[Insert CAB Logo]

Marine Stewardship Council fisheries assessments

# [Fishery name]

# Announcement Comment Draft Report

# Client and Peer Review Draft Report

# Public Comment Draft Report

# Final Draft Report

# Public Certification Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) |  |
| Assessment team |  |
| Fishery client |  |
| Assessment type | *Initial Assessment / Reassessment / Scope Extension / Transition Assessment* |
| Date |  |

*Instructions to CABs and assessment teams*

*This template details the information required from Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) when creating the following assessment reports:*

* *Announcement Comment Draft Report (FCP v2.3 Section 7.8)*
* *Client and Peer Review Draft Report (FCP v2.3 Section 7.19)*
* *Public Comment Draft Report (FCP v2.3 Section 7.20)*
* *Final Draft Report (FCP v2.3 Section 7.22)*
* *Public Certification Report (FCP v2.3 Section 7.24)*

*If any discrepancies are noted between this template and the MSC Fisheries Standard, CABs and teams shall 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 shall ensure it is clear which Unit of Assessment or scoring element is being referenced. CABs shall provide rationale for all Units of Assessment and scoring elements and may group rationales when addressing multiple Units of Assessment or scoring elements.*

For reassessments, CABs shall report clearly in the Conditions Section to all parties which conditions have been closed at the end of the certification, and whether any remain open and why.

*Please complete all unshaded fields. 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 and assessment teams’ section.*

Unless otherwise indicated in the notes and guidance, CABs shall draft all sections in the reporting template at the Announcement Comment Draft Report stage. CABs shall update each section as necessary as per the Fisheries Certification Process at each subsequent reporting stage. CABs shall complete all sections at the Final Draft Report stage. CABs shall finalise each section at the Public Certification Report stage as per FCP v2.3 Section 7.24.

*CABs shall inform the reader why some sections in the report are blank and when they will be populated.*

*If an interpretation is used, CABs shall cite it in the relevant section of the report and include a hyperlink to the interpretation.*

*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 main strengths and weaknesses of the client’s operation.*
* For the Announcement Comment Draft Report (ACDR) only (delete this in subsequent reports): the CAB shall include an explanation to stakeholders of the purpose of the ACDR, that it contains indicative scoring and is not the final scoring. CABs may use the example text below:

*“The Announcement Comment Draft Report (ACDR) provides indicative scoring and rationales and identifies where more information is needed. The objective of the ACDR is to facilitate stakeholder input into the assessment and to ensure the fishery client, assessment team and stakeholders are better informed and prepared for the site visit. Stakeholders are encouraged to review the ACDR and to provide information to the assessment team and raise any concerns with the indicative scoring. The draft scoring ranges in the ACDR are based on a review of information and documents submitted by the fishery client. Based on the information provided by stakeholder, the site visit and further information gathering, the draft scoring ranges will become scores. These scores may be higher or lower than the draft scoring ranges. The scores will be published in the next assessment report (the Public Comment Draft Report)”.*

*The CAB shall include a summary of the information gaps and specifically request that stakeholders provide information related to these gaps if they are able to do so.*

* For the ACDR only: A summary of key issues for further investigation as indicated by any information gaps.
* From Public Comment Draft Report reporting stage only - the draft determination / determination reached with supporting justification.

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section(s) 7.10, 7.16, 7.21*

## Report details

### Authorship and peer review details

Peer reviewer information to be completed at Public Comment Draft Report stage

Table 1: Authorship and assessment team

| **Role** | **Name** | **Area of expertise** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Team leader |  | *E.g. Principle 1/ Principle 2/ Principle 3*  *Traceability*  *RBF* |
| Team members  *(Insert and delete rows as appropriate)* |  |  |
|  |  |

Table 2: Peer reviewers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Peer reviewers *(Insert and delete rows as appropriate)* |  |
|  |

