[Insert CAB Logo]

Marine Stewardship Council fisheries assessments

# [Fishery name]

# Pre-Assessment Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) |  |
| Fishery client |  |
| Assessment type | Pre-assessment |
| Date |  |

*Instructions to CABs*

*This template details the information required from Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) when creating a pre-assessment report.*

*If any discrepancies are noted between this template and the MSC Fisheries Standard, CABs should use the wording of the MSC Fisheries Standard. CABs may make amendments to the scoring tables to reflect multiple Units of Assessment or multiple scoring elements (e.g. extra rows under each scoring issue). CABs should ensure it is clear which Unit of Assessment or scoring element is being referenced. CABs should provide rationale for all Units of Assessment and scoring elements and may group rationales when addressing multiple Units of Assessment or scoring elements.*

*Where possible, this template has been designed to be consistent with the full assessment reporting template. However, the MSC understands that as pre-assessments are conducted with limited resources, some information detailed in this template may not be available, and that clients may have different needs in terms of pre-assessments.*

*Please complete all unshaded fields where information is available. For all instructions, notes and guidance indicated in italics, please delete and replace with your specific information where relevant. e.g. the ‘Instructions to CABs’ section.*

*Corporate branding:*

*This template may be formatted to comply with the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) corporate identity. The CAB shall ensure that content and structure follow the template.*

*Examples of appropriate amendments are:*

* *A title page with the company logo;*
* *A company header and footer used throughout the report;*
* *Replacement of font styles;*
* *Inclusion of contact details for the assessment team members in relation to consultation*
* *Deletion of any sections that are not applicable;*
* *Deletion of introductory text or instructions; and,*
* *Addition of subheadings to improve clarity and readability.*

## Contents

*Insert a table of contents.*

## Glossary

*View the MSC-MSCI Vocabulary. Insert an optional glossary or list of acronyms used. Note that any terms defined here shall not contradict terms used in the MSC-MSCI Vocabulary.*

## Executive summary

*The CAB shall include in the executive summary:*

* *The names and a brief description of the assessors or authors.*
* *A brief explanation of the process applied and summary of assessment activities.*
* *The main strengths and weaknesses of the client’s operation.*
* *The extent to which the fishery is or is not consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard.*

## Report details

### Aims and constraints of the pre-assessment

*The CAB shall note in the report that a pre-assessment does not attempt to duplicate a full assessment against the MSC Fisheries Standard. A full assessment involves a group of assessment team members and public consultation stages that are not included in a pre-assessment. A pre-assessment provides a provisional assessment based on a limited set of information provided by the client.*

*The CAB may add other details specific to this pre-assessment as appropriate.*

*The CAB should outline any limitations placed on this pre-assessment, e.g. inaccessibility of the fishery or paucity of key data.*

### Version details

*The CAB shall include in the report a statement on the versions of the fisheries program documents used for this assessment.*

Table 1: Fisheries program documents versions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document/Assessment Tree** | **Version number/Type** |
| MSC Fisheries Certification Process | Version 3.0 |
| MSC Fisheries Standard | Version 3.0 |
| Assessment tree | *Default / Enhanced Bivalve / Salmon / Introduced species / Other* |
| MSC General Certification Requirements | Version 2.5 |
| MSC Reporting Template | Version 2.0 |
| MSC Pre-Assessment Reporting Template | Version 4.1 |

## Unit(s) of Assessment and Unit(s) of Certification

## Unit(s) of Assessment

*The CAB may include in the report a statement of the CAB’s determination that the fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard. Where a fishery has been enhanced or the likely Unit(s) of Assessment include introduced species, the report may include a statement on the fisheries’ position in relation to the scope criteria.*

*The report should contain possible Unit(s) of Assessment and a justification for choosing the Unit of Assessment.*

*For geographical area, the CAB should refer to FCP v3.0 G7.5.6.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 7.4 and 7.5*

Table 2: Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UoA X** | **Description**  |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| Other eligible fishers |  |
| Justification for choosing the Unit of Assessment |  |
| **UoA X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| Other eligible fishers |  |
| Justification for choosing the Unit of Assessment |  |
| **UoA X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| Other eligible fishers |  |
| Justification for choosing the Unit of Assessment |  |

## Vessels list(s) (optional)

*The CAB may include in the report a list of vessels or a hyperlink to a publicly available list of vessels for each Unit of Assessment.*

## Traceability

### Traceability - initial review and planning

Reference(s): FCP v3.0 7.8.2 l-n

Table : Traceability initial planning

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed point of change of ownership of product to any party not covered by the fishery assessment |
| *Confirm the proposed first sale to any party not covered by the fishery assessment and any trading between client group members that may happen before.*  |
| The proposed point from which subsequent Chain of Custody (CoC) is required  |
| *Confirm if this is proposed to happen before first sale to any party not covered by the fishery assessment, and when it is proposed to happen.*  |
| The plan for reviewing traceability at the initial assessment site visit  |
| *Outline of information needed to be obtained and if known the people able to provide this.*  |

### Traceability within the fishery

*The CAB may include in the report a description of the tracking, tracing and segregation systems within the fishery and how these systems will allow any products intended to be sold as certified in future, to be traced back to the Unit(s) of Assessment.*

*This section requests information relating to the fishery’s ability to segregate and identify catch by gear type, species and catch area.*

*The CAB may include in the report an evaluation of the robustness of the management systems related to traceability.*

*The CAB may include in the report any traceability references, including hyperlinks to publicly-available documents.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 7.17.1 and 7.17.6.a-d*

Table : Traceability within the fishery

|  |
| --- |
| Statement on fishery’s ability to track and trace to each Unit of Assessment |
| Systems allow the fishery client to track to trace any fish or fish products back to each individual UoASystems **do not** allow the fishery client to track and trace any fish or fish products back to each individual UoA*(delete as appropriate)* |
| Movement of fish and fish product between **harvest** and **landing** *An illustration of movement of product between harvest and landing. Include when any of the following happen: Harvesting, At-Sea processing, Translocation, Transhipment, Offloading, Landing.*  |
| *Provide this information through a flow diagram. An example is provided below:**Fishing vessel → Transhipment → Offloader → Landing* |
| Movement of fish and fish products between **landing** and the proposed **start of the CoC** if relevant *An illustration of movement of product between landing and the proposed start of CoC. Include when any of the following is happening: Transport, Storage, Sorting/ Grading, Packing, Auction.* |
| *Complete this section if the proposed CoC starts after landing. Note as n/a if CoC starts at or before landing. Provide this information through a flow diagram. An example is provided below:**Landing → Transport → Storage → Sale by client group company* |
| Description of any processing and sorting/ grading prior to change of ownership |
|  |
| For the critical tracking events (i.e. where in the product flow this data needs to be transferred) of all fish and fish product handling and sale not covered by the proposed CoC describe: * Process of segregating to each Unit of Assessment
* Key data elements (i.e. the data or documents to identify the UoA such as species, catch area, gear)
 |
| *Detail for all stages covered by the fishery. Include images where this helps to show segregation.* |
| Where there are IPI stock(s) within the scope of certification, describe the verification of traceability systems  |
| *IPI by nature cannot be segregated from the P1 stocks. Confirm how the presence of IPI impacts segregating to UoA and managing key UoA data through critical tracking events.**State N/A where this does not apply.* |
| Other relevant information on the systems to track and trace to each UoA |
| *For example: Relevant monitoring, oversight or regulatory controls which assure the traceability to each individual UoA; references to regulation, observer coverage, that can support these systems.* |
| Do systems allow the fishery client to trace any fish or fish products back to the individual UoA?If yes, describe | Yes/No*Detail* |
| Do systems allow the fishery client to trace any fish or fish products back to the individual UoA and how do they do this?If yes, describe | Yes/No*Detail* |
| Does transhipment occur within the fishery? | Yes/No |
| What is the type of transhipment and what the systems to track and trace to UoA? (high seas/in port/ other)If yes: * How and when does this occur?
* What systems allow to track and trace to UoA?
 | High seas/in port/other*Detail: As relevant also confirm any segregation and labelling on board.* |
| For high seas transhipment are the systems to support tracking and tracing to UoA verified independent from the certificate holder? If yes, describe | Yes/No/No high seas transhipment*Detail* |
| For high seas transhipment do the systems to verify tracking and tracing to UoA cover both fishing and receiving vessels? If yes, describe | Yes/No/No high seas transhipment*Detail* |
| For high seas transhipment do the systems to track and trace to UoA apply to 100% of transhipment events? If yes, describe | Yes/No/No high seas transhipment*Detail* |

### Traceability risks and mitigations

*The CAB may include in the report a description of the factors that may lead to risks of non-certified seafood being mixed with UoA seafood using the table below. For each risk factor, there should be a description of whether the risk factor is relevant for the fishery and, if so, a description of the relevant mitigation measures or traceability systems in place.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 7.5.10 a-d, 7.17.1.3*

Table : Traceability risks and mitigation within the fishery

| **Factor** | **Description of the traceability risk factors and details of the risk mitigation and management** *Include in each description:** *Whether each factor occurs*
* *When it occurs and how frequently (e.g. regularly, seasonally, rarely)*
* *How any potential traceability risks are mitigated and any risk management*
* *If covered by information provided elsewhere in the pre-assessment report, cross reference as needed.*
 |
| --- | --- |
| Will the fishery use gears that are not part of the UoA? If Yes, include in the description: * If this may occur on the same trip, on the same vessels, or during the same season;
* How any risks are mitigated.
 |  |
| Will vessels in the UoA also fish outside the UoA geographic area? If Yes, include in the description:* If this may occur on the same trip;
* How any risks are mitigated.
 |  |
| Do client group members ever handle certified and non-certified products during any of the activities covered by the UoA? This refers to both at-sea activities and on-land activities and should reflect those listed in product movement in Table 4. It includes:* Translocation
* Transhipment
* Transport
* Storage
* Processing
* Sorting/ grading
* Packing
* Landing
* Auction

If yes please describe how any risks are mitigated. |  |
| Does transhipment occur within the fishery?If Yes, please describe:* If transhipment takes place at-sea, in port, or both;
* If the transhipment vessel may handle product from outside the UoA;

How any risks are mitigated. |  |
| Are there any other risks of mixing or substitution between the UoA and other non-certified product? If yes, please describe how any risks are mitigated. |  |
| Are there any other risks of mixing between different UoAs?Please describe how any risks are mitigated. |  |

## Pre-assessment results

### Pre-assessment results overview

#### Overview

##### Additional sub-heading level (use is optional)

*The CAB should include in the report an overview of the key points arising from the analysis, emphasising any potential obstacles to certification and any issues to be considered prior to entering full assessment.*

*The CAB may describe any other issues of particular relevance to the fishery, including answers to any questions raised by the client.*

#### Recommendations

*If the CAB wishes to include any recommendations to the client or notes for future assessments, these may be included in this section.*

*The CAB shall inform the client of:*

* *Communications that may need to take place with management agencies, conservation groups, post-harvest sectors, relevant commercial and non-commercial fishing groups to explain the MSC assessment process and the implications (including costs and benefits) of certification.*
* *The types and extent of data and information that the client will need to make available for full assessment.*
* *The location, timing and form of any announcements to be made during full assessment.*
* *The optional MSC training information on the assessment process for clients.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 7.1.7*

### Summary of potential conditions by Principle

Table : Summary of Principle level scores

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Principle of the Fisheries Standard** | **Number of PIs with draft scoring ranges <60** |
| Principle 1 – Stock status |  |
| Principle 2 – Minimising environmental impacts |  |
| Principle 3 – Effective management |  |

### Summary of Performance Indicator level scores

*The CAB shall include in the report a completed ‘summary of Performance Indicator level scores table below’ and may include completed full scoring tables for Performance Indicators scored in sections 7.4 – 7.6. If the full scoring sections are not used, then they may be deleted. The CAB shall indicate in the report if Performance Indicators were not assessed as part of the pre-assessment, and no score shall be provided.*

*When scoring the draft scoring ranges, the CAB shall use the following key to determine the result:*

* *Information suggests fishery is not likely to meet the SG60 for any scoring issue (Fail <60).*
* *Information suggests fishery will reach SG60 but may not meet all scoring issues at SG80, a condition may be needed (Pass with condition 60 – 79).*
* *Information suggests fishery is likely to exceed SG80 resulting in an unconditional pass for this Performance Indicator. Fishery may meet one or more scoring issues at SG100 level (Pass ≥80).*

*The CAB shall apply cell shading to the draft scoring range cells (e.g. ,60 = red, 60-79 = amber, green = ≥80, or similar).*

*Where scoring issues are referred to in the summary tables, scoring issues should be described using the language from the MSC Fisheries Standard.*

*Where relevant, comment should be provided on the implication of the individual Performance Indicator scores for the aggregate Principle scores. This may for example, identify whether there are many Performance Indicators within one Principle which are likely to raise conditions that may lead to the fishery failing to meet the MSC Fisheries Standard.*

*If a fishery is data-deficient and may need to use the MSC Risk-Based Framework (RBF), the CAB shall indicate this to the fishery (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Tables 3-5. If the RBF is expected to be used to score PI 1.1.1, no score needs to be provided for PI 1.1.2 and a default 80 score should be assigned to PI 1.2.4.*

*For performance indicators 1.1.1 (stock status), 2.1.1 (In scope species outcome) and 2.2.1 (ETP/OOS species outcome) a preliminary PSA should be conducted as described in MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A4, and the result recorded in the space provided in the table for the relevant PI.*

*For performance indicator 2.3.1 (Habitats outcome) a preliminary CSA should be conducted as described in FCP MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A7, and the result recorded in the space provided in the table for this PI.*

Table 7: Summary of Performance Indicator level scores

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.1.1 – Stock status** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.2.1 – Harvest Strategy** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.2.2 – Harvest control rules and tools** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.2.3 – Information and monitoring** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.2.3R – Information and monitoring if RBF is used to score PI 1.2.3 – delete if not applicable** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **1.2.4 – Assessment of stock status** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.1.1 – In-scope species outcome** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.1.2 – In-scope species management strategy** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.1.3 – In-scope species information** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.1.3R – In-scope species information if RBF is used to score PI 2.1.3 – delete if not applicable** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.2.1 – ETP/OOS species outcome** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.2.2 – ETP/OOS species management strategy** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.2.3 – ETP/OOS species information** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.2.3R – ETP/OOS species information if RBF is used to score PI 2.2.3 – delete if not applicable** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.3.1 – Habitats outcome** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.3.2 – Habitats management strategy**  | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.3.3 – Habitats information** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.3.3R – Habitats information if RBF is used to score PI 2.3.3 – delete if not applicable** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.4.1 – Ecosystem outcome** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.4.2 – Ecosystem management strategy** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **2.4.3 – Ecosystem information** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.1.1 – Legal and/or customary framework** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.1.2 – Consultation, roles, and responsibilities** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.1.3 – Long term objectives** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.2.1 – Fishery-specific objectives** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.2.2 – Decision-making processes** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |
| **Performance Indicator** | **Draft scoring range** | **Data deficient?**  |
| **3.2.4 – Monitoring and management performance evaluation** | <60 / 60 – 79 / ≥80 | Yes / No |
| Rationale or key points |
|  |

### Principle 1

#### Principle 1 background

##### Additional sub-heading level (use is optional)

*The CAB may include in the report a summary of the fishery based on the topics below, referencing electronic or other documents used:*

* *An outline of the fishery resources including life histories as appropriate.*
* *An outline of status of stocks as indicated by stock assessments, including a description of the assessment methods, standards, and stock indicators, biological limits, etc.*
* *Information on the seasonal operation of the fishery (if not included in the Overview section earlier).*
* *A brief history of fishing and management.*

*The CAB should provide any information used as supporting rationale in the scoring tables, if used.*

*The CAB may indicate in the report whether the target species may be key Low-Trophic Level (LTL). If there are multiple Principle 1 species, the CAB should indicate in the report which are key LTL.*

#### Catch profiles

*The CAB may include in the report any relevant catch profiles showing Unit of Assessment (UoA) catch over time.*

#### Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch data

*The CAB should include in the report a Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch data table using the table below. If possible, a separate table should be provided for each species or gear.*

Table : Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TAC / Catch Data** | **Year** | **Amount** |
| TAC | Year (YYYY) | Amount (n, unit) |
| UoA share of TAC | Year (YYYY) | Amount (n, unit) |
| Total catch by UoA (most recent year) | Year (YYYY) | Amount (n, unit) |
| Total catch by UoA (second most recent year) | Year (YYYY) | Amount (n, unit) |

#### Principle 1 Performance Indicator scores and rationales – delete if not applicable

*The CAB may include, in the Performance Indicator scoring tables in the report, sufficient rationale for each Scoring Issue or for each Performance Indicator and should make reference to Scoring Guideposts (SG). References may be included in the form of hyperlinks, citations or by providing the quantitative information. The CAB should identify in the report if there are information gaps.*

*For any Performance Indicator for which scoring is not required or a default score is applied, the CAB should record this in the relevant scoring table.*

*If the Risk-Based Framework (RBF) has been used to score a Performance Indicator, the CAB should include in the report a justification for use and the relevant RBF outputs table may include scores and rationales.*

*Additional scoring tables may be used and should be clearly marked for modified assessment trees, e.g. PI 2.5.2 - Modified.*

###### PI 1.1.1 – Stock status

| **PI 1.1.1** | **The stock is at a level that maintains high productivity and has a low probability of recruitment overfishing** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Stock status relative to recruitment impairment** |
| Guidepost | It is **likely** that the stock is above the point of recruitment impairment (PRI). | It is **highly likely** that the stock is above the PRI. | There is a **high degree** of certainty that the stock is above the PRI. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Stock status in relation to achievement of maximum sustainable yield (MSY)** |
| Guidepost |  | The stock is at or fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY. | There is a high degree of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY or has been above this level over recent years. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Stock status relative to reference points** |
|  | Type of reference point | Value of reference point | Current stock status relative to reference point |
| Reference point used in scoring stock relative to PRI (SIa) |  *Insert type of reference point e.g. BLOSS.* | *Include value specifying units e.g. 50,000t total stock biomass.* | *Include current stock status in the same units as the reference point e.g. 90,000/BLOSS = 1.8.* |
| Reference point used in scoring stock relative to MSY (SIb) | *Insert type of reference point e.g. BMSY.* | *Include value specifying units e.g. 100,000t total stock biomass.* | *Include current stock status in the same units as the reference point e.g. 90,000/BMS~~Y~~ = 0.9.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |
| Data-deficient? (Risk-Based Framework needed) | **Yes / No** |

###### PI 1.1.1A – Scoring of key LTL stocks – delete if not applicable

*Note – only use this for stocks identified as key Low Trophic-Level (LTL)*

| **PI 1.1.1A** | **The stock is at a level that has a low probability of serious ecosystem impacts** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Stock status relative to ecosystem impairment** |
| Guide post | It is **likely** that the stock is above the point where serious ecosystem impacts could occur. | It is **highly likely** that the stock is above the point where serious ecosystem impacts could occur. | There is a **high degree** of certainty that the stock is above the point where serious ecosystem impacts could occur. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Stock status in relation to ecosystem needs** |
| Guide post |  | The stock is at or fluctuating around a level consistent with ecosystem needs. | There is a **high degree** of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around a level consistent with ecosystem needs or has been above this level over recent years. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Stock status relative to reference points** |
|  | Type of reference point | Value of reference point | Current stock status relative to reference point |
| Reference point used in scoring stock relative to ecosystem impairment (SIa) | *Insert type of reference point e.g. B35%.* | *Include value specifying units e.g. 50,000t total stock biomass.* | *Include current stock status in the same units as the reference point e.g. 90,000/B35% = 1.8.* |
| Reference point used in scoring stock relative to ecosystem needs (SIb) | *Insert type of reference point e.g. B75%.* | *Include value specifying units e.g. 100,000t total stock biomass.* | *Insert type of reference point e.g. B75%.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding

| **PI 1.1.2** | **Where the stock is reduced, there is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Rebuilding timeframes** |
| Guide post | A rebuilding timeframe is specified for the stock that is the **shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time**. For cases where 2 generations is less than 5 years, the rebuilding timeframe is up to 5 years.  |  | The shortest practicable rebuilding timeframe is specified that does not exceed **1 generation time** for the stock.  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Rebuilding evaluation** |
| Guide post | Monitoring is in place to determine whether the rebuilding strategies are effective in rebuilding the stock within the specified timeframe. | There is **evidence** that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding stocks, or it is **likely** based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates, or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the stock within the **specified timeframe**. | There is **strong evidence** that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding stocks, or it is highly likely based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates, or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the stock within the **specified timeframe**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.1 – Harvest strategy

| **PI 1.2.1** | **There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Harvest strategy design** |
| Guide post | The harvest strategy is **expected** to achieve stock management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1/PI 1.1.1A SG80. | The harvest strategy is **responsive** to the state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy **work together** towards achieving stock management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1/PI 1.1.1A SG80. | The harvest strategy is **responsive** to the state of the stock and is **designed** to achieve stock management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1/PI 1.1.1A SG80. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | *The CAB shall insert sufficient rationale to support the team’s conclusion for each Scoring Guidepost (SG), including whether the team scored PI 1.1.1 or PI 1.1.1A.* |
| **b** | **Harvest strategy evaluation** |
| Guide post | The harvest strategy is **likely** to work based on prior experience or plausible argument. | The harvest strategy has been **tested** and is expected to meet the objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1/ PI 1.1.1A SG80 or there is evidence that the harvest strategy is achieving its objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1/ PI 1.1.1A SG80.  | The performance of the harvest strategy has been **evaluated** and evidence exists to show that it is achieving the objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1/ PI 1.1.1A SG80, including being clearly able to maintain stocks at target levels. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Harvest strategy monitoring** |
| Guide post | Monitoring is in place that is expected to determine whether the harvest strategy is working. |  |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** |  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Harvest strategy review** |
| Guidepost |  |  | The harvest strategy is periodically reviewed and improved as necessary. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Shark finning** |
| Guide post | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |  |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** |  |  |
| Rationale | *Scoring Issue need not be scored if sharks are not a target species.* |
| **f** | **Review of alternative measures** |
| Guide post | There has been a review of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of unwanted catch of the target stock.  | There is a **review** every 5 years of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of the target stock and they are implemented as appropriate. | There is a **review** that happens every 2 years of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of the target stock, and they are implemented, as appropriate. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *Scoring Issue need not be scored if sharks are not a target species.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.2 – Harvest control rules and tools

| **PI 1.2.2** | **There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **HCRs design and application** |
| Guide post | **Generally understood** HCRsare **in place** that are **expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the PRI is approached.** | **Well-defined** HCRs **are in place** that **ensure** the exploitation rate is reduced as the PRI is approached, and are expected to keep the stock **fluctuating around** a target level consistent with (or above) MSY, or for key LTL species at levels consistent with ecosystem needs. | The HCRs are expected to keep the stock **fluctuating at or above** a target level consistent with MSY, or another more appropriate level **most** of the time, taking into account the ecological role of the stock. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **The robustness of HCRs to uncertainty** |
| Guide post |  | The HCRs are likely to be robust to the main uncertainties. | The HCRs take account of a **wide** range of uncertainties including the ecological role of the stock, and there is **evidence** that the HCRs are robust to the main uncertainties. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Evaluation of HCRs** |
| Guide post | There is **some evidence** that tools used or **available** to implement HCRs are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation. | **Available evidence indicates** that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs.  | **Evidence clearly shows** that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs.  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.3 – Information and monitoring

| **PI 1.2.3** | **Relevant information is collected to support the harvest strategy** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Range of information** |
| Guide post | **Some** relevant information related to stock structure, stock productivity, and fleet composition is available to support the harvest strategy. | **Sufficient** relevant information related to stock structure, stock productivity, fleet composition, and other data are available to support the harvest strategy.  | A **comprehensive** **range** of information (on stock structure, stock productivity, fleet composition, stock abundance, UoA removals, and other information such as environmental information), including some that may not be directly related to the current harvest strategy, is available. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post | Stock abundance and UoA removals are monitored and **at least 1 indicator** is available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest strategy. | Stock abundance and UoA removals are **regularly monitored at a level of accuracy and coverage consistent with the harvest strategy**,and **1 or more indicators** are available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest strategy.  | **All information** required by the harvest strategy is monitored with high frequency and a high degree of certainty, and there is a good understanding of the inherent **uncertainties** in the information (data) and the robustness of assessment and management in dealing with this uncertainty. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Comprehensiveness of information** |
| Guide post |  | There is good information on all other fishery removals from the stock. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.3R – Information/monitoring if the RBF is used to score PI 1.1.1 – delete if not applicable

