, and still under development and the consolidation of a harvest strategy is very close, however, the stock assessment process has not yet been determined, but within the framework of the FIP improvements have been noted. Then, this PI is evaluated with 80. |
| 1.2.4 | Assessment of stock status | >80 | >80 | Since the Pre-Assessment, the stock assessment approach has shown some improvements, the collection of information has improved, and the discussion has taken place in various instances that have contributed to the improvement. Considering that the implicit exploitation strategy is to keep the catch and effort levels constant, the recent approaches are consistent with this implicit strategy (Feltrim, 2017), in relation to the generic reference points it remains with a favorable probability of being outside of Risk and assessments consider sources of uncertainty.  The secretary of aquaculture and fisheries has been developing a project for stock assessment which should be ready by the end of 2022, which it hopes to improve in the medium term.  The fishery reaches 80, the score of 80 is maintained |
| 2 | Primary species | 2.1.1 | Outcome | 60-79 | >80 | In the initial PA, only the trap fishery was evaluated, this time two main species were annealed, with less than 10% of the landing of the target species. The report "TECHNICAL DOCUMENT ON A SITUAÇÃO ATUAL DAS PESCARIAS DO PARGO NA REGIÃO NORTE DO BRASIL, 2017" recognizes a greater number of species associated with the fishery in all the fishing gear involved. Likewise, the technical difficulty of distinguishing whether the landing was carried out with traps or spinels has been recognized.  At present, in the fishery a process of gathering information has been developed through the program of Record in detail the activity of vertical longline fishing activity north (N) / northeast (NE) and traps, carried out by the shipowners and with Obligation and deadlines for the delivery of information, which is made official and published by the Ministry of Fisheries (https://sistemasweb.agricultura.gov.br/sap-sisrgp/)  In compliance with the Interministerial Ordinance SEAP-PR / MMA No. 42 of July 27, 2018, which defines the standards for the sustainable use and recovery of the populations of the Lutjanus purpureus (pargus) species, specifically complying with the provisions of the art. 11, the Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries (SAP) promotes the publicity of on-board map data related to catches made in 2020, personal data, as provided in current legislation.  The published data were extracted from the maps on board of the fishing modalities: 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10, having as target species the Snapper (Lutjanus purpureus) and area of ​​operation in the territorial sea N / NE (AP to AL); and Zee N / NE (AP to AL), collected in the MPA / MMA Interministerial Normative Instruction No. 10, of June 10, 2011, delivered by the legal guardians of the vessels in the Federal Superintendencies of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply - SFA's in 2020 or digitally through AGROFORM, directly to SAP due to the COVID-19 pandemic and complying with MPA Normative Instruction No. 20, of September 10, 2014, which establishes criteria and procedures for the completion and delivery of Maps on Board of vessels registered and authorized in the General Registry of Fishing Activity (RGP).  Online information is available on bycatch in the snapper fishery, of which 5 species are recognized with relevance in the landings (about 1% of the total landed), however, the bycatch corresponds to 15% of the total disembarkation in analysis  https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/aquicultura-e-pesca/registro-monitoramento-e-cadastro/monitoramento-e- Ordenmento-da-pesca-do-pargo/monitoramento-e- ordinance-of-fishing-do-snapper  Additionally, information obtained directly from the Satellite Fishing Vessel Tracking Program - PREPS system of all vessels of fishing modalities 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10 for the year 2020 was included.  A study of underwater filming was carried out with the traps, where the low interaction of the trap with primary and secondary species was confirmed.  In view of the scientific information available, the evidence from official data on board and the in-situ experience of cameras on board, the interaction with other species in the fishery is very low, so it is possible to assume that the impact of the fishery of Snapper, even considering all authorized fishing gear and the entire fleet it operates, does not put bycatch species at risk. In this sense, the fishery exceeds the score of 80, because the background and analysis have enough evidence about a very low bycatch level. |
| 2.1.2 | Management strategy | >80 | >80 | Even when there is no specific regulatory strategy, the levels of interaction reported are very low. Even so, there is regulation of fishing gear, which in part avoids excess bycatch, there are regulations to report everything caught on fishing trips and the areas of operation are being registered.  There is a snapper recovery plan, which will have regulations for effort, mortality and other regulations that will control the target fishery and consequently, the impact on Bycatch.  Based on the data and the observed Bycatch levels, it is considered that the fishery gets 80. Then, the score is 80. |
| 2.1.3 | Information | >80 | >80 | The Bycatch information from the fleet is published on the official website, also it`s available several technical reports.  Quantitative information is being collected that would allow an assessment of the status of the populations involved, even when the incidence in the fishery is very low.  In this case, it is considered that it reaches the score of 80 |
| Secondary species | 2.2.1 | Outcome | >80 | >80 | The case of secondary species is similar to primary species, with the exception that the occurrence in the fishery is even lower.  Therefore, the fishery is not considered a great threat to these species.  The procedures and actions are similar to those indicated for PI 2.1.1  In this case, the fishery is not considered a threat to these species and does not compromise their safety limits.  Considering that the collection and analysis of data is in the process of development, this PI is evaluated with 80 |
| 2.2.2 | Management strategy | >80 | >80 | The snapper recovery plan has regulations for effort, mortality and other regulations that will control the target fishery and consequently, the impact on Bycatch.  Based on the data and the low observed Bycatch levels for secondaries species, it is considered that the fishery reaches 80 |
| 2.2.3 | Information | >80 | >80 | The Bycatch information from the fleet is published on the official website, also it`s available several technical reports.  Quantitative information is being collected that would allow an assessment of the status of the populations involved, even when the incidence in the fishery is very low.  In this case, it is considered that it reaches the score of 80 |
| ETP species | 2.3.1 | Outcome | >80 | >80 | The information recently collected confirms that the fishery does not affect ETP species (based on reports from the UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PARÁ, INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS COSTEIROS), and in case events or interactions are reported, there are procedures and action protocols to report, manipulate and release.  The PI get 80. |
| 2.3.2 | Management strategy | >80 | >80 | For its part, the Ministry of the Environment has action plans for sharks and rays, marine mammals, marine reptiles and seabirds, in accordance with international recommendations and directives. The information must be reported in the capture logs made by shipowners and fishermen.  <https://www.in.gov.br/web/dou/-/portaria-n-375-de-1-de-agosto-de-2019-209272605>  <https://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/faunabrasileira/plano-de-acao-nacional-lista/841-plano-de-acao-nacional-para-a-conservacao-das-tartarugas-marinhas4>  <https://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/faunabrasileira/plano-de-acao-nacional-lista/2839-plano-de-acao-nacional-para-a-conservacao-dos-tubaroes>  The PI get 80. |
| 2.3.3 | Information | >80 | >80 | After some time of observation, the UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PARÁ, INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS COSTEIROS reports has now sufficient information that shows this fishery doesn't affect any ETP species.  Within the report of snapper fishing activities, the delivery of information on ETP species is contemplated, so any event would be reported through this program.  https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/aquicultura-e-pesca/registro-monitoramento-e-cadastro/monitoramento-e- Ordenmento-da-pesca-do-pargo/monitoramento-e- ordinance-of-fishing-do-snapper  Additionally, information obtained directly from the Satellite Fishing Vessel Tracking Program - PREPS system of all vessels of fishing modalities 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10 was included and can be used for.  The last information recorded, the action plans, the possibility of reporting interactions in the current system and the scarce interaction with ETP species allow a score of 80 |
| Habitats | 2.4.1 | Outcome | >80 | >80 | During the first pre-evaluation carried out, there was no full knowledge of the habitat in the resource's distribution area, subsequently oil and gas prospective drilling studies found a carbonate system off the Amazon River Basin mouth, underneath the river plume (Moura et al, 2016). With this information, the situation changes since there is a possibility that fishing gear affects habitats in an unforeseen way.  In this sense, pilot experiments are carried out to evaluate the impact of the traps on the bottom and the species with which they interact.  knowledge is incipient, but it accounts for the presence of corals and other structures. The footage will continue as part of a monitoring program  The information is scarce, since it has recently been discovered, according to the experience gathered and the fishing history, it is probable that the extractive activity of the fleet does not reduce the structure and function of the habitats frequently found to a point where it can be produced. serious or irreversible damage.  As this information should continue to develop, a score of 80 is considered adequate. |
| 2.4.2 | Management strategy | >80 | >80 | The information on the composition of the habitat in the snapper fishing areas is recent, so there is a partial strategy. However, Brazil has a battery of measures and strategies for the protection of marine areas for conservation and / or sustainable development. Likewise, the regulations make it possible to protect specific areas or restrict the scope of fishing. All the above is under evaluation and discussion process.  The compilation of information on the impact of fishing gear on these ecosystems could allow the implementation of adequate protection measures, specific for this scenario.  Given the incipience of this information, the information is objective to the measures, and those are being partially applied in the fishery. The main information came from a specific program with underwater cameras research.  It is considered that the fishery does reach 80, the measures are in progress to implemented or formalized. |
| 2.4.3 | Information | >80 | >80 | An adequate amount of information has been generated to define protection measures and actions, and the implementation of a fishing gear monitoring and regulation program is also contemplated. the fishery contemplates a score of 80. |
| Ecosystem | 2.5.1 | Outcome | >80 | >80 | It is highly unlikely that the fishery will alter the major elements of the ecosystem structure and function up to a  point at which serious or irreversible damage may occur. Recent information shows little interaction with other species, and by virtue of the recommended and current exploitation levels, the stock would have a high probability of not collapsing. Therefore, it is estimated that it does not affect the trophic chain.  This PI get a score of 80 |
| 2.5.2 | Management strategy | >80 | >80 | Considering the minimum impacts of the fishery, previously justified, it is marked with 80. |
| 2.5.3 | Information | >80 | >80 | The information has increased in the last time, the key elements to restrict the impacts are known, which can be inferred, but not quantified, the roles of each invoked species can be recognized, however, this information still does not allow to deduce the impacts on the ecosystem of extractive activity.  It reaches 80. |
| 3 | Governance and Policy | 3.1.1 | Legal and customary framework | 60-79 | 60-79 | Brazil has a Law on Fisheries and Aquaculture, there is a national legal system and organized framework for cooperation with other parties, when is necessary, to obtain management results in accordance with MSC Principles 1 and 2. <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2009/lei/l11959.htm>  Responsibility for the management of fisheries and environmental matters is shared between the Ministry of the Environment (MMA) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (MAPA). The MMA and its related bodies IBAMA and ICMBio: environmental inspection, joint planning with MAPA, MDIC also participates promotion and development of fishing activity, registration, statistics, monitoring, control and joint planning with the MMA. State Secretaries of Fisheries or similar two states of Amapá and Pará: management, monitoring and inspection.  Naval Command: safety in navigation, port activities, river traffic, professional training of fishermen  Due to pandemic reasons, many instances have not been developed. The legal framework and responsibilities are in place, they have been partially applied. The fishery reaches 60, but not 80. |
| 3.1.2 | Consultation, roles and responsibilities | 60-79 | 60-79 | The main coordination is on Secretary of Aquaculture and Fisheries.  Each party performs its role, there is partial evidence of compliance with the measures, as well as the application of sanctions and controls in the fishery. even when there is a willingness to move forward, better coordination and complementarity between the parties is lacking.  In general terms, roles and participation are guaranteed in the regulatory framework. the execution and compliance with the regulations and the implementation of the instances have been conditioned by external factors such as the pandemic.  Some duties and responsibilities are defined in the recovery plan  The fishery reaches 60, but not 80. |
| 3.1.3 | Long term objectives | >80 | >80 | The legal framework (the fishing law) sets general long-term objectives and as part of a sustainable development, however they are not clearly explicit and do not have a clear procedure.  The recovery plan addresses long-term objectives by the establishment of some recovery objectives from a situation of risk of the species. There are actions or strategies, and the plan had timing to do it.  Even so, there are conservation and sustainability objectives that can be improved. The fishery reaches 80. |
| Fishery specific management system | 3.2.1 | Fishery specific objectives | 60-79 | 60-79 | The recovery plan includes the specific objectives of the fishery, in general terms it is expected to remove from a condition of "vulnerable to extinction" and the implementation of planning and management measures and bring it to levels equivalent to the MSY.  in this sense, they can be considered consistent with MSC. There are actions that must be developed to obtain clarity regarding the fulfillment of the objectives, so they have not yet been clearly defined.  the specific objectives of the recovery plan can be considered as coherent but not explicit with P1 and P2, the fishery reaches 60, not 80 |