### Version details

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

Table 3: Fisheries program documents versions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document/Assessment Tree** | **Version number/Type** |
| MSC Fisheries Certification Process | Version 2*.3* |
| MSC Fisheries Standard | Version 2*.01* |
| Assessment tree | *Default / Enhanced Bivalve / Salmon / Introduced species / Other* |
| MSC General Certification Requirements | Version 2*.5* |
| MSC Reporting Template | Version 1.3 |

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

## Unit(s) of Assessment

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

*The report shall include any changes to the Unit(s) of Assessment since the previous assessment (e.g. through a scope extension).*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.4 and 7.5*

Table 4: 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 |  |
| **UoA X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| Other eligible fishers |  |
| **UoA X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| Other eligible fishers |  |

## Unit(s) of Certification

*If there are changes to the proposed Unit(s) of Certification (UoC), the CAB shall include in the report a justification.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.5*

Table 5: Unit(s) of Certification (UoC)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UoC X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| **UoC X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |
| **UoC X** | **Description** |
| Target Stock |  |
| Geographical area |  |
| Fishing gear type(s) and, if relevant, vessel type(s) |  |
| Client group |  |

## Confirmation of scope

*The CAB shall include in the report a statement of the CAB’s determination that the fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard.*

*For enhanced fisheries only, the CAB shall include in the report:*

* *A statement describing how the fishery meets the scope criteria for enhanced fisheries, and*
* *The assessment processes, analyses and outcomes on which the CAB based its justification to determine that the fishery is within scope.*

*Where the fishery includes an introduced species, the CAB shall include in the report:*

* *A statement describing how the fishery meets the scope criteria for Introduced Species Based Fisheries (ISBF).*
* *The assessment processes, analyses and outcomes on which the CAB based its justification to determine that the fishery is within scope.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.4, MSC Scope Declaration Template*

## Overview of the fishery

*The CAB shall include in the report an overview of the fishery, including:*

* *Who – information about the fishery client/client group*
* *Where – description of where the fishery operates, including maps, and when the fishery operates*
* *How – Number of vessels, and their size; gear description and deployment (any technical measures on the gear or deployment to avoid bycatch)*
* *Monitoring of the fishery – details of fisheries monitoring and surveillance, including (if relevant) methods for the independent observation of catches*

## Assessment results overview

### Determination

To be drafted at Public Comment Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report a formal statement as to the certification determination recommendation reached by the assessment team on whether the fishery should be certified.*

*The CAB shall include in the report a formal statement as to the certification action taken by the CAB’s official decision-maker in response to the determination recommendation.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.20.3.i and Section 7.21,*

### Principle level scores

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report the scores for each of the three MSC principles in the table below.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.15*

Table 6: Principle level scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Principle** | **UoA 1** | **UoA 2** | **UoA 3** | **UoA 4** |
| Principle 1: Target species |  |  |  |  |
| Principle 2: Ecosystem impacts |  |  |  |  |
| Principle 3: Management system |  |  |  |  |

### Summary of Performance Indicator level scores

*The CAB shall include in the report a completed copy of the Fishery Assessment Scoring Worksheet.*

*The CAB shall confirm whether the MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox was used for the scoring of any PI/SI.*

For the Announcement Comment Draft Report (ACDR) only, the CAB shall include a statement that the table shows draft scoring ranges which may change during the assessment process.

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.15 and 7.7.3*

### Summary of conditions

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report a table summarising conditions raised in this assessment. Details of the conditions shall be provided in the appendices. If no conditions are required, the CAB shall include a statement confirming this.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.16*

Table 7: Summary of conditions

| **Condition number** | **Condition** | **PI** | **Deadline** | **Exceptional circum-stances?** | **Carried over from previous certificate?** | **Related to previous condition?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
|  |  |  |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
|  |  |  |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |

#### Recommendations (Optional)

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

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

## Traceability and eligibility

### Eligibility date

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report the eligibility date and the justification for selecting this date, including consideration of whether the traceability and segregation systems in the fishery are appropriately implemented.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.18*

### Traceability - initial review and planning at announcement

To be included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only. Not relevant for re-assessment.