*Note – only use this when RBF is used to score PI 1.1.1 for the UoA (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox v1.0 Table A2).*

| **PI 1.2.3R** | **Relevant information is collected to support the harvest strategy** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Range of information** |
| Guide post | **Some** relevant information related to consequence analysis (CA) and productivity and susceptibility attributes for the target species are available to support the harvest strategy. | **Sufficient** relevant information related to consequence analysis (CA) and productivity and susceptibility attributes for the target species are available to support the harvest strategy. | A **comprehensive range** of information (on stock structure, stock productivity, fleet composition, stock abundance, UoA removals and other information such as environmental information), including some that may not be directly related to the current harvest strategy, is available. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post | Stock abundance and UoA removals are monitored and **at least 1 indicator** is available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest strategy. | Stock abundance and UoA removals are **regularly monitored at a level of accuracy and coverage consistent with the harvest strategy**,and **1 or more indicators** are available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest strategy.  | **All information** required by the harvest strategy is monitored with high frequency and a high degree of certainty, and there is a good understanding of the inherent **uncertainties** in the information (data) and the robustness of assessment and management in dealing with this uncertainty. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Comprehensiveness of information** |
| Guide post |  | There is good information on all other fishery removals from the stock. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.4 – Assessment of stock status

| **PI 1.2.4** | **There is an assessment of the stock status** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Appropriateness of assessment to stock under consideration** |
| Guide post |  | The assessment is appropriate for the stock and for the harvest strategy. | The assessment takes into account the major features relevant to the biology of the species and the nature of the UoA. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Assessment approach** |
| Guide post | The assessment estimates stock status relative to generic reference points appropriate to the species category. | The assessment estimates stock status relative to reference points that are appropriate to the stock and can be estimated. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Uncertainty in the assessment** |
| Guide post | The assessment **identifies major sources** of uncertainty. | The assessment **takes uncertainty into account**. | The assessment evaluates stock status relative to reference points in a **probabilistic** way. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Evaluation of assessment** |
| Guide post |  |  | The assessment has been tested and shown to be robust. Alternative hypotheses and assessment approaches have been rigorously explored. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Peer review of assessment** |
| Guide post |  | The assessment of stock status is subject to peer review. | The assessment has been **internally and externally peer** reviewed. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

### Principle 2

#### Principle 2 background

##### Additional sub-heading level (use is optional)

*The CAB may include in the report a summary of the Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA) based on the topics below, referencing electronic or other documents used:*

* *The aquatic ecosystem, its status and any particularly sensitive areas, habitats or ecosystem features influencing or affected by the UoA.*
* *The In Scope, Out of Scope (OOS) and Endangered, Threatened or Protected (ETP) species including their status and relevant management history.*
* *Specific constraints, e.g. details of any unwanted catch of species, their conservation status and measures taken to minimise this as appropriate.*
* *If cumulative impacts need consideration for any Principle 2 Performance Indicators, the report should contain a summary of how this has been addressed, i.e. which other MSC UoAs/fisheries and how the cumulative impacts were considered.*

*The CAB should provide any information used as supporting rationale in the scoring tables.*

*The CAB may include background information justifying how scoring elements were assigned to components within Principle 2 of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The CAB may amend the table below to present this information. The CAB may include in the report the catch and UoA related mortality of all main in scope and main ETP/OOS species together with a description of the adequacy of information, identification of data sources used and whether they are qualitative or quantitative.*

*Reference(s): Fisheries Standard v3.0 SA3.1.2, SA3.1.5 and decision tree outlined in Figure SA3*

Table 9: Scoring elements

| **Component/Stock** | **Scoring elements** | **Designation** | **Data-deficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *e.g. In-scope,* | *e.g. species or stock (SA3.1.2.6)* | *Main or Minor* | *No/Yes* |
| *e.g. ETP/OOS* | *e.g. ETP/OOS unit x (SA3.8.1)* | *n/a* | *No/Yes* |
| *e.g. Habitats* | *e.g. less/more sensitive habitat x (SA3.11.3)* | *n/a* | *No/Yes* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Principle 2 Performance Indicator scores and rationales

###### PI 2.1.1 – In-scope species outcome

| **PI 2.1.1** | **The UoA aims to maintain in-scope species above the PRI and does not hinder recovery of in-scope species if they are below the PRI** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Main in-scope species stock status** |
| Guide post | **Main** in-scope species are **likely** to be above the PRI.orIf the species is below the PRI, it is **likely** that the UoA does not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | **Main** in-scope species are **highly likely** to be above the PRI.orIf the species is below the PRI, there is evidence of recovery, or it is **highly likely** that the UoA does not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that **main** in-scope species **are** fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *The Team may wish to use the following table when there is more than 1 scoring element.*Table : Scoring in-scope species

| **Scoring element** | **Designation** | **Score** | **Rationale** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *E.g. species or stock (SA 3.1.1.1)* | *Main / Minor* | *E.g. 60, 80, 100* | *Rationale to support the team’s conclusion for each Scoring Guidepost (SG).* |

 |
| **b** | **Minor in-scope species stock status** |
| Guide post |  |  | **Minor** in-scope species are **highly likely** to be above the PRI.orIf below the PRI, there is evidence that the UoA does not hinder the recovery and rebuilding of **minor** in-scope species. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |
| Data-deficient? (Risk-Based Framework needed) | **Yes / No** |

###### PI 2.1.2 – In-scope species management strategy

| **PI 2.1.2** | **There is a strategy in place that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of in-scope species** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that are expected to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of the **main** in-scope species at/to the in-scope species outcome SG60 level. | There is a **partial strategy** in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that is expected to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of the main in-scope species at/to the in-scope species outcome SG80 level. orWhere in-scope species outcome fails to meet the SG80, a demonstrably effective strategy is in place between all MSC UoAs that categorise this species as **main** in-scope to ensure that they collectively do not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA for managing **main** and **minor** in-scope species at the in-scope species outcome SG80 level. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post | The measures, **if necessary**, are considered **likely** to work for the **main** in-scope species, based on plausible argument. | There is some **evidence** that the measures/partial strategy, **if necessary**, is achieving the objectives for **main** in-scope species set out in scoring issue (a), based on some information directly about the UoA and/or species involved. | **There is evidence** that the partial strategy/strategy is achieving the objectives set out in scoring issue (a), based on information directly about the UoA and/or species involved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Review of alternative measures** |
| Guide post | There is a **review** of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of **main** in-scope species | There is a **review** at least once every 5 years of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of **main** in-scope species and they are **implemented, as appropriate**.  | There is a **review** that happens every 2 years of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of all in-scope species, and they are **implemented, as appropriate**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Shark finning** |
| Guide post | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |  |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** |  |  |
| Rationale | *Scoring Issue need not be scored if there are no in-scope shark species, including those that are released.* |
| **e** | **Ghost gear management strategy** |
| Guide post | There are measures in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that are expected to minimise ghost gear and its impact on all in-scope species. | There is a partial strategy in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that is expected to minimise ghost gear and its impact on all in-scope species. | There is a strategy in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that is expected to minimise ghost gear and its impact on all in-scope species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale | *The Scoring Issue is only scored when the equivalent ghost gear SI within ETP/OOS is not scored.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.1.3 – In-scope species information

| **PI 2.1.3** | **Information is adequate to determine the impact of the UoA on in-scope species and the effectiveness of management measures or strategies in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impact on main in-scope species** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the impact of the UoA on the stock status of **main** in-scope species. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA on the stock status of **main** in-scope species with a **high degree of accuracy**. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA on the stock status of **main** in-scope species with a **very high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impact on minor in-scope species** |
| Guide post |  |  | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA on the stock status of **minor** in-scope species with a **high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Information adequacy for management strategy** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to support **measures** to manage **main** in-scope species. | Information is adequate to support a **partial strategy** to manage **main** in-scope species. | **Information is adequate to support a strategy** to manage **all** in-scope species and evaluate with a **high degree of certainty** whether the strategy is achieving its objective. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.1.3R – In-scope species information if RBF is used to score PI 2.1.1 – delete if not applicable

*Note – only use this when RBF is used to score PI 2.1.1 for the UoA (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Table A3).*

| **PI 2.1.3R** | **Information on the nature and amount of in-scope species taken is adequate to determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage in-scope species** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impact on main in-scope species** |
| Guidepost | Qualitative information is adequate to estimate productivity and susceptibility attributes for main in-scope species. | Some quantitative information is adequate to assess productivity and susceptibility attributes for main in-scope species. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impact on minor in-scope species** |
| Guide post |  |  | Some quantitative information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA on minor in-scope species with respect to status. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Information adequacy for management strategy** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to support **measures** to manage **main** in-scope species. | Information is adequate to support a **partial strategy** to manage **main** in-scope species. | Information is adequate to support **a strategy** to manage **all** in-scope species and evaluate with a **high degree of certainty** whether the strategy is achieving its objective. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.2.1 – ETP/OOS species outcome

| **PI 2.2.1** | **The direct effects of the UoA do not hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Direct effects** |
| Guidepost | The direct effects of the UoA are **unlikely** to hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status. | The direct effects of the UoA are **highly unlikely** to hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the direct effects of the UoA do not hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |
| Data-deficient? (Risk-Based Framework needed) | **Yes / No** |

###### PI 2.2.2 – ETP/OOS species management strategy

| **PI 2.2.2** | **The UoA has precautionary management strategies in place designed to:*** **Ensure that incidental catches of the ETP/OOS unit are minimised and where possible eliminated**
* **Ensure that the UoA does not hinder recovery to Favourable Conservation Status.**
 |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, that are expected to **minimise** the UoA-related mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and achieve the ETP/OOS outcome SG80 level of performance. | There is a **strategy** in place, **if necessary**, that is expected to minimise the UoA-related mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and achieve the ETP/OOS outcome SG80 level of performance. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place that is expected to **minimise** the UoA-related mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and achieve the ETP outcome SG80 level of performance. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post |  | Evidence indicates that the **measures, strategy or comprehensive strategy** have reduced or **minimised** the mortality of the ETP/OOS unit. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Review of alternative measures to minimise mortality of the ETP/OOS unit** |
| Guide post |  | There is a **review** at least once every 5 years of the **alternative measures** to **minimise** UoA-related mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and they are implemented as appropriate for the ETP/OOS unit. | There is a **review** that happens every 2 years of **alternative measures** to **minimise** UoA- related mortality of the ETP/OOS unit, and they are implemented, as appropriate for the ETP/OOS unit. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Shark finning** |
| Guide post | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |  |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** |  |  |
| Rationale | *Scoring Issue need not be scored if there are no in-scope shark species, including those that are released.* |
| **e** | **Ghost gear management strategy** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, for the UoA that are expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on the ETP/OOS unit. | There is a **partial strategy** in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that is expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on the ETP/OOS unit. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that is expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on the ETP/OOS unit. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | *This SI shall only be scored when there are ETP/OOS scoring elements (SA3.9.5.b).* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.2.3 – ETP/OOS species information

| **PI 2.2.3** | **Information is adequate to determine the impact of the UoA on the ETP/OOS unit and the effectiveness of management measures or strategies in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the impact of the UoA on the ETP/OOS unit. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA on the ETP/OOS unit, and to **estimate** whether the UoA may be a threat to its recovery, with a **high degree of accuracy**. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA on the ETP/OOS unit, and to **estimate** whether the UoA may be a threat to its recovery, with a very **high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for management strategy** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to support **measures** to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit. | **Information is adequate** to support a strategy to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, and to measure trends to evaluate the effectiveness of the **measures** to minimise mortality. | Information is adequate to support a **comprehensive strategy** to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the **measures** to minimise mortality with a **high degree of certainty**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.2.3R – ETP/OOS species information if RBF is used to score PI 2.2.1 – delete if not applicable

*Note: Only use this when RBF is used to score PI 2.2.1 for the UoA (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Table A4).*

| **PI 2.2.3R** | **Relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, including:** * **Information for the development of the management strategy.**
* **Information to assess the effectiveness of the management strategy.**
* **Information to determine the outcome status of the ETP/OOS unit.**
 |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is adequate to estimate productivity and susceptibility attributes for the ETP/OOS unit. | Some quantitative information is adequate to assess productivity and susceptibility attributes for the ETP/OOS unit. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for management strategy** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to support **measures** to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit. | **Information is adequate** to support a strategy to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, and to measure trends to evaluate the effectiveness of the **measures** to minimise mortality. | Information is adequate to support a **comprehensive strategy** to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the **measures** to minimise mortality with a **high degree of certainty**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.3.1 – Habitats outcome

| **PI 2.3.1** | **The UoA does not cause serious or irreversible harm to habitat structure and function, considered on the basis of the area covered by the governance body(ies) responsible for fisheries management in the area(s) where the UoA operates** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Less sensitive habitats** |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of **less** sensitive habitats to a point where there would be **serious or irreversible harm**. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of **less** sensitive habitats to a point where there would be **serious or irreversible harm**. | There is **evidence** that the UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of **less** sensitive habitats to a point where there would be **serious or irreversible harm**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **More sensitive habitats** |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of **more** sensitive habitats to a point where there would be **serious or irreversible harm**. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of **more** sensitive habitats to a point where there would be **serious or irreversible harm**. | There is **evidence** that the UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of **more** sensitive habitats to a point where there would be **serious or irreversible harm**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *The Scoring issue need not be scored if there are no “more sensitive habitats”.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |
| Data-deficient? (Risk-Based Framework needed) | **Yes / No** |

###### PI 2.3.2 – Habitats management strategy

| **PI 2.3.2** | **There is a strategy in place that is designed to ensure the UoA does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the habitats** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, that are expected to achieve the habitat outcome SG80 level. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, that is expected to achieve the habitat outcome SG80 level or above. | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the impact of all MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries on habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post | The **measures**, **if necessary**, are considered **likely** to work, based on **plausible argument**. | There is some **evidence** that the measures/partial strategy, **if necessary**, is achieving the objectives set out in SI (a), based on **information directly about the UoA and/or habitats** involved. | There is evidence that the **partial strategy/strategy** is achieving the objectives set out in SI (a), based on **information directly about the UoA and/or habitats** involved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Compliance with management requirements and other MSC UoAs’/non-MSC fisheries’ measures to protect more sensitive habitats** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** compliance in the UoA with management requirements to protect **more** sensitive habitats. | Information is adequate to **determine**, with a **high degree of accuracy**, compliance in the UoA with both its management requirements and protection measures afforded to **more** sensitive habitats by other MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries, **where relevant**. | Information is adequate to **determine**, with a **very** **high degree of accuracy**, compliance in the UoA with both its management requirements and with protection measures afforded to more sensitive habitats by other MSC UoAs/ non-MSC fisheries, **where relevant**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *Scoring issue need not be scored if there are no “more sensitive habitats” (SA3.11.3).* |
| **d** | **Ghost gear management strategy** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, for the UoA that are expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on all habitats. | There is a **partial strategy** in place for the UoA**, if necessary**, that is expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on all habitats. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA, **if necessary**, that is expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on all habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.3.3 – Habitats information

| **PI 2.3.3** | **Information is adequate to determine the impact of the UoA on habitats, including changes in the risk posed by the UoA over time** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | The types and distribution of habitats are **broadly understood**. | The nature, distribution, and **vulnerability** of habitats in the UoA area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the UoA. | The distribution ofThe distribution of habitats is known over their range, with particular attention given to the occurrence of **vulnerable** habitats. habitats is known over their range, with particular attention to the occurrence of vulnerable habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the impacts of gear use on habitats.  | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impacts of the UoA on habitats with a **high degree of accuracy**. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impacts of the UoA on habitats with a **very** **high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post |  | Adequate information continues to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitats.  | Changes in habitat distributions over time are measured.  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.3.3R – Habitats information if CSA is used to score PI 2.3.1 – delete if not applicable

*Note – only use this when RBF is used to score PI 2.3.1 for the UoA (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox v1.0 Table A5).*

| **PI 2.3.3R** | **Information is adequate to determine the risk posed to habitats by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage impacts on the habitats** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is adequate to estimate the types and distribution of habitats. | Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to estimate the types and distribution of habitats. | The distribution of habitats is known over their range, with particular attention to the occurrence of vulnerable habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is adequate to estimate the consequence and spatial attributes of habitats. | Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to estimate the consequence and spatial attributes of habitats. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post |  | Adequate information continues to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitats.  | Changes in habitat distributions over time are measured.  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.4.1 – Ecosystem outcome

| **PI 2.4.1** | **The UoA does not cause serious or irreversible harm to the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Ecosystem status** |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to disrupt the **key** elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to disrupt the **key** elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | There is **evidence** that the UoA is **highly unlikely** to disrupt the **key** elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | *List/detail what “key ecosystem elements” are being assessed (SA3.14.3-SA3.14.4, GSA3.14.4).* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |
| Data-deficient? (Risk-Based Framework needed) | **Yes / No** |

###### PI 2.4.2 – Ecosystem management strategy

| **PI 2.4.2** | **There are measures in place to ensure the UoA does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to ecosystem structure and function** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, which considers the potential impacts of the UoA on the **key** elements underlying ecosystem structure and function.  | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, that is expected to achieve the Ecosystem outcome SG80 level. | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the impact of the UoA on the **key** elements underlying ecosystem structure and function. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post | The **measures, if necessary**, are considered **likely** to work, based on plausible argument.  | There is **some evidence** that the **measures/partial strategy, if necessary**, is achieving the objectives set out in scoring issue (a), based on some information directly about the UoA and/or the ecosystem involved. | There is **evidence** that the **partial strategy/strategy** is achieving the objectives set out in scoring issue (a) based on information directly about the UoA and/or ecosystem involved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.4.3 – Ecosystem information

| **PI 2.4.3** | **There is adequate knowledge of the ecosystem and the main impacts of the UoA on key ecosystem elements** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to identify the key elements of the ecosystem. | Information is adequate to broadly understand the key elements of the ecosystem. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Investigation of UoA impacts** |
| Guide post | Main impacts of the UoA on the **key** ecosystem elements **can be inferred** from existing information | Main impacts of the UoA on the **key** elements of the ecosystem **have been investigated in detail**. | Main interactions between the UoA and the **key** ecosystem elements **have been investigated in detail**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Understanding of component functions** |
| Guide post |  | The main functions of the components in the ecosystem are **known**. | The impacts of the UoA on the components are identified and the main functions of these components in the ecosystem are **understood**. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post |  | Adequate data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level. | **Information is adequate** to support the development of strategies to manage ecosystem impacts. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

### Principle 3

#### Principle 3 background

##### Additional sub-heading level (use is optional)

*The CAB may include in the report a summary of the UoA and the fishery-specific management system based on the topics below, referencing electronic or other documents used including:*

* *Area of operation of the UoA and under which jurisdiction(s) it falls.*
* *Particulars of the recognised groups with interests in the UoA.*
* *Details of consultations leading to the formulation of the management plan.*
* *Details of ongoing disputes within the fishery.*
* *Arrangements for on-going consultations with interest groups.*
* *Details of other non-MSC fishery users or activities, which could affect the UoA, and arrangements for liaison and co-ordination.*
* *Details of the decision-making process or processes, including the recognised participants.*
* *Objectives for the fishery (referring to any or all of the following if relevant):*
	+ *Resource*
	+ *Environmental*
	+ *Biodiversity and ecological*
	+ *Technological*
	+ *Social*
	+ *Economic*
* *An outline of the fleet types or fishing categories participating in the fishery.*
* *Details of those individuals or groups granted rights of access to the fishery and particulars of the nature of those rights.*
* *Description of the measures agreed upon for the regulation of fishing in order to meet the objectives within a specified period. These may include general and specific measures, precautionary measures, contingency plans, mechanisms for emergency decisions, etc.*
* *Particulars of arrangements and responsibilities for monitoring, control and surveillance and enforcement.*
* *This includes details of information system in place to detect non-compliance.*
* *Details of any planned education and training for interest groups.*
* *Date of the next review and audit of the management plan.*

*Some of the above may be of a generic nature and hence be dealt with in the general rules of fishing (e.g. a national fishery legislation), in which case these can be referred to in the plan, without repeating all the details. However, specific points or detail may be required for specific fisheries.*

*The CAB may indicate in the report which combination of jurisdictional categories apply to the management system of the UoA, including consideration of formal, informal and/or traditional management systems when assessing performance of UoAs under Principle 3, including:*

* *Single jurisdiction*
* *Single jurisdiction with indigenous component*
* *Shared stocks*
* *Straddling stocks*
* *Stocks of highly migratory species (HMS)*
* *Stocks of discrete high seas non-HMS*

*The CAB should provide any information used as supporting rationale in the scoring tables.*

*Reference(s): Fisheries Standard v3.0*

#### Principle 3 Performance Indicator scores and rationales

###### PI 3.1.1 – Legal and/or customary framework

| **PI 3.1.1** | **The management system exists within an appropriate and effective legal and/or customary framework which ensures that it:*** **Is capable of delivering sustainability in the UoA(s);**
* **Observes the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food or livelihood; and**
* **Incorporates an appropriate dispute resolution framework**
 |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Compatibility of laws or standards with effective management** |
| Guide post | There is an **effective national legal system** and a **framework for cooperation** with other parties, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2. | There is an **effective national legal system** and **organised and effective cooperation with other parties**, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2. | There is an **effective national legal system** and **binding procedures governing cooperation with other parties** that deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Resolution of disputes** |
| Guide post | The management system incorporates or is subject by law to a **mechanism** for the resolution of legal disputes arising within the system. | The management system incorporates or is subject by law to a **transparent mechanism** for the resolution of legal disputes which is **considered to be effective** in dealing with most issues and that is appropriate to the context of the UoA. | The management system incorporates or is subject by law to a **transparent mechanism** for the resolution of legal disputes, which is appropriate to the context of the fishery and has been **tested and proven to be effective**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Respect for rights** |
| Guide post | The management system has a mechanism to **generally respect** the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food or livelihood in a manner consistent with the objectives of MSC Principles 1 and 2. | The management system has a mechanism to **observe** the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food or livelihood in a manner consistent with the objectives of MSC Principles 1 and 2. | The management system has a mechanism to **formally commit** to the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food and livelihood in a manner consistent with the objectives of MSC Principles 1 and 2. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.1.2 – Consultation, roles, and responsibilities

| **PI 3.1.2** | **The management system has effective consultation processes that are open to interested and affected parties. The roles and responsibilities of organisations and individuals who are involved in the management process are clear and understood by all relevant parties** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Roles and responsibilities** |
| Guide post | Organisations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles, and responsibilities are **generally understood**. | Organisations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles, and responsibilities are **explicitly defined and well understood for key areas** of responsibility and interaction. | Organisations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles, and responsibilities are **explicitly defined and well understood for all areas** of responsibility and interaction. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Consultation processes** |
| Guide post | The management system includes consultation processes that **obtain relevant information** from the main affected parties, including **local knowledge**, to inform the management system. | The management system includes consultation processes that **regularly seek and accep**t relevant information, **including local knowledge**. The management system demonstrates consideration of the information obtained. | The management system includes consultation processes that **regularly seek and accept** relevant information, including **local knowledge**. The management system demonstrates consideration of the information and **explains how it is used or not used**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Participation** |
| Guide post |  | The consultation process **provides opportunity** for all interested and affected parties to be involved. | The consultation process **provides opportunity and encouragement** for all interested and affected parties to be involved, and **facilitates** their effective engagement. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.1.3 – Long term objectives

| **PI 3.1.3** | **The management policy has clear long-term objectives to guide decision-making that are consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard, and incorporates the precautionary approach** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Objectives** |
| Guide post | Long-term objectives to guide decision-making, consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard and the **precautionary approach,** are **implicit** within **management policy**. | **Clear** long-term objectives that guide decision-making, consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard and the **precautionary approach**, are **explicit** within **management policy**. | **Clear** long-term objectives that guide decision-making, consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard and the **precautionary approach**, are **explicit** within **and** **required by** management policy. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.1 – Fishery-specific objectives

| **PI 3.2.1** | **The fishery-specific management system has clear, specific objectives designed to achieve the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Objectives** |
| Guide post | **Objectives**, which are broadly consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2, are **implicit** within the fishery-specific management system. | **Short and long-term objectives**, which are consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2, are **explicit** within the fishery-specific management system. | **Well-defined and measurable short- and long-term objectives**, which are demonstrably consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2, are **explicit** within the fishery-specific management system. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.2 – Decision-making processes

| **PI 3.2.2** | **The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Decision-making processes** |
| Guide post | There are **some** decision-making processes in place that result in **measures** and **strategies** to achieve the fishery-specific objectives. | There are **established** decision-making processes that result in **measures** and **strategies** to achieve the fishery-specific objectives. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Responsiveness of decision-making processes** |
| Guide post | Decision-making processes respond to **serious issues** identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner, and take some account of the wider implications of decisions. | Decision-making processes respond to **serious and other important issues** identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely, and adaptive manner, and take account of the wider implications of decisions. | Decision-making processes respond to **all issues** identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely, and adaptive manner, and take account of the wider implications of decisions. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Use of precautionary approach** |
| Guide post |  | Decision-making processes use the **precautionary approach** and are based on best available information. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Accountability and transparency of management system and decision-making process** |
| Guide post | Some information on the fishery’s performance and management action is generally available on request to stakeholders. | **Information on the fishery’s performance and management action is available on request**, and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring, evaluation, and review activity. | Formal reporting to all interested stakeholders **provides comprehensive information on the fishery’s performance and management actions** and describes how the management system responded to findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring, evaluation, and review activity. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Approach to disputes** |
| Guide post | Although the management authority or fishery may be subject to continuing court challenges, it is not indicating a disrespect or defiance of the law by repeatedly violating the same law or regulation necessary for the sustainability of the fishery. | The management system or UoA is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges. | The management system or UoA acts proactively to avoid legal disputes or rapidly implements judicial decisions arising from legal challenges. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement

| **PI 3.2.3** | **Monitoring, control, and surveillance (MCS) mechanisms ensure the management measures in the UoA are enforced and complied with** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **MCS system** |
| Guide post | MCS **mechanisms** exist within the UoA. | An MCS **system** exists within the UoA. | A **comprehensive** MCS system is well-established within the UoA. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Sanctions** |
| Guide post | Sanctions to address non-compliance exist within the UoA. | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, that are appropriate to the UoA, and are applied. | Comprehensive sanctions to address non-compliance exist, that are appropriate to the UoA, and are consistently applied. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Compliance (information)** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** compliance in the UoA. | Information is adequate to **estimate** compliance in the UoA with a **high degree of accuracy**. | Information is adequate to **estimate** compliance in the UoA with a **very high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Compliance (outcome)** |
| Guide post | **Systematic non-compliance** of regulations specific to governing sustainable fishing practices on the water is not evident within the UoA. | Majority of regulations, including all regulations specific to governing sustainable fishing practices on the water, are **likely** to be complied with. | Majority of regulations, including all regulations specific to governing sustainable fishing practices on the water, are **consistently** complied with. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.4 – Monitoring and management performance evaluation

| **PI 3.2.4** | **There is a system for monitoring and evaluating the performance of the fishery-specific management system against its objectives. There is effective and timely review of the fishery-specific management system** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Evaluation coverage** |
| Guide post | There are mechanisms in place to evaluate **some** parts of the fishery-specific management system. | There are mechanisms in place to evaluate **key** parts of the fishery-specific management system. | There are mechanisms in place to evaluate **all** parts of the fishery-specific management system. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Internal and/or external review** |
| Guide post | The fishery-specific management system is subject to **occasional internal** review. | The fishery-specific management system is subject to **regular internal** and **occasional external review**. | The fishery-specific management system is subject to **regular** internal and external review. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

### Additional scoring tables – delete if not applicable

*The CAB should include in the report scoring tables for enhanced bivalve fisheries or salmon fisheries where relevant. The CAB should copy scoring tables below into Sections 7.4–7.5 to replace default scoring tables and delete Section 7.7.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 7.8.3*

#### Enhanced Bivalve Fisheries – delete if not applicable

###### PI 1.1.3 – Genetic outcome

| **PI 1.1.3** | **The fishery has negligible discernible impact on the genetic structure of the population** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Genetic impact of enhancement activity** |
| Guide post | The fishery is **unlikely** to impact genetic structure of wild populations to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The fishery is **highly unlikely** to impact genetic structure of wild populations to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | An independent peer-reviewed scientific assessment confirms with a **high degree of certainty** that there are no risks to the genetic structure of the wild population associated with the enhancement activity. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.5 – Genetic management

| **PI 1.2.5** | **There is a strategy in place for managing the hatchery enhancement activity such that it does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the genetic diversity of the wild population** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Genetic management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, which are expected to maintain the genetic structure of the population at levels compatible with the SG80 genetic outcome level of performance (PI 1.1.3). | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, which is expected to maintain the genetic structure of the population at levels compatible with the SG80 genetic outcome level of performance (PI 1.1.3). | There is a **strategy** in place to maintain the genetic structure of the population at levels compatible with the SG80 genetic outcome level of performance (PI 1.1.3). |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Genetic management strategy evaluation** |
| Guide post | The **measures** are considered **likely** to work based on plausible argument. | There is some **objective basis for confidence** that the **partial strategy** will work based on information directly relevant to the population(s) involved. | The **strategy** is based **on in-depth knowledge** of the genetic structure of the population, and **testing** supports **high confidence** that the **strategy** will work. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Genetic management strategy implementation** |
| Guide post |  | There is **some evidence** that the **partial strategy** is being implemented successfully, **if necessary**. | There is **clear evidence** that the strategy is being **implemented successfully**. There is some evidence that the strategy is **achieving its overall objective**. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.6 – Genetic information

| **PI 1.2.6** | **Information on the genetic structure of the population is adequate to determine the risk posed by the enhancement activity and the effectiveness of the management of genetic diversity** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | **Qualitative or inferential information** is available on the genetic structure of the population.Information is **adequate** to broadly understand the **likely** impact of hatchery enhancement. | **Qualitative or inferential information and some quantitative information** are available on the genetic structure of the population.Information is **sufficient** to estimate the **likely** impact of hatchery enhancement. | The genetic structure of the population is understood in **detail**.Information is **sufficient** to estimate the impact of hatchery enhancement with a **high degree of certainty**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for genetic management strategy** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to support **measures** to manage main genetic impacts of the enhancement activity on the stock, **if necessary**. | Information is adequate to support a **partial strategy** to manage the main genetic impacts of the enhancement activity on the stock, **if necessary**. | Information is adequate to support a **comprehensive strategy** to manage the genetic impacts of the enhancement activity on the stock and evaluate with a **high degree of certainty** whether the **strategy** is achieving its objective. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.5.1 – Translocation outcome

| **PI 2.5.1** | **The translocation activity has negligible discernible impact on the surrounding ecosystem** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Impact of translocation activity** |
| Guide post | The translocation activity is **unlikely** to introduce diseases, pests, pathogens, or non-native species into the surrounding ecosystem. | The translocation activity is **highly unlikely** to introduce diseases, pests, pathogens, or non-native species into the surrounding ecosystem. | There is **evidence** that the translocation activity is **highly unlikely** to introduce diseases, pests, pathogens, or non-native species into the surrounding ecosystem. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.5.2 – Translocation management

| **PI 2.5.2** | **There is a strategy in place for managing translocations such that the fishery does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the surrounding ecosystem** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Translocation management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place which are expected to protect the surrounding ecosystem from the translocation activity at levels compatible with the SG80 translocation outcome level of performance (PI 2.5.1). | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, that is expected to protect the surrounding ecosystem from the translocation activity at levels compatible with the SG80 translocation outcome level of performance (PI 2.5.1). | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the impacts of translocation on the surrounding ecosystem. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Translocation management strategy evaluation** |
| Guide post | The measures are considered **likely** to work based on plausible argument. | A valid documented risk assessment or equivalent environmental impact assessment demonstrates that the translocation activity is **highly unlikely** to introduce diseases, pests, pathogens, or non-native species into the surrounding ecosystem. | An independent peer-reviewed scientific assessment confirms with a **high degree of certainty** that there are no risks to the surrounding ecosystem associated with the translocation activity. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Translocation contingency measures** |
| Guide post |  | Contingency **measures** have been agreed in the case of an accidental introduction of diseases, pests, pathogens, or non-native species due to the translocation. | A **formalised contingency plan** in the case of an accidental introduction of diseases, pests, pathogens, or non-native species due to the translocation is documented and available. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.5.3 – Translocation information

| **PI 2.5.3** | **Information on the impact of the translocation activity on the environment is adequate to determine the risk posed by the fishery** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | Information is available on the presence or absence of diseases, pests, pathogens, and non-native species at the source and destination of the translocated stock to guide the management **strategy** and reduce the risks associated with the translocation. | Information is **sufficient** to adequately inform the risk and impact assessments required in the SG80 translocation management level of performance (PI 2.5.2). | Information from frequent and **comprehensive monitoring** demonstrates no impact from introduced diseases, pests, and non-native species with a **high degree of certainty**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

#### Salmon Fisheries – delete if not applicable

###### PI 1.1.1 – Stock status

| **PI 1.1.1** | **The SMU is at a level which maintains high production and has a low probability of falling below its LRP** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Stock status** |
| Guide post | It is **likely** that the SMU is above the LRP. | It is **highly likely** that the SMU is above the LRP. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the SMU is above the LRP. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Stock status in relation to the TRP** |
| Guide post |  | The SMU is at or **fluctuating around** its TRP. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the SMU has been **fluctuating around** its TRP, or has been above its TRP , over recent years. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Status of component populations** |
| Guide post |  |  | The **majority** of component populations in the SMU are within the range of expected variability. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Stock status relative to reference points** |
|  | Type of reference point | Value of reference point | Current stock status relative to reference point |
| Reference point used in scoring relative to LRP (SI a) | *Insert type of reference point e.g. Sgen.* | *Include value specifying units e.g. 50,000 spawners.* | *Include current stock status in the same units as the reference point e.g. 90,000/Escapement Goal=1.8.* |
| Reference point used in scoring relative to TRP (SI b) | *Insert type of reference point e.g. Escapement Goal.* | *Include value specifying units e.g. 100,000 spawners.* | *Include current stock status in the same units as the reference point e.g. 90,000/Escapement Goal=0.9.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding

| **PI 1.1.2** | **Where the SMU is reduced, there is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Rebuilding timeframes** |
| Guide post | A rebuilding timeframe is specified for the SMU **that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time**.  |  | The shortest practicable rebuilding timeframe is specified that does not exceed **1 generation time** for the SMU. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  |  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Rebuilding evaluation** |
| Guide post | Monitoring is in place to determine whether the fishery-based rebuilding **strategies** are effective in rebuilding the SMU within the specified timeframe.  | There is **evidence** that the fishery-based rebuilding **strategies** are being implemented effectively, or it is **likely** based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates, or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the SMU within the **specified timeframe**. | There is **strong evidence** that the rebuilding **strategies** are being implemented effectively, or it is **highly likely** based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates, or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the SMU within the **specified timeframe**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Use of enhancement in stock rebuilding** |
| Guide post | Enhancement activities are **not routinely used** as a stock rebuilding strategy but may be temporarily in place as a conservation measure to preserve or restore wild diversity threatened by human or natural impacts. | Enhancement activities are **very seldom** used as a stock rebuilding strategy. | Enhancement activities are **not used** as a stock rebuilding strategy. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.1 – Harvest strategy

| **PI 1.2.1** | **There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Harvest strategy design** |
| Guide post | The harvest strategy is **expected** to achieve SMU management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80, including **measures** that address component population status issues. | The harvest strategy is **responsive** to the state of the SMU, and the elements of the harvest strategy **work together** towards achieving SMU management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80, including **measures** that address component population status issues. | The harvest strategy is **responsive** to the state of the SMU and is **designed** to achieve SMU management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80, including **measures** that address component population status issues. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Harvest strategy evaluation** |
| Guide post | The harvest strategy is **likely** to work based on prior experience or plausible argument. | The harvest strategy has been **tested** and is expected to meet the objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80 or there is evidence that the harvest strategy is achieving its objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80. | The performance of the harvest strategy has been **evaluated** and evidence exists to show that it is achieving its objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80, including being clearly able to maintain SMUs at target levels. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Harvest strategy monitoring** |
| Guide post | Monitoring is in place that is expected to determine whether the harvest strategy is working. |  |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** |  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Harvest strategy review** |
| Guide post |  |  | The harvest strategy is periodically reviewed and improved as necessary. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Review of alternative measures** |
| Guide post | There has been a review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of the target stock. | There is a review every 5 years of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of the target stock and they are implemented as appropriate.  | There is a review at least every 2 years of the potential effectiveness and practicality of **alternative measures** to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted catch** of the target stock, and they are implemented, as appropriate. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *Scoring Issue need not be scored if sharks are not a target species.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.2 – Harvest control rules and tools

| **PI 1.2.2** | **There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **HCR design and application** |
| Guide post | **Generally understood** HCRs are **in place** that are **expected** to reduce the exploitation rate as the SMU **LRP** is approached. | **Well defined** HCRs are **in place** that **ensure** that the exploitation rate is reduced as the **LRP** is approached, are expected to keep the SMU **fluctuating around** a target level consistent with MSY. | The HCRs are expected to keep the SMU **fluctuating at or above** a target level consistent with MSY or another more appropriate level, taking into account the ecological role of the stock, **most** of the time. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **HCR robustness to uncertainty** |
| Guide post |  | The HCRs are likely to be robust to the main uncertainties. | The HCRs take account of a **wide** range of uncertainties, including the ecological role of the SMU, and there is **evidence** that the HCRs are robust to the main uncertainties. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **HCR evaluation** |
| Guide post | There is **some evidence** that tools used or **available** to implement HCRs are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation. | **Available evidence indicates** that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs. | **Evidence clearly shows** that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs.  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Maintenance of wild population components** |
| Guide post | It is **likely** that the HCRs and tools are consistent with maintaining the diversity and productivity of the wild component populations. | It is **highly likely** that the HCRs and tools are consistent with maintaining the diversity and productivity of the wild component populations. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the HCRs and tools are consistent with maintaining the diversity and productivity of the wild component populations. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.3 – Information and monitoring

| **PI 1.2.3** | **Relevant information is collected to support the harvest strategy** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **HCR design and application** |
| Guide post | **Some** relevant information related to SMU structure, SMU production, and fleet composition is available to support the harvest strategy, including **indirect or direct information is available on some component populations**. | **Sufficient** relevant information related to SMU structure, SMU production, fleet composition and other data is available to support the harvest strategy, **including harvests and spawning escapements for a representative range of wild component populations**. | A **comprehensive range** of information, including some that may not be relevant to the current harvest strategy, is **available**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post | SMU wild abundance and UoA removals are monitored and **at least 1 indicator** is available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest strategy. | SMU wild abundance and UoA removals are **regularly monitored at a level of accuracy and coverage consistent with the harvest strategy**, and **1 or more indicators** are available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest strategy. | **All information** required by the harvest strategy is monitored with high frequency and a high degree of certainty, and there is a good understanding of inherent **uncertainties** in the information (data) and the robustness of assessment and management to this uncertainty. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Comprehensiveness of information** |
| Guide post |  | There is good information on all other fishery removals from the **SMU**. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.2.4 – Assessment of stock status

| **PI 1.2.4** | **There is an adequate assessment of the stock status of the SMU** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Appropriateness of assessment to stock under consideration** |
| Guide post |  | The assessment is appropriate for the SMU and for the harvest strategy. | The assessment takes into account the major features relevant to the biology of the species and the nature of the UoA. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Assessment approach** |
| Guide post | The assessment estimates stock status relative to generic reference points appropriate to salmon. | The assessment estimates stock status relative to reference points that are appropriate to the SMU and can be estimated. | The assessment estimates with a high level of confidence both stock status and reference points that are appropriate to the SMU and its wild component populations.  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Uncertainty in the assessment** |
| Guide post | The assessment **identifies major sources** of uncertainty. | The assessment **takes uncertainty into account**. | The assessment takes into account uncertainty and is evaluating stock status relative to reference points in a **probabilistic** way. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Evaluation of assessment** |
| Guide post |  |  | The assessment has been tested and shown to be robust, and alternative hypotheses and assessment approaches have been rigorously explored. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Peer review of assessment** |
| Guide post |  | The assessment of SMU status, including the choice of indicator populations and methods for evaluating wild salmon in enhanced fisheries, is subject to peer review. | The assessment, including design for using indicator populations and methods for evaluating wild salmon in enhanced fisheries, has been **internally and externally** peer reviewed. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **f** | **Representativeness of indicator stocks** |
| Guide post | Where indicator stocks are used as the primary source of information for making management decisions on SMUs, there is **some scientific basis** for the choice of indicators. | Where indicator stocks are used as the primary source of information for making management decisions on SMUs, there is **some evidence of coherence** between the status of the indicator streams and the status of the other populations they represent within the management unit, including selection of indicator stocks with low productivity to match those of the representative SMU where applicable. | Where indicator stocks are used as the primary source of information for making management decisions on SMUs, the status of the indicator streams are **well correlated** with other populations they represent within the management unit, including stocks with lower productivity. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **g** | **Definition of SMUs** |
| Guide post | The majority of SMUs are defined with a clear rationale for conservation, fishery management, and stock assessment requirements. | The SMUs are well defined and include definitions of the major populations with a clear rationale for conservation, fishery management, and stock assessment requirements. | There is an unambiguous description of each SMU that may include the geographic location, run timing, migration patterns, and/or genetics of component populations, with a clear rationale for conservation, fishery management, and stock assessment requirements. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.3.1 – Enhancement outcomes

| **PI 1.3.1** | **Enhancement activities do not negatively impact wild stock(s)** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Enhancement impacts** |
| Guide post | It is **likely** that the enhancement activities do not have significant negative impacts on the local adaptation, reproductive performance, or productivity and diversity of wild stocks. | It is **highly likely** that the enhancement activities do not have significant negative impacts on the local adaptation, reproductive performance, or productivity and diversity of wild stocks. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the enhancement activities do not have significant negative impacts on the local adaptation, reproductive performance, or productivity and diversity of wild stocks. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.3.2 – Enhancement management

| **PI 1.3.2** | **Effective enhancement and fishery strategies are in place to address effects of enhancement activities on wild stock(s)** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | **Practices and protocols** are in place to protect wild stocks from significant negative impacts of enhancement. | There is a **partial strategy** in place to protect wild stocks from significant negative impacts of enhancement. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place to protect wild stocks from significant negative impacts of enhancement. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy evaluation** |
| Guide post | The practices and protocols in place are considered **likely** to be effective based on plausible argument. | There is **some objective basis for confidence** that the strategy is effective, based on evidence that the **strategy** is achieving the outcome metrics used to define the minimum detrimental impacts. | There is **clear evidence** that the **comprehensive strategy** is successfully protecting wild stocks from significant detrimental impacts of enhancement. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 1.3.3 – Enhancement information

| **PI 1.3.3** | **Relevant information is collected, and assessments are adequate to determine the effect of enhancement activities on wild stock(s)** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy** |
| Guide post | **Some relevant information** is available on the contribution of enhanced fish to the fishery harvest, total escapement, and hatchery broodstock. | **Sufficient relevant qualitative and quantitative information** is available on the contribution of enhanced fish to the fishery harvest, total escapement, and hatchery broodstock. | A **comprehensive range of relevant quantitative information** is available on the contribution of enhanced fish to the fishery harvest, total escapement, and hatchery broodstock. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Use of information in assessment** |
| Guide post | The effect of enhancement activities on wild-stock status, productivity, and diversity are taken into account qualitatively. | A **moderate-level analysis** of relevant information is conducted and used by decision makers to quantitatively estimate the impact of enhancement activities on wild-stock status, productivity, and diversity. | A **comprehensive analysis** of relevant information is conducted and routinely used by decision makers to determine, with a **high degree of certainty**, the quantitative impact of enhancement activities on wild-stock status, productivity, and diversity. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.2.1 – ETP/OOS species outcome

| **PI 2.2.1** | **The ETP/OOS unit is at favourable conservation status, or the UoA and associated enhancement activities do not hinder recovery to this level** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Direct effects** |
| Guide post | The direct effects of the UoA, including enhancement activities, are **unlikely** to hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status. | The direct effects of the UoA, including enhancement activities, are **highly unlikely** to hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the direct effect of the UoA, including enhancement activities, do not hinder recovery of the ETP/OOS unit to favourable conservation status. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.2.2 – ETP/OOS species management strategy

| **PI 2.2.2** | **The UoA and associated enhancement activities have precautionary management strategies designed to:*** **Ensure that incidental catches of the ETP/OOS unit are minimised and where possible eliminated**
* **Ensure that the ETP/OOS unit is at favourable conservation status, or the UoA and associated enhancement activities do not hinder recovery to this level.**
 |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, that are expected to minimise the UoA- and enhancement related-mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and achieve the ETP/OOS outcome SG80 level of performance.  | There is a **strategy** in place, **if necessary**, that is expected to minimise the UoA- and enhancement related-mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and achieve the ETP/OOS outcome SG80 level of performance. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place that, if necessary, is expected to **minimise** the UoA- and enhancement related- mortality of the ETP/OOS unit and achieve the ETP/OOS outcome SG80 level of performance. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post |  | Evidence indicates that the **measures, strategy, or comprehensive strategy** have reduced or **minimised** the mortality of the ETP/OOS unit. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Review of alternative measures to minimise mortality of ETP/OOS species** |
| Guide post |  | There is a **review** at least once every 5 years of the **alternative measures** to minimise UoA- and enhancement related-mortality of the ETP/OOS unit, and they are implemented as appropriate for the ETP/OOS unit. | There is a **review** at least every 2 years of **alternative measures** to **minimise** UoA- and enhancement related-mortality of the ETP/OOS unit, and they are implemented, as appropriate, for the ETP/OOS unit. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Shark finning** |
| Guide post | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |  |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No** |  |  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **e** | **Ghost gear management strategy** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, for the UoA and associated enhancement activities, that are expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on the ETP/OOS unit. | There is a **partial strategy** in place for the UoA and associated enhancement activities, **if necessary**, that is expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on the ETP/OOS unit. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA and associated enhancement activities, **if necessary**, that is expected to **minimise** ghost gear and its impact on the ETP/OOS unit. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.2.3 – ETP/OOS species information

| **PI 2.2.3** | **Information is adequate to determine the impact of the UoA and enhancement activities on the ETP/OOS unit and the effectiveness of management measures or strategies in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the impact of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the ETP/OOS unit. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the ETP/OOS unit, and to estimate whether the UoA and associated enhancement activities may be a threat to its recovery, with a **high degree of accuracy**. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impact of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the ETP/OOS unit, and to estimate whether the UoA and associated enhancement activities may be a threat to its recovery, with a **very high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for management strategy** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to support **measures** to manage the impacts on the ETP/OOS unit. | Information is adequate to support a **strategy** to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, and to measure trends to evaluate the effectiveness of the **measures** to minimise mortality. | Information is adequate to support a **comprehensive strategy** to manage impacts on the ETP/OOS unit, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the **measures** to minimise mortality with a **high degree of certainty**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.3.1 – Habitats outcome

| **PI 2.3.1** | **The UoA and its associated enhancement activities do not cause serious or irreversible harm to habitat structure and function, considered on the basis of the area covered by the governance body(ies) responsible for fisheries management in the area(s) where the UoA operates** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Less sensitive habitats** |
| Guide post | The UoA and its associated enhancement activities, is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of less sensitive habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA and its associated enhancement activities is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of less sensitive habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | There is **evidence** that the UoA and its associated enhancement activities is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of less sensitive habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **More sensitive habitats** |
| Guide post | The UoA and its associated enhancement activities is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of more sensitive habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.  | The UoA and its associated enhancement activities is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of more sensitive habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | There is **evidence** that the UoA and its associated enhancement activities is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of more sensitive habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *Scoring issue need not be scored if there are no “more sensitive habitats”.* |
| **c** | **Impacts due to enhancement activities within the UoA** |
| Guide post | The enhancement activities are **unlikely** to have adverse impacts on habitat. | The enhancement activities are **highly unlikely** to have adverse impacts on habitat. |  There is a **high degree of certainty** that the enhancement activities do not have adverse impacts on habitat. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.3.2 – Habitats management strategy

| **PI 2.3.2** | **There is a strategy in place that is designed to ensure the UoA and associated enhancement activities do not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the habitats** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, that are expected to achieve the habitat outcome SG80 level. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, that is expected to achieve the habitat outcome SG80 level or above. | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the impact of all MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries UoAs and associated enhancement activities on habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post | The measures are **considered likely** to work, based on plausible argument. | There is some **evidence** that **the measures/partial strategy** is achieving the objectives set out in SI (a), based on information directly about the UoA, its enhancement activities, and/or habitats involved. | There is **evidence** that the **partial strategy/strategy** is achieving the objectives set out in SI (a), based on information directly about the UoA, its enhancement activities, and/or habitats involved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Compliance with management requirements and other MSC UoAs’/non-MSC fisheries’ measures to protect more sensitive habitats** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** compliance in the UoA with management requirements to protect more sensitive habitats. | Information is adequate to **estimate**, with a **high degree of accuracy**, compliance in the UoA with its management requirements and protection measures afforded to more sensitive habitats by other MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries, **where relevant**. | formation is adequate to **estimate**, with a **very high degree of accuracy**, compliance in the UoA with both its management requirements and with protection measures afforded to more sensitive habitats by other MSC UoAs/ non-MSC fisheries, **where relevant**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | *Scoring issue need not be scored if there are no “more sensitive habitats”.* |
| **d** | **Ghost gear management strategy** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, for the UoA and associated enhancement activities, that are expected to minimise ghost gear and its impact on all habitats | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, for the UoA and associated enhancement activities, that is expected to minimise ghost gear and its impact on all habitats. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA and associated enhancement activities that is expected to minimise ghost gear and its impact on all habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.3.3 – Habitats information

| **PI 2.3.3** | **Information is adequate to determine the risk posed to the habitat by the UoA and associated enhancement activities and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage impacts on the habitat** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | The types and distribution of the habitats are **broadly understood**. | The nature, distribution, and vulnerability of the habitats in the UoA area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the UoA. | The distribution of habitats is known over their range, with particular attention given to the occurrence of vulnerable habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the impacts of gear use and enhancement activities on habitats.  | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impacts of the UoA, including enhancement activities, on habitats with a **high degree of accuracy**. | Information is adequate to **estimate** the impacts of the UoA, including enhancement activities, on habitats with a **very high degree of accuracy**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post |  | Adequate information continues to be collected to detect any increase in risk to habitats.  | Changes in all habitat distributions over time are measured.  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.4.1 – Ecosystem outcome

| **PI 2.4.1** | **The UoA and associated enhancement activities do not cause serious or irreversible harm to the key elements of ecosystem structure and function** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Ecosystem status** |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | There is **evidence** that the UoA is **highly unlikely** to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Impacts due to enhancement** |
| Guide post | Enhancement activities are **unlikely** to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.  | Enhancement activities are **highly unlikely** to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.  | There is **evidence** that the enhancement activities are **highly unlikely** to disrupt the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.  |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.4.2 – Ecosystem management

| **PI 2.4.2** | **There are measures in place to ensure the UoA and enhancement activities do not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to ecosystem structure and function** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place** |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, **if necessary**, which consider the **potential impacts** of the UoA on the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and function.  | There is a **partial strategy** in place, **if necessary**, which takes into account **available information and is expected to limit impacts** of the UoA on the ecosystem so as to achieve the Ecosystem outcome SG80 level. | There is a **strategy** that consists of a **plan** in place that includes measures to **address all main impacts of the UoA** on the ecosystem, and at least some of these measures are in place. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Management strategy effectiveness** |
| Guide post | The **measures** are considered **likely** to work, based on plausible argument.  | There is **some evidence** that the **measures/ partial strategy** are achieving the objectives set out in scoring issue (a), based on some information directly about the UoA and/or the ecosystem involved. | There is evidence that the **partial strategy/ strategy** is achieving the objectives set out in scoring issue (a), based on information directly about the UoA and/or ecosystem involved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Management strategy implementation** |
| Guide post |   | There is **some evidence** that the **measures/partial strategy** is being implemented successfully. | There is **clear evidence** that the **partial strategy/strategy** is being implemented successfully and is achieving its objective as set out in scoring issue (a).  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Management of enhancement activities** |
| Guide post | There is an **established** artificial production strategy in place that is expected to achieve the Ecosystem outcome SG60 level. | There is a **tested and evaluated** artificial production strategy with sufficient monitoring in place, and evidence is available to reasonably ensure with high likelihood that the strategy is effective in achieving the Ecosystem outcome SG80 level. | There is a **comprehensive and fully evaluated** artificial production strategy to verify with certainty that the Ecosystem outcome SG100 level is achieved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 2.4.3 – Ecosystem information

| **PI 2.4.3** | **There is adequate knowledge of the impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the ecosystem** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information quality** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **identify** the key elements of the ecosystem. | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the key elements of the ecosystem. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Investigation of UoA impacts** |
| Guide post | Main impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information. | Main impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the key elements of the ecosystem **have been investigated in detail**. | Main interactions between the UoA and associated enhancement activities and the key ecosystem elements **have been investigated in detail**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Understanding of component functions** |
| Guide post |   | The main functions of the components in the ecosystem are **known**. | The impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the components are identified, and the main functions of these components in the ecosystem are **understood**. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Information relevance** |
| Guide post |  | Adequate information is available on the impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on these components to allow some of the main consequences for the ecosystem to be inferred. | Adequate information is available on the impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on the components **and elements** to allow the main consequences for the ecosystem to be inferred. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Monitoring** |
| Guide post |  | Adequate data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level. | Information is adequate to support the development of strategies to manage ecosystem impacts. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.1.3 – Long term objectives

| **PI 3.1.3** | **The management policy for the SMU and associated enhancement activities has clear long-term objectives to guide decision-making that are consistent with MSC Fisheries Standard and incorporates the precautionary approach** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Objectives** |
| Guide post | Long-term objectives to guide decision-making, consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard and the precautionary approach, are **implicit** within management policy. | Clear long-term objectives that guide decision-making, consistent with MSC Fisheries Standard and the precautionary approach, are **explicit** within management policy. | Clear long-term objectives that guide decision-making, consistent with MSC Fisheries Standard and the precautionary approach, are **explicit** within and **required by** management policy. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.1 – Fishery-specific objectives

| **PI 3.2.1** | **The fishery-specific and associated enhancement management system(s) have clear, specific objectives designed to achieve the outcomes expressed by the MSC Principles 1 and 2** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Objectives** |
| Guide post | **Objectives**, which are broadly consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2, are **implicit** within the fishery and associated enhancement management system(s). | **Short and long-term objectives**, which are consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2, are **explicit** within the fishery and associated enhancement management system(s). | **Well defined and measurable short- and long-term objectives**, which are demonstrably consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC Principles 1 and 2, are **explicit** within the fishery and associated enhancement management system(s). |
| Met? | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** | **Yes / No / Partial** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.2 – Decision-making processes

| **PI 3.2.2** | **The fishery-specific and associated enhancement management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Objectives** |
| Guide post | There are **some** decision-making processes in place that result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific and enhancement objectives. | There are **established** decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific and enhancement objectives. |  |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Responsiveness of decision-making processes** |
| Guide post | Decision-making processes respond to **serious issues** identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely, and adaptive manner and take some account of the wider implications of decisions. | Decision-making processes respond to **serious and other important issues** identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely, and adaptive manner, and take account of the wider implications of decisions. | Decision-making processes respond to **all issues** identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely, and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Use of precautionary approach** |
| Guide post |  | Decision-making processes use the precautionary approach and are based on best available information. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  |  |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Accountability and transparency of management system and decision-making process** |
| Guide post | Some information on the fishery’s performance and management action is generally available on request to stakeholders. | **Information on the fishery’s performance and management action is available on request**, and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring, evaluation, and review activity. | Formal reporting to all interested stakeholders **provides comprehensive information on fishery performance and management actions** and describes how the management system responded to findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring, evaluation, and review activity. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **e** | **Approach to disputes** |
| Guide post | Although the management authority or fishery may be subject to continuing court challenges, it is not indicating a disrespect or defiance of the law by repeatedly violating the same law or regulation necessary for the sustainability of the fishery. | The management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges. | The management system or fishery acts proactively to avoid legal disputes or rapidly implements judicial decisions arising from legal challenges. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement

| **PI 3.2.3** | **MCS mechanisms ensure the management measures in the UoA and associated enhancement activities are enforced and complied with** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **MCS system** |
| Guide post | MCS **mechanisms** exist within the UoA and associated enhancement activities. | An MCS **system** exists within the UoA and associated enhancement activities. | A **comprehensive** MCS system is well-established within the UoA and associated enhancement activities |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Sanctions** |
| Guide post | Sanctions to address non-compliance exist within the UoA and associated enhancement activities. | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, that are appropriate to the UoA and associated enhancement activities, and are applied. | Comprehensive sanctions to address non-compliance exist, that are appropriate to the UoA and associated enhancement activities, and are consistently applied. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **Compliance (information)** |
| Guide post | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** compliance in the UoA. | Information is adequate to **estimate** compliance in the UoA with a high degree of accuracy. | Information is adequate to **estimate** compliance in the UoA with a very high degree of accuracy. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **d** | **Compliance (outcome)** |
| Guide post | Systematic non-compliance of regulations specific to governing sustainable fishing practices on the water is not evident within the UoA and associated enhancement activities. | Majority of regulations, including all regulations specific to governing sustainable fishing practices on the water, are **likely** to be complied with. | Majority of regulations, including all regulations specific to governing sustainable fishing practices on the water, are **consistently** complied with. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

###### PI 3.2.4 – Monitoring and management performance evaluations

| **PI 3.2.4** | **There is a system for monitoring and evaluating the performance of the fishery-specific and enhancement management system(s) against its objectives****There is effective and timely review of the fishery-specific and associated enhancement program(s) management system** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Evaluation coverage** |
| Guide post | The fishery and associated enhancement program(s) have in place mechanisms to evaluate **some** parts of the management system. | The fishery and associated enhancement program(s) have in place mechanisms to evaluate **key** parts of the management system. | The fishery and associated enhancement program(s) have in place mechanisms to evaluate **all** parts of the management system. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **Internal and/or external review** |
| Guide post | The fishery-specific and associated enhancement program(s) management system is subject to **occasional internal** review. | The fishery-specific and associated enhancement program(s) management system is subject to **regular internal and occasional external** review. | The fishery-specific and associated enhancement program(s) management system is subject to **regular internal and external** review. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

### Principle 1 for stocks managed by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs)

###### PI 1.2.2 – Harvest control rules and tools

| **PI 1.2.2** | **There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place** |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **HCR design and application** |
| Guide post | HCRs are **expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the PRI is approached** and are either **generally understood** and **in place**, or **available**. | **Well-defined** HCRs are **in place** that **ensure** that the exploitation rate is reduced as the PRI is approached, and are expected to keep the stock **fluctuating around** a target level consistent with (or above) MSY, or for key LTL species a level consistent with ecosystem needs. | The HCRs are expected to keep the stock **fluctuating at or above** a target level consistent with MSY, or another more appropriate level taking into account the ecological role of the stock, **most of the time**. |
| Met? | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **b** | **HCR robustness to uncertainty** |
| Guide post |  | The HCRs are **likely** to be robust to the main uncertainties. | The HCRs take account of a **wide** range of uncertainties including the ecological role of the stock, and there is **evidence** that the HCRs are robust to the main uncertainties. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |
| **c** | **HCR evaluation** |
| Guide post | There is **some evidence** that tools used or **available** to implement HCRs are appropriate and **effective** in controlling exploitation. | **Available evidence indicates** that the tools in use are appropriate and **effective** in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs. | **Evidence clearly shows** that the tools in use are **effective** in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No**  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft scoring range | **<60 / 60-79 / ≥80** |
| Information gap indicator | **More information sought / Information sufficient to score PI***If more information is sought, include a description of what the information gap is and what is information is sought* |

## Appendices

### Evaluation processes and techniques

#### Site visits

*The CAB may include in the report:*

* *A description of any field activities that were conducted during the pre-assessment.*
* *A list of meetings held.*
* *Details of any other engagement with stakeholders.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 Section 7.14*

#### Recommendations for stakeholder participation in full assessment

*The CAB may include in the report:*

* *Details of people to be interviewed or included in a full assessment: local residents, representatives of stakeholder organisations including contacts with any regional MSC representatives.*
* *A description of stakeholder engagement strategy and opportunities available.*

### Risk-Based Framework outputs – delete if not applicable

#### Consequence Analysis (CA)

*The CAB should complete the Consequence Analysis (CA) table below for each data-deficient species under PI 1.1.1, including rationales for scoring each of the CA attributes.*

*Reference(s): MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A3*

Table 11: CA scoring template

| **Principle 1: Stock status outcome** | **Scoring element** | **Consequence subcomponents** | **Consequence score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Population size |  |
| Reproductive capacity |  |
| Age/size/sex structure |  |
| Geographic range |  |
| **Justification for most vulnerable subcomponent** |  |  |  |
| **Justification for consequence score** |  |  |  |

#### Productivity Susceptibility Analysis (PSA)

*The CAB should include in the report an MSC Productivity Susceptibility Analysis (PSA) worksheet for each Performance Indicator where the PSA is used and one PSA rationale table for each data-deficient species identified, subject to MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A4. If species are grouped together, the CAB should list all species and group them indicating which are most at-risk.*

*Reference(s): Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A4*

Table 12: PSA productivity and susceptibility attributes and scores for fish and invertebrates

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| **Productivity** |
| Scoring element (species) |  |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Average age at maturity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average maximum age |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Fecundity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average maximum sizeNot scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average size at maturityNot scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Reproductive strategy |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Trophic level |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Density dependenceInvertebrates only |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** |
| FisheryOnly where the scoring element is scored cumulatively | *Insert list of fisheries impacting the given scoring element (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox A4.4.3a)* |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification. Note specific requirements in MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox A4.4.6.b, where the impacts of fisheries other than the UoA are taken into account.* | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability | *Insert attribute justification. Note specific requirements in MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox A4.4.7.b, where the impacts of fisheries other than the UoA are taken into account.* | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Selectivity of gear type |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Post capture mortality |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Catch (weight) Only where the scoring element is scored cumulatively | *Insert weights or proportions of fisheries impacting the given scoring element (MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox A4.4.4).* | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table 13 PSA productivity and susceptibility attributes and scores for birds

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| **Productivity** |
| Scoring element (species) |  |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Average age at first breeding |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average ‘optimal’ adult survival probability |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Fecundity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Selectivity of gear type |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Post capture mortality |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table PSA productivity and susceptibility attributes and scores for marine mammals: Mysticetes and sirenians; Odontocetes; Pinnipeds and sea otters

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| **Productivity** |
| Scoring element (species) |  |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Average age at maturity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Fecundity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average ‘optimal’ adult survival probability (only scored for Pinnipeds and sea otters) |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Selectivity of gear type |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Post capture mortality |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table PSA productivity and susceptibility attributes and scores for sea turtles

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| **Productivity** |
| Scoring element (species) |  |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Average age at maturity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Fecundity: eggs per season per remigration interval |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Selectivity of gear type |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Post capture mortality |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table PSA productivity and susceptibility attributes and scores for sea snakes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| **Productivity** |
| Scoring element (species) |  |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Average length at maturity (cm) |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average maximum size (cm) |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Fecundity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Selectivity of gear type |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Post capture mortality |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table PSA productivity and susceptibility attributes and scores for amphibians

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| **Productivity** |
| Scoring element (species) |  |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Average age at maturity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average maximum age |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Fecundity |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average maximum sizeNot scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average size at maturityNot scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Reproductive strategy |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Trophic level |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Density dependenceInvertebrates only |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability | *Insert attribute justification.*  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Selectivity of gear type |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Post capture mortality |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table 18: Species grouped by similar taxonomies (if MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox A4.1.6 is used)

| **Species scientific name** | **Species common name (if known)** | **Taxonomic grouping** | **Most at-risk in group?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *e.g. Genus species subspecies* |  | *Indicate the group that this species belongs to, e.g. Scombridae, Soleidae, Serranidae, Merluccius spp.* | *Yes / No* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Consequence Spatial Analysis (CSA)

*The CAB should complete the Consequence Spatial Analysis (CSA) table below for PI 2.4.1, if used, including rationales for scoring each of the CSA attributes.*

*Reference(s): Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A7*

Table 19: CSA justification table for PI 2.3.1 Habitats

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Consequence** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Regeneration of biota |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Natural disturbance |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Removability of biota |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Removability of substratum |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Substratum hardness |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Substratum ruggedness |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Seabed slope |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Spatial** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Gear footprint |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Spatial overlap |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Encounterability |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |

#### Scale Intensity Consequence Analysis (SICA)

*The CAB should complete the Scale Intensity Consequence Analysis (SICA) table below for PI 2.4.1, if used, including rationales for scoring each of the SICA attributes.*

*Reference(s): MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A8*

Table 20: SICA scoring template for PI 2.4.1 Ecosystem

| **Performance Indicator PI 2.4.1 Ecosystem outcome** | **Spatial scale of fishing activity** | **Temporal scale of fishing activity** | **Intensity of fishing activity** | **Relevant subcomponents** | **Consequence Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Species composition |  |
| Functional group composition |  |
| Distribution of the community |  |
| Trophic size/structure |  |
| Justification for spatial scale of fishing activity |  |
| Justification for temporal scale of fishing activity |  |
| Justification for intensity of fishing activity |  |
| Justification for consequence score |  |

### Benthic Impacts Tool settings – delete if not applicable

*This template details the information the user of the MSC Benthic Impacts Tool must report in order for the output to be used to inform scoring. The intention is to ensure the outputs of the Benthic Impact Tool are auditable and reproducible.*

*Please complete all unshaded fields. For all notes and guidance indicated in italics, please delete and replace with your specific information.*

*Reference: MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section C*

Table 21: Benthic Impacts Tool: User and assessment information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name  |  |
| Organisation |  |
| Date of use |  |
| Units of Assessment(s) for which tool used |  |
| Confirm that the MSC Benthic Impacts Tool User Manual was followed | *Yes / No* |

Table 22: Benthic Impacts Tool: Data and settings

*Complete this table for each gear type assessed using the Benthic Impacts Tool. If multiple gear types were assessed using the Benthic Impacts Tool, replicate the table below and complete one table per gear type.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Gear type assessed |  |
| **Datasets:** *In each of the boxes please provide a description of the data used (e.g., data type, scope, source and any modifications to original datasets)* |
| Fishing effort data |  |
| Assessment area boundary |  |
| Habitats within the assessment area boundary |  |
| **Settings** |
| **Effort and habitat data** |
| How many years of fishing effort data are there in the dataset? |  |
| What grid cell size did you use? |  |
| **Depletion values:** *Complete where default values were not used* |
| What gear-specific depletion rate did you use? |  |
| What gear-specific penetration depths did you use? |  |
| What sediment type did you assign to each habitat type? | *E.g., A2.3 – Mud, A2.4 – Sand, A2.5 – Gravel* |
| **Recovery rates:** *Complete where default values were not used* |
| What longevity distribution parameters were used? |  |
| What species data was used? |  |

### Harmonised fishery assessments – delete if not applicable

*Harmonisation is required in cases where assessments overlap, or new assessments overlap with pre-existing fisheries.*

*If relevant, in accordance with FCP v3.0 Annex PB requirements, the CAB may describe in the report the processes, activities and specific outcomes of efforts to harmonise fishery assessments. The CAB may identify in the report the fisheries and Performance Indicators that may be subject to harmonisation at full assessment.*

*Reference(s): FCP v3.0 Annex PB, Table PB1*

Table 23: Overlapping Units of Assessment

| **Fishery name** | **Unit of Assessment** | **Certification status**  | **Certification date** | **Performance Indicators to harmonise** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 24: Overlapping Units of Assessment

|  |
| --- |
| **Supporting information** |
| *Describe any background or supporting information relevant to the harmonisation activities, processes and outcomes.* |
| **Has there been an Annual Harmonisation meeting of which the results will be adopted?** | *Yes / No* |
| **Date of annual harmonisation meeting** | *DD / MM / YY* |
| **If applicable, describe the meeting outcome**  |
| *e.g. Agreement found among teams or lowest score adopted.* |

Table 25: Scoring differences

| **Performance Indicators (PIs)** | **Fishery name & UoA name** | **Fishery name & UoA name** | **Fishery name & UoA name** | **Fishery name & UoA name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI**  | Score | Score | Score | Score |
| **PI** | Score | Score | Score | Score |
| **PI** | Score | Score | Score | Score |

Table 26: Rationale for scoring differences

|  |
| --- |
| **If exceptional circumstances apply, outline the situation and whether there is agreement between or among teams on this determination (FCP v3.0 PB 1.3.2.1).** |
|  |
| **If applicable, explain and justify any difference in scoring and rationale for the relevant Performance Indicators (FCP v3.0 Annex PB 1.3.2.2).** |
|  |

### Assessment Team – biographies/summaries of CVs (optional)

*The CAB may include in an appendix to the report biographies and/or summaries of CVs of the assessment team.*

### References (Bibliography)

*The CAB should list all references here, including hyperlinks to publicly-available documents.*

*The CAB should provide a full reference to make finding any information a straightforward process for stakeholders. Where possible, the CAB should include both a hyperlink and additional details required to find the information if the hyperlink breaks.*

*The CAB may choose to have a references section per principle or a single references section.*

## Template information and copyright

The Marine Stewardship Council’s ‘MSC Pre-Assessment Reporting Template v4.1’ and its content is copyright of “Marine Stewardship Council” - © “Marine Stewardship Council” 2023. All rights reserved.

*The CAB should delete the table below:*

Table 27: Template version control

| **Version** | **Date of publication** | **Description of amendment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.0 | 15 August 2011 | Date of first release |
| 1.1 | 31 October 2013 | Updated in line with changes to CR v1.3 |
| 2.0 | 08 October 2014 | Confirmed background sections (Section 3) as optional (use of ‘may’ statements)Modified Table 6.3 to create a simplified scoring sheet to be completed in place of full evaluation tablesMade amendments to PIs based on Fishery Standard Review changes (e.g. removed original PIs 1.1.2, 3.1.4 and 3.2.4). |
| 2.1 | 9 October 2017 | Inclusion of optional full evaluation tables |
| 3.0 | 17 December 2018 | Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.1 |
| 3.1 | 29 March 2019 | Minor document changes for usability |
| 3.2 | 25 March 2020 | Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.2 |
| 4.0 | 26 October 2022 | Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v3.0 |
| 4.1 | 01 May 2023 | Added optional vessel lists section 5.2, minor correction to RBF PI 1.2.3 |

A controlled document list of MSC program documents is available on the MSC website (<https://www.msc.org/for-business/certification-bodies/supporting-documents>).
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