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In-Transition to MSC (ITM) Program - Pilot

Marine Stewardship Council

ITM Eligibility Report

[Fishery name]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) |  |
| ITM fishery |  |
| ITM project manager |  |
| Assessment type | *ITM eligibility verification* |
| Date |  |

Introduction

|  |
| --- |
| This template details the information required from Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) when verifying the eligibility of a fishery that wishes to enter the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) In-Transition to MSC program pilot.This template should be completed by the CAB with contributions from the ITM Project Manager as outlined in the ITM Program Requirements and Guidance – Pilot v1.1Section 2 applies to verification of the pre-assessment and Section 3 to the improvement action plan. Where a pre-assessment was conducted by a CAB, completion of Section 2.2 will not be required. |

1. ITM Eligibility Reporting Template
	1. Overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Applicant Fishery |  |
| Name of CAB doing verification |  |
| Pre-assessment accepted? | *Yes / No* |
| Action Plan accepted? | *Yes / No* |
| Fishery judged able to enter full assessment after 5 years in the ITM? | *Yes / No* |
| Eligibility status determination | *Eligible / Ineligible* |
| Rationale for eligibility status |  |
| Date of ITM eligibility determination | *dd/mm/yyyy* |

* 1. Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)

|  |
| --- |
| Add additional rows for multiple Units of Assessment (UoAs). For vessel or fleet description, please include details about the number of vessels and vessel size of the UoA. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1.2 – Unit(s) of Assessment (UoAs) from pre-assessment report** |
| UoA [enter number] | Description |
| Species |  |
| Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Harvest method / gear |  |
| Fleet description (number of vessels and types) |  |
| Client group |  |
| Other eligible fishers |  |
| Justification for choosing the Unit (s) of Assessment |  |

* 1. Summary of Performance Indicator level scores

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1.3 – Summary of Performance Indicator level scores** |
| Principle of the Fisheries Standard | Number of PIs with draft scoring ranges |
| <60 | 60-79 | ≥80 |
| Principle 1 – Stock status |  |  |  |
| Principle 2 – Minimising environmental impacts |  |  |  |
| Principle 3 – Effective management |  |  |  |

1. Pre-assessment report check and verification
	1. Pre-assessment report checklist

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2.1 – Pre-assessment report checklist** |
| Date of pre-assessment | *dd/mm/yyyy* |
| Pre-assessment less than 3 years old? | *Yes / No* |
| Pre-assessment done by accredited CAB? | *Yes / No* |
| Name of CAB or other entity that conducted pre-assessment |  |
| Name of CAB who verified pre-assessment | *Only applicable if pre-assessment not done by CAB* |
| Version of pre-assessment reporting template used? | *MSC Pre-Assessment Reporting Template* *v2.1 / v3.0 / v3.1 / v3.2* |
| Submitted in English? | *Yes / No* |
| Used full scoring tables for Performance Indicators down to Scoring Issue level? | *Yes / No* |
| Traceability considered? | *Yes / No* |
| Fishery in Scope of requirements outlined in Section 7.4 of the MSC Fisheries Certification Process (FCP) v2.2? | *Yes / No* |
| Definition of Unit(s) of Assessment (UoAs) meets MSC requirements outlined in Section 7.5 of the MSC FCP v2.2?  | *Yes / No* |
| References to information and sources used to support scoring are included in the pre-assessment?  | *Yes / No* |

* 1. Pre-assessment verification (only applicable for pre-assessments not conducted by a CAB)

|  |
| --- |
| Pre-assessments not conducted by a CAB need to be verified by a CAB against the ITM requirements. Table 2.2 should be used to capture the CAB’s findings in relation to the pre-assessment report and Performance Indicator (PI) draft scoring ranges awarded. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2.2 – Performance Indicator level draft scoring range evaluation**  |
| Performance Indicator | Pre-assessment draft scoring range | Rationale follows relevant MSC requirements and guidance?  | Information presented in rationale supports score given to this PI? | Agree/Disagree with score awarded? | Reviewer Comments*[only required when “No” is selected as one of the answers]*  |
| 1.1.1 – Stock status | <60 / 60-79 / ≥80 | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.1 – Harvest Strategy | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.2 – Harvest control rules and tools | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.3 – Information and monitoring | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.4 – Assessment of stock status | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.1.1 – Primary Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.1.2 – Primary Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.1.3 – Primary Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.2.1 – Secondary Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.2.2 – Secondary Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.2.3 – Secondary Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.3.1 – ETP Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.3.2 – ETP Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.3.3 – ETP Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.4.1 – Habitats Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.4.2 – Habitats Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.4.3 – Habitats Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.5.1 – Ecosystems Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.5.2 – Ecosystems Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.5.3 – Ecosystems Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.1.1 – Legal and customary framework | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.1.2 – Consultation, roles and responsibilities | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.1.3 – Long term objectives | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.1 – Fishery specific objectives | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.2 – Decision making processes | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.4 – Management performance evaluation | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |

1. Improvement action plan checks and verification
	1. Improvement action plan checklist

|  |
| --- |
| **Improvement Action plan template and benchmarking and tracking tool**Fisheries are expected to use the latest MSC improvement action plan template and it should be accompanied by a copy of the MSC Benchmarking and Tracking tool (BMT). The MSC recognises that some fisheries may have used different templates when they first developed their action plans which may contain additional sections or slightly different formatting. During the ITM Pilot some deviation will be acceptable but should not hinder the CAB to carry out the verification. **Start date of action plan**MSC accepts that some fisheries may have formed fisheries improvement projects (FIPs) and started implementing improvement actions before entering the ITM program. It would be acceptable to include these actions within the submitted action plan if they do not precede the ITM entry date by more than 12 months and long as it is clearly indicated when the ITM phase starts and which actions have already been completed.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.1 – Improvement action plan checklist** |
| Entity (organisation or individual) that developed the action plan |  |
| Was the latest MSC improvement action plan template used? | *Yes / No* |
| ITM Project Manager identified? | *Yes / No* |
| Start date of action plan | *mm/yyyy* |
| End date of action plan | *mm/yyyy* |
| Proposed month and year of announcement of entering Full Assessment | *mm/yyyy* |
| Likelihood that action plan will achieve improvements within 5 years | *Unlikely / Likely / Highly likely* |
| Improvement actions are realistic and achievable within timeframe? | *Yes / No* |
| Metrics for measuring progress are appropriate? | *Yes / No* |
| Improvement Actions correspond to areas of improvement identified in the pre-assessment report? | *Yes / No* |
| Benchmarking and Tracking Tool (BMT) supplied? | *Yes / No* |
| BMT Index at time of pre-assessment? | *Enter BMT Index* |

* 1. Improvement action plan verification

|  |
| --- |
| Table 3.2 – Improvement action plan evaluation |
| Performance Indicator | Pre-Assessment draft scoring range | Improvement actions are realistic and achievable within timeframe? | Metrics for measuring progress are appropriate? | Reviewer Comments*[only required when “No” is selected as one of the answers]* |
| 1.1.1 – Stock status | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.1 – Harvest Strategy | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.2 – Harvest control rules and tools | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.3 – Information and monitoring | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 1.2.4 – Assessment of stock status | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.1.1 – Primary Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.1.2 – Primary Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.1.3 – Primary Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.2.1 – Secondary Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.2.2 – Secondary Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.2.3 – Secondary Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.3.1 – ETP Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.3.2 – ETP Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.3.3 – ETP Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.4.1 – Habitats Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.4.2 – Habitats Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.4.3 – Habitats Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.5.1 – Ecosystems Outcome | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.5.2 – Ecosystems Management | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 2.5.3 – Ecosystems Information | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.1.1 – Legal and customary framework | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.1.2 – Consultation, roles and responsibilities | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.1.3 – Long term objectives | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.1 – Fishery specific objectives | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.2 – Decision making processes | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |
| 3.2.4 – Management performance evaluation | *<60 / 60-79 / ≥80* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* | *Yes / No / Not Applicable* |  |

1. Template information and copyright

The Marine Stewardship Council’s ‘ITM eligibility Reporting Template v1.1’ and its content is copyright of “Marine Stewardship Council” - © “Marine Stewardship Council” 2020. All rights reserved.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Template version control** |  |
| Version | Date of publication | Description of amendment |
| 1.0 (Pilot) | 30 September 2019 | N/A – new document as part of ITM Program Requirements and Guidance – Pilot v1.0 |
| 1.1 (Pilot) | 09 December 2020 | Eligibility template separated from progress template and modified to allow recording of more detailed CAB findings. Guidance added on improvement action plan template to be used and start date of action plan. |
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