| 3.2.2 | Decision making processes | 60-79 | 60-79 | Here are established decision-making processes that lead to measures and strategies to achieve the specific objectives of the fishery.  Decision-making processes respond to serious and other significant issues identified in relevant investigations, monitoring, evaluations, and consultations, in a timely manner, transparent, timely and flexible and considering the overall impact of decisions. this is founded from the Fisheries Law <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2009/lei/l11959.htm>  Decision-making processes employ the precautionary approach and are based on the best available information.  Official reports and analyzed data are available to all interested parties, provide comprehensive information about fishery behavior and management actions, and describe how the management system responds to  relevant conclusions and recommendations resulting from the research, monitoring, evaluation and review activities.  In accordance with what was evaluated, there is evidence that decision-making has been based on the best available information and, when necessary, updated information has been generated to support the strategies. A recovery plan has been built with actions that are still in the process of development. The pandemic has affected the processes.  The fishery reaches 60, not 80 |
| 3.2.3 | Compliance and enforcement | <60 | 60-79 | The fishery has control and surveillance mechanisms for the fishery and sanctions for offenders. There is unreported and unreported fishing. Improvements are expected in the short term.  Before 2021 season starts, in May 1st 2021, Federal Government thru SAP (Fisheries and Aquaculture Secretary) finally committed to Sustainable Management Plan published in Portaria Inter mininsterial # 42/2018 denied authorization for 72 boats to fish, during 60 or 90 days, until boats comply with regulation (navigation and harvesting data sharing). It was the first time that something like that happened in the history of snapper fishery in the country. <https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/aquicultura-e-pesca/mapas-de-bordo/mapas-de-bordo-2019-da-especie-pargo>  Th fishery gets 60-79 |
| 3.2.4 | Management performance evaluation | <60 | <60 | There is no evidence of improvements in this aspect since the Pre Assessment, the respective steps have not been taken to evaluate the performance of the management measures. the fishery does not reach 60. |

## Environmental Workplan Results

*Fill in the following table by reviewing the latest FIP’s environmental workplan (see the FIP’s Documents section on the Details tab on the FIP’s FisheryProgress profile) and summarizing the results that have been achieved over the past three years (or since the last audit report was completed) by the FIP. A result is defined as:*

* *A regulatory policy change or regulatory action to improve the fishery (e.g., a new bycatch provision), or fishing practice change (e.g., a change in fishing gear developed voluntarily and implemented by the FIP) to improve the fishery*
* *A publicly verifiable positive change in the water (e.g., an increase in biomass of target stock, an increase in population of impacted protected species, a decrease in habitat or ecosystem impacted)*
* *An activity that led to an MSC performance indicator score change in the fishery*

*It is advised that auditors determine results through stakeholder consultation, however the FIP’s Action Progress tab on FisheryProgress may also be a useful resource. For results to be valid, FIP participants must have directly worked on or contributed to the improvement through one or more actions/tasks in the FIP’s environmental workplan. For each result:*

1. *Summarize the result in a short sentence*
2. *Identify the most closely related action(s), as they are listed on the FIP’s Action Progress tab on the* [*FisheryProgress*](http://www.fisheryprogress.org/) *profile*
3. *Identify the most closely related MSC performance indicator(s) impacted by the result*
4. *Provide an explanation of steps that the FIP participants took, or the how the FIP’s work played a role in supporting and achieving the result*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Result | Related Action on FisheryProgress | Related MSC Performance Indicator | Explanation |
| Develop studies to assess fisheries environmental impacts on species and substrates | Fisheries data collection  Management Plan  Environmental impact  Management and Monitoring System  Fisheries data collection | 1.1.2, 2.5.3, 2.4.3, 2.1.3, 2.1.1 | In 2018, the recovery plan for the red snapper (*Lutjanus purpureus*) was published. This plan describes the scope, establishes objectives and various measures. It highlights the need for fishery monitoring and data collection and establishes actions (emergency and recovery).  This recovery plan can be interpreted as the compilation and planning of improvement actions in the fishery. In this sense, it supports and directs the improvement actions carried out in the fishery and those budgeted for the near future.  It is possible to associate the recovery plan with specific actions to improve the programs for collecting information from the fleet.  After the first Pre-Assessment, an oil and gas prospective drilling studies found a carbonate system off the Amazon River Basin mouth, underneath the river plume (Moura et al, 2016). It was determined that it was relevant to study this point in detail, until obtaining a better knowledge about how the traps interact with the seafloor and the benthic community. A partnership with UFPA permitted describe that the seafloor in the fishing grounds are muddy or sandy, with sparse unconsolidated coral reefs structures. Some interactions were found when the trap is collected slowly or far away from the boat as the ropes makes an obtuse angle trap drags and interact with the seafloor/benthos. On the other hand, collections made fast with the ropes in "right" angle, avoid almost completely the interaction.  Near 250 hours of underwater footage distributed in 24 different fishing spots where professional cameras were attached to trap/gear shows enough information about the seabed and benthic communities in major Snapper fishing grounds.  The footage will continue as part of a monitoring program. |
| Improve continuous fisheries data collection Program (catch, effort, fishing areas, by-catch, ghost fisheries) | Fisheries data collection  Management Plan  Environmental impact  Management and Monitoring System | 1.2.3, 1.1.2, 1.1.1, 2.3.3, 2.5.3, 2.4.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.2.2, 2.2.1, 3.2.4 | UFPA FIP First Report brings relevant information related do stock structure, productivity, fleet composition and other data to support harvest strategy.  Currently, fisheries information has been compiled and studies and diagnoses of the resource have been carried out. There are regulations for the delivery of Logbooks by the fleet and it is currently information that is available and accessible online.  After last two season observation UFPA/FIP reports has now sufficient information that shows this fishery doesn't affect any ETP species and the bycatch levels were very low, in the case of principals and secondaries species. Qualitative information was collected and is presented in the UFPA FIP First Report about retained species. The actual fishery logbooks reports confirm and describe a very low bycatch in the entire fleet.  Currently, the procedure to report the fishing activities is available on-line and fisheries information has been compiled and studies and diagnoses of the resource have been carried out. There are regulations for the delivery of Logbooks by the fleet and it is currently information that is available and accessible online. Government also published the harvesting data per species for season. |
| Develop and implement a Management and Monitoring System | Fisheries data collection  Management and Monitoring System  Management Plan  Environmental impact | 1.2.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.3, 1.1.2, 3.2.3, 3.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.2.1, 3.1.1, 3.2.4 | UFPA brings relevant information related do stock structure, productivity, fleet composition and other data to support harvest strategy.  Before 2021 season starts, on May 1st 2021, Federal Government thru SAP (Fisheries and Aquaculture Secretary) finally committed to Sustainable Management Plan published in Portaria Inter mininsterial # 42/2018 denied authorization for 72 boats to fish, during 60 or 90 days, until boats comply with regulation (navigation and harvesting data sharing). It was the first time that something like that happened in the history of snapper fishery in the country. <https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/aquicultura-e-pesca/mapas-de-bordo/mapas-de-bordo-2019-da-especie-pargo>  Online information is available on https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/aquicultura-e-pesca/registro-monitoramento-e-cadastro/monitoramento-e- Ordenmento-da-pesca-do-pargo/monitoramento-e- ordinance-of-fishing-do-snapper  Additionally, information obtained directly from the Satellite Fishing Vessel Tracking Program - PREPS system of all vessels of fishing modalities 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10 for the year 2020 was included. |
| Develop and implement a management plan for the fishery/stock | Management Plan  Fisheries data collection  Environmental impact  Management and Monitoring System | 1.2.4, 1.1.2, 1.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.2.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.1 | In 2018, the recovery plan for the red snapper (*Lutjanus purpureus*) was published. This plan describes the scope, establishes objectives and various measures. It highlights the need for fishery monitoring and data collection and establishes actions (emergency and recovery).  This recovery plan can be interpreted as the compilation and planning of improvement actions in the fishery. In this sense, it supports and directs the improvement actions carried out in the fishery and those budgeted for the near future.  Since 2019, a New Management Strategy Evaluation method were proposed by Feltrim`s paper (2019), showing that the stock if harvested under 4,500 T/yr level will have a 75% probability of maintaining itself sustainable and 82% probability to not promote overfishing. PS - there are a strong correlation between landings and exports to US (90-95% of local harvest goes to this market). NMFS data shows US imports 4863 T in 2016; 3997 T in 2017; 4148 T in 2018, 3998 T in 2019 and 3880 T in 2020, so, likely the 4,500 T/yr quota is achievable and an agreement between government, fishing community, NGOs and importers is possible.  Caribbean Red Snapper fisheries and few other Brazilian fisheries received support from NGOs to draft a Management Plan that also enforces a new legal framework to them. Using FIP data and organization, the NGOs worked together with the Environmental Agencies in Brazil (MMA and ICMBio) and develop a new Management/Recovering Plan and new legal framework to support it (Portaria 228 in 14 june 2018 and Portaria Interministerial 42 on 27 July 2018). Stakeholders, government, NGOs, Unions of Fishermen, now must discuss over this concrete Plan.  Since 2020, in a pandemic situation, management and meetings have been affected, delaying and limiting operations.  . |

## Supporting References
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