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.17.1 and 7.17.6 a-d*

Table 8: Traceability initial planning

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed point of change of ownership of product to any party not covered by the fishery certificate |
| *Confirm the proposed first sale to any party not covered by the fishery certificate 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 certificate, and when it is proposed to happen.* |
| The plan for reviewing traceability at the site visit |
| *Outline of information needed to be obtained and if known the people able to provide this.* |

### Traceability within the fishery

To be drafted for the Client and Peer Review Draft Report

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.17.1 and 7.17.6 a-d*

Table 9: Traceability within the fishery

|  |
| --- |
| Statement on fishery’s ability to track and trace to each Unit of Certification |
| Systems allow the fishery client to track to trace any fish or fish products sold as MSC certified back to the individual UoC.  Systems **do not** allow the fishery client to track and trace any fish or fish products sold as MSC certified back to the individual UoC.  *(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 **start of the CoC** if relevant.    *An illustration of movement of product between landing and start of CoC. Include when any of the following is happening: Transport, Storage, Sorting/ Grading, Packing, Auction.* |
| *Complete this section if 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 CoC describe:   * Process of segregating to each Unit of Certification * Key data elements (i.e. the data or documents to identify the UoC such as species, catch area, gear) |
| *Detail for all stages covered by the fishery certificate. 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 and will be sold as certified. Confirm how the presence of IPI impacts segregating to UoC and managing key UoC 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 UoC |
| *For example: Relevant monitoring, oversight or regulatory controls which assure the traceability to each individual UoC; references to regulation, observer coverage, that can support these systems.* |

### Traceability risks and mitigations

To be initially drafted for the Announcement Comment Draft Report but updated with more information for the Client and Peer Review Draft Report

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.5.10 a-d, 7.17.1.3*

Table 10: 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 assessment report (such as table 9 for segregation or in section 5 MSC Fisheries Standard – Principle 3 – Effective management for regulatory frameworks), cross reference as needed.* |
| --- | --- |
| Will the fishery use gears that are not part of the UoC?  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 UoC also fish outside the UoC geographic area?  If Yes, include in the description:   * If this may occur on the same trip; * How any risks are mitigated. |  |
| Do vessels from outside the UoC and/or client group ever fish on the same stock? |  |
| Do the fishery client members ever handle certified and non-certified products during any of the activities covered by the fishery certificate?  This refers to both at-sea activities and on-land activities and should reflect those listed in product movement in Table 9. It includes:   * Translocation * Transhipment * Transport * Storage * Processing * Sorting/ grading * Packing * Landing * Auction |  |
| Does transhipment occur within the fishery?  If yes, include in the description:   * What is the type of transhipment in-port/ high seas/ other * What are the systems used to track and trace to UoC   For high seas transhipment include in the description how the systems to track and trace to the UoC:   * Are verified independently of the fishery client * Cover all fishing and receiving vessels involved in transhipment * Apply to all transhipment events   If any of these 3 criteria above are not met for high seas transhipment CoC certification is required for both the fishing and receiving vessels involved in this transhipment. |  |
| Are trading agents to be covered within the fishery certificate?  If yes, include in the description:   * How information on UoC is passed through |  |
| Are there any other risks of mixing or substitution between certified and non-certified fish?  If No, refer to the section describing product movement and segregation which demonstrates this. |  |
| Are there any other risks of mixing between different Units of Certification?  If Yes, include in the description:   * link to any relevant variations relating to this   If No, refer to the section describing product movement and segregation which demonstrates this. |  |

### Eligibility to enter further chains of custody

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB may copy this table into the Fishery Certificate Statement as this information is relevant to the first buyer.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.8.2.m, 7.17.1.3 and 7.17.6.f-m*

Table 11: Eligibility to enter Chain of Custody

|  |
| --- |
| Determination on whether fish and fish products from the certified UoC(s) can go onto be sold as certified. Including:   * *Whether the ability for fish and fish products to be sold as certified is conditional upon CoC certification;* * *If traceability systems still need to be established prior to either CoC certification OR revised fishery determination.* |
| *Delete as appropriate:*   * It is determined that fish and fish products from the certified Units of Certification can go onto be sold as certified * It is determined that fish and fish products from the certified Units of Certification cannot go on to be sold as certified or bear the MSC label   *The latter would be selected where systems need to be established within the fishery. Please select the latter and then specify if product eligibility is conditional to the fishery to pass Chain of Custody Certification. Note that a Chain of Custody audit can only be successfully completed once systems are in place.* |
| The point of change of ownership of product to any party not covered by the fishery certificate and detail of any trading between client group members prior to this |
|  |
| The point from which subsequent Chain of Custody (CoC) is required  *The latest this can happen is the point of change of ownership of fish or fish product to any party not covered by the fishery certificate (reference section above) but it may happen sooner in which case describe as per the product flow (in table 9). Note the requirement for when CoC is required to start on High Seas Transhipment.* |
|  |
| The entities, or categories of entities, at the point of landing and/or sale required to have separate CoC including any auctions, selling agents, offloaders or storage facilities and so not covered in the above tables 9 and 10. |
|  |
| A list of entities, or categories of entities, eligible to access the certificate and sell product as certified including:   * *Confirm if all vessels within the geographic area and gear of the UoC are eligible to sell fish and fish products as certified* * *Any other limits to vessel types, ownership, client group membership* * *Include any trading agents used* |
|  |
| Points of landing, auctions or other transfer which may be used for the sale of fish from the certified fishery into further chains of custody, either:   * *The geographic region where all landing points are possible, or* * *Named landing points, auctions or other transfer sites if there are limits* |
|  |
| Any specific eligibility criteria for product to be sold as certified, or where to find this information where relevant, including:   * *Product form* * *Trip type (e.g. includes outside EEZ),* * *Need for Chain of Custody* * *Need for trading through client group members* |
| *Where there is nothing additional to the UoC, state N/A.* |
| How fish or fish products can be identified or can be confirmed as certified at the point it enters certified CoC, including:   * *How information on gear, species, stock, area, vessel (where relevant) client group member (where relevant) is provided* * *Any segregation to UoC required of first buyers (e.g. sort batches by species)* * *Where relevant how any specific eligibility criteria can be confirmed by the first buyer (as per section above)* |
|  |
| How IPI is identified to first buyers at the point it enters certified CoC where relevant |
|  |

### Eligibility of Inseparable or Practicably Inseparable (IPI) stock(s) to enter further chains of custody

*Where IPI stock(s) are present, the CAB shall include in the report an evaluation of the species, stock, proportion and weight of the catch of IPI stock(s) and their eligibility to enter further chains of custody. The CAB shall include in the report a justification of how requirements in FCP Annex PA, or Fisheries Standard v3.0 Section SC5 for salmon fisheries, are met for any catches of IPI stock(s).*

*The CAB may copy the table from the IPI announcement template in here.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.5.12*

## Scoring

### Principle 1

#### Principle 1 background

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

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

#### Catch data

*The CAB shall include in the report any relevant catch data for the Unit of Assessment.*

#### Principle 1 catch

*The CAB shall 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 12: 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 UoC (most recent year) | Year (YYYY) | Amount (n, unit) |
| Total catch by UoC (second most recent year) | Year (YYYY) | Amount (n, unit) |

#### Principle 1 species

*The CAB shall list the proposed Principle 1 species. The CAB should explain how FCP v2.3 7.5.2 has been applied.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.5.2*

#### Principle 1 Performance Indicator scores and rationales

*The CAB shall include, in the Performance Indicator scoring tables in the report, sufficient rationale which makes direct reference to every scoring issue and whether it is fully met at each Scoring Guidepost (SG).*

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

*If a condition is required, the CAB shall assign a condition number for cross-references in assessment reports.*

*If Section SE (Alternative P1 scoring for stocks managed by RFMOs) applies to the fishery in assessment, the CAB shall include in the report how the requirements were applied, and score PI 1.2.2 using the scoring table in Section SE 2.2. (Fisheries Standard v3.0/MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Tool D)*

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

*Additional scoring tables shall be used and clearly marked for modified assessment trees, e.g. PI 2.4.2 - Modified.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.15, MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Annex D*

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 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 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 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).* | | |
| **b** | **Harvest strategy evaluation** | | | | |
| Guide post | | The harvest strategy is **likely** to work based on prior experience or plausible argument. | The harvest strategy may not have been fully **tested** but evidence exists that it is achieving its objectives. | The performance of the harvest strategy has been **fully evaluated** and evidence exists to show that it is achieving its objectives 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 | | It is **likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | It is **highly likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **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 the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of unwanted catch of the target stock. | There is a **regular** review 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. | There is a **biennial** review 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

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

| **PI 1.2.2** | | | **There are well-defined and effective harvest control rules (HCRs) in place** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **HCRs design and application** | | | |
| Guide post | **Generally understood** HCRs are in place **or available** that are **expected** to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached. | **Well defined** HCRs are **in place** that **ensure** that the exploitation rate is reduced as the PRI is approached, 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** | **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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 one indicator** is available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest control rule. | Stock abundance and UoA removals are **regularly monitored at a level of accuracy and coverage consistent with the harvest control rule**, and **one or more indicators** are available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest control rule. | **All information** required by the harvest control rule 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 stock. |  |
| Met? | |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 control rule. | 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 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. 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

### Principle 2

#### Principle 2 background

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

*The CAB shall 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 Primary, Secondary 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 shall contain a summary of how this has been addressed, i.e. which other MSC UoAs/fisheries and how the cumulative impacts were considered.*

*Scoring elements*

*The CAB shall include in the background the information justifying how scoring elements were assigned to components within Principle 2 of the MSC Fisheries Standard (Fisheries Standard v2.01 Section SA3.1, SA3.4.2-SA3.4.5, SA3.7.1). The team may amend the table below to present this information. The CAB shall include in the report the catch and UoA related mortality of all main Primary, main Secondary and ETP 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 v2.01*

Table 13: Scoring elements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component | Scoring elements | Designation | Data-deficient |
| e.g. P1, Primary, Secondary, ETP, Habitats, Ecosystems | e.g. species or stock (SA 3.1.1.1) | Main or Minor |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Principle 2 Performance Indicator scores and rationales

*The CAB shall include, in the Performance Indicator scoring tables in the report, sufficient rationale which makes direct reference to every scoring issue and whether it is fully met at each Scoring Guidepost (SG).*

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

###### PI 2.1.1 – Primary species outcome

| **PI 2.1.1** | | **The UoA aims to maintain primary species above the point where recruitment would be impaired (PRI) and does not hinder recovery of primary species if they are below the PRI** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Main primary species stock status** | | | |
| Guide post | Main primary species are **likely** to be above the PRI.  OR  If the species is below the PRI, the UoA has measures in place that are **expected** to ensure that the UoA does not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | Main primary species are **highly likely** to be above the PRI.  OR  If the species is below the PRI, there is either **evidence of recovery** or a demonstrably effective strategy in place **between all MSC UoAs which categorise this species as main**, to ensure that they collectively do not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that main primary species are above the PRI **and are** fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | *The Team may wish to use the following table when there is more than 1 scoring element.*  Table 14: Scoring elements   | **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** | **Main primary species stock status** | | | |
| Guide post |  |  | **Minor** primary species are **highly likely** to be above the PRI.  or  If below the PRI, there is evidence that the UoA does not hinder the recovery and rebuilding of **minor** primary species. |
| Met? |  |  | Met? |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.1.2 – Primary species management strategy

| **PI 2.1.2** | | | **There is a strategy in place that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of primary species, and the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of unwanted catch** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 primary species at/to levels which are likely to be above the PRI. | 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 primary species at/to levels which are highly likely to be above the PRI. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA for managing main and minor primary species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **b** | **Management strategy evaluation** | | | | |
| Guide post | | The measures are considered **likely** to work, based on plausible argument (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar fisheries/species). | There is some **objective basis for confidence** that the measures/partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or species involved. | **Testing** supports **high confidence** that the partial strategy/strategy will work, based on information directly about the fishery and/or species 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 overall objective as set out in scoring issue (a).** |
| Met? | |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **d** | **Shark finning** | | | | |
| Guide post | | It is **likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | It is **highly likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **e** | **Review of alternative measures** | | | | |
| Guide post | | There is a review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of unwanted catch of main primary species. | There is a **regular** review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of unwanted catch of main primary species and they are implemented as appropriate. | There is a **biennial** review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of unwanted catch of all primary species, and they are implemented, as appropriate. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.1.3 – Primary species information

| **PI 2.1.3** | | | **Information on the nature and extent of primary species is adequate to determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage primary species** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Information adequacy for assessment of impact on main primary species** | | | |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is **adequate to estimate** the impact of the UoA on the main primary species with respect to status.  OR  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.1.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is adequate to estimate productivity and susceptibility attributes for main primary species. | Some quantitative information is available and is **adequate to assess** the impact of the UoA on the main primary species with respect to status.  OR  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.1.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is adequate to assess productivity and susceptibility attributes for main primary species. | Quantitative information is available and is **adequate to assess with a high degree of certainty** the impact of the UoA on main primary species with respect to status. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impact on minor primary species** | | | | |
| Guide post | |  |  | Some quantitative information is adequate to estimate the impact of the UoA on minor primary 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** primary species. | Information is adequate to support a **partial strategy** to manage **main** primary species. | Information is adequate to support a **strategy** to manage **all** primary 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.2.1 – Secondary species outcome

| **PI 2.2.1** | | **The UoA aims to maintain secondary species above a biologically based limit and does not hinder recovery of secondary species if they are below a biological based limit** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Direct effects** | | | |
| Guide  post | Main secondary species are **likely** to be above biologically based limits.  OR  If below biologically based limits, there are **measures** in place expected to ensure that the UoA does not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | Main secondary species are **highly likely** to be above biologically based limits.  OR  If below biologically based limits, there is either **evidence of recovery or a demonstrably effective partial strategy** in place such that the UoA does not hinder recovery and rebuilding.  AND  Where catches of a main secondary species outside of biological limits are **considerable**, there is either **evidence of recovery** or a, **demonstrably effective strategy in place between those MSC UoAs that have considerable catches of the species**, to ensure that they collectively do not hinder recovery and rebuilding. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that main secondary species are above biologically based limits. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **b** | **Minor secondary species stock status** | | | |
| Guide  post |  |  | Minor secondary species are highly likely to be above biologically based limits.  OR  If below biologically based limits’, there is evidence that the UoA does not hinder the recovery and rebuilding of secondary species |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.2.2 – Secondary species management strategy

| **PI 2.2.2** | | | **There is a strategy in place for managing secondary species that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of secondary species and the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of unwanted catch.** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Management strategy in place** | | | |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place, if necessary, which are expected to maintain or not hinder rebuilding of main secondary species at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure that the UoA does not hinder their recovery. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, if necessary, for the UoA that is expected to maintain or not hinder rebuilding of main secondary species at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure that the UoA does not hinder their recovery. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA for managing main and minor secondary species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **b** | **Management strategy evaluation** | | | | |
| Guide post | | The measures are considered **likely** to work, based on plausible argument (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar UoAs/species). | There is some **objective basis for confidence** that the measures/partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the UoA and/or species involved. | **Testing** supports **high confidence** that the partial strategy/strategy will work, based on information directly about the UoA and/or species 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** | **Shark finning** | | | | |
| Guide post | | It is **likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | It is **highly likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **e** | **Review of alternative measures to minimise mortality of unwanted catch** | | | | |
| Guide post | | There is a review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted** catch of main secondary species. | There is a **regular** review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted** catch of main secondary species and they are implemented as appropriate. | There is a **biennial** review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of **unwanted** catch of all secondary species, and they are implemented, as appropriate. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.2.3 – Secondary species information

| **PI 2.2.3** | | | **Information on the nature and amount of secondary species taken is adequate to determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage secondary species** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts on main secondary species** | | | |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is **adequate to estimate** the impact of the UoA on the main secondary species with respect to status.  OR  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.2.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is adequate to estimate productivity and susceptibility attributes for main secondary species. | Some quantitative information is available and **adequate to assess** the impact of the UoA on main secondary species with respect to status.  OR  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.2.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is adequate to assess productivity and susceptibility attributes for main secondary species. | Quantitative information is available and **adequate to assess with a high degree of certainty** the impact of the UoA on main secondary species with respect to status. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **b** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts on minor secondary species** | | | | |
| Guide post | |  |  | Some quantitative information is adequate to estimate the impact of the UoA on minor secondary 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** secondary species. | Information is adequate to support a **partial strategy** to manage **main** secondary species. | Information is adequate to support a **strategy** to manage **all** secondary 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.3.1 – ETP species outcome

| **PI 2.3.1** | | | **The UoA meets national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species**  **The UoA does not hinder recovery of ETP species** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Effects of the UoA on population/stock within national or international limits, where applicable** | | | |
| Guide post | Where national and/or international requirements set limits for ETP species, the **effects of the UoA** on the population/ stock are known and **likely** to be within these limits. | Where national and/or international requirements set limits for ETP species, the **combined effects of the MSC UoAs** on the population /stock are known and **highly likely** to be within these limits. | Where national and/or international requirements set limits for ETP species, there is a **high degree of certainty that the combined effects of the MSC UoAs** are within these limits. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | | *Scoring issue need not be scored if there are no national or international requirements that set limits for ETP species.* | | |
| **b** | **Direct effects** | | | | |
| Guide post | | Known direct effects of the UoA are likely to not **hinder recovery** of ETP species. | Direct effects of the UoA are **highly likely** to not **hinder recovery** of ETP species. | There is a **high degree of confidence** that there are no **significant detrimental direct effects** of the UoA on ETP species. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **c** | **Indirect effects** | | | | |
| Guide post | |  | Indirect effects have been considered for the UoA and are thought to be **highly likely** to not create unacceptable impacts. | There is a **high degree of confidence** that there are no **significant detrimental indirect effects** of the UoA on ETP species. |
| Met? | |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.3.2 – ETP species management strategy

| **PI 2.3.2** | | | **The UoA has in place precautionary management strategies designed to:**  **• Meet national and international requirements.**  **• Ensure the UoA does not hinder recovery of ETP species.**  **Also, the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of ETP species** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Management strategy in place (national and international requirements)** | | | |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place that minimise the UoA-related mortality of ETP species, and are expected to be **highly likely to achieve** national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species. | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the UoA’s impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality, which is designed to be **highly likely to achieve** national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place for managing the UoA’s impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality, which is designed to **achieve above** national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | | *Scoring issue need not be scored if requirements for protection or rebuilding are provided through national ETP legislation or international agreements.* | | |
| **b** | **Management strategy in place (alternative)** | | | | |
| Guide post | | There are **measures** in place that are expected to ensure the UoA does not hinder the recovery of ETP species. | There is a **strategy** in place that is expected to ensure the UoA does not hinder the recovery of ETP species. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place for managing ETP species, to ensure the UoA does not hinder the recovery of ETP species. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | | *Scoring issue need not be scored if requirements for protection or rebuilding are provided through national ETP legislation or international agreements.* | | |
| **c** | **Management strategy evaluation** | | | | |
| Guide post | | The measures are **considered likely** to work, based on **plausible argument** (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar fisheries/species). | There is an **objective basis for confidence** that the measures/strategy will work, based on **information** directly about the fishery and/or the species involved. | The strategy/comprehensive strategy is mainly based on information directly about the fishery and/or species involved, and a **quantitative analysis** supports **high confidence** that the strategy will work. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **d** | **Management strategy implementation** | | | | |
| Guide post | |  | There is some **evidence** that the measures/strategy is being implemented successfully. | There is **clear evidence** that the strategy/comprehensive strategