CoC Default Standard v5.0

Project lead: Alison Roel (alison.roel@msc.org)
We want to know
Can the proposals be implemented?
Do they assure integrity and improve clarity?

The current proposals build on those presented in the September 2017 consultation:
• CoC holders buying from the fishery or farm must verify product is from the UoC.
• Traceability documents must be provided to MSC within 5 days of request.

This consultation introduces 4 additional high impact changes

All changes discussed here will be implemented in all three versions of the CoC Standard (Default/ Group/ CFO)
## CoC Default Standard Changes

### 2017 consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Summary of consultation output</th>
<th>Decision since consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require each CoC holder to verify the scheme owner’s website monthly to determine if the supplier’s certificate is valid. Objective: Integrity (address risks of fraudulent certificate claims).</td>
<td>Concerns this was too prescriptive and too burdensome.</td>
<td>Downgraded to guidance. May fully introduce in future when information can be available in all relevant languages and/or through a client portal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation buying directly from a certified fishery/ farm shall have a process to confirm certified products originate from the UoC. Objective: To address traceability risks at the first step in the supply chain</td>
<td>Requests for more clarity of information on the fishery UoC, and better guidance on the clause.</td>
<td>Incorporated. Reworded to 'receive from' in recognition that this step may be needed even where legal ownership does not change. Extended guidance. Ongoing work to improve information on the fishery UoC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents shall be provided to MSC for traceback within 2 working days of request. Objective: Integrity (facilitate investigations)</td>
<td>Challenges of 2 working days were raised for smaller businesses e.g. restaurants.</td>
<td>Extended to 5 calendar days (use of calendar days also aligns with all other requirements).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
- **Objective:** Integrity (facilitate investigations) or Traceability (address risks at the first step in the supply chain).
- **Concerns:** Too prescriptive, too burdensome.
- **Requests:** More clarity of information, better guidance on the clause.
1: Product shall not be mislabelled by species or fishery or farm origin

Objective: Product Integrity

• Retailer/brand claims assured
• Supports MSC assurance work (e.g. product testing)
• Non-conformities can clearly be raised against this when mislabelling detected at audit

Note:
• Products do not have to identify species or origin
• For species common name CoC holders may reference regional regulation
• Does not trigger suspension (if the product is certified), nor non-conforming product procedure
1: Product shall not be mislabelled by species or fishery or farm origin

2.3.1 Certified products shall not be mislabelled by species or origin of farm or fishery.

**Guidance 2.3.1**

Product cannot be mislabelled, including by species or origin. It is not required for product to be labelled by species or origin, but where it is this information must be correct and aligned with the information the organisation received at product receipt. Origin information for MSC products is normally catch area, and for ASC products by country of origin. Where common names are used for species the organisation may be requested to justify the guidelines or regional listing from which these are based.
1: Product shall not be mislabelled by species or fishery or farm origin

Targeted questions

• Could/should this requirement be broader, and take into account all mislabelling?

• For brand owners, retailers: do you see a benefit in this introduction in assuring your claims?

• For CABs: there enough information to audit this requirement?

CoC default Standard and associated guidance, search #mislabelling

Please give your feedback in the CoC program review consultation survey
2: CoC holders shall have no association with illegal fishing

Objective: Align with industry trends

- For the MSC and the program to have no association with organisations linked to illegal fishing
- Assure there is a mechanism to address complaints/concerns raised with the MSC relating to this
2: CoC holders shall have no association with illegal fishing

- This affects any organisations with links to fisheries, shipments, exports or imports.

- It covers the non-certified seafood they handle and their wider business & any vessels they wholly own or directly subcontract to.

- Companies shall have systems to mitigate risks of association with illegal fishing & keep relevant legal documentation.

- Systems may consider RFMO blacklists & purple notices from INTERPOL, as relevant.
2: CoC holders shall have no association with illegal fishing

- Auditors will verify the client systems, and only where a risk is identified request non-certified product records.
- Where non-conformities are identified the CoC certificate holder has 30 days to rectify.
- MSC will provide a ‘request for action’ to a Conformity Assessment Body when stakeholders provide evidence of a CoC holders association with illegal fishing activity.
2: CoC holders shall have no association with illegal fishing

Targeted questions:

• For supply chain companies: Do you already have systems in place to meet this clause?

• For auditors: Do you have any questions/ concerns regarding auditing meet this clause?

Please give your feedback in the CoC program review consultation survey
CoC Default Standard Changes

3: All subcontractors shall provide access to records or products

Objectives: Product Integrity

- Allows auditors to access product at the transportation stage where required
- Assures all product until retail packed can be accessed where risks are identified

Note:
- CoC certificate holders do not need to create specific agreements with transport subcontractors

CoC default Standard and associated guidance, search #subcontractors

Please give your feedback in the CoC program review consultation survey
4: Farmed products sold as certified shall exclude antibiotics or banned substances as required by the farm standard

Objective: Product Integrity

- Assure certified product is sold in adherence with farm standards
- Mitigate product integrity risks where demand for farmed product may exceed supply, so incentivizing substitution
- Address stakeholder concerns regarding antibiotic detection in ASC shrimp
- Provides on-going assurance of farmed product claims

CoC default Standard and associated guidance, search #ASC
4: Farmed products sold as certified shall exclude antibiotics or banned substances as required by the farm standard

- This affect any organisations transforming (processing or repacking) ASC products
- They shall need systems in place to assure products do not contain the relevant antibiotics or banned substances
- Most often this will be laboratory tests of products
- Each ASC Standard references what must be excluded either at the farm, or only in product to be sold as certified.
- MSC can raise a ‘request for action’ to a CAB where breaches are reported to us so a non-conformity can be raised.
4: Farmed products sold as certified shall exclude antibiotics or banned substances as required by the farm standard

To complement this ASC is working on:

• A review of the Shrimp Standard, including the antibiotic requirement

• Unifying the approach to antibiotics across all ASC Standards

• Producer and certifier sampling and testing
4: Farmed products sold as certified shall exclude antibiotics or banned substances as required by the farm standard

Examples of where this applies are:

**ASC Shrimp**: where clause 5.3.1 of *The Shrimp Standard* and associated rationale/footnotes states that any shrimp treated with antibiotics cannot be sold as certified, and that antibiotics defined by WHO as ‘critically important’ cannot be used at the farm at all.

**ASC Salmon**: where clause 5.2.2 of *The Salmon Standard* and associated rationale/footnotes states that any antibiotics or chemicals banned in producer or importer country cannot be used, nor those WHO defined as ‘critically important’.

CoC default Standard and associated guidance, search #ASC
4: Farmed products sold as certified shall exclude antibiotics or banned substances as required by the farm standard

Targeted questions:

• For supply chain companies: Do you already have systems in place to meet this clause? Do you check test results from suppliers for relevant products?

• For auditors: Do you think this clause can effectively be audited on a sample basis?

Please give your feedback in the CoC program review consultation survey
Thank you!

Consultation website:
improvements.msc.org

For more information or questions, please email:
Standards@msc.org

www.msc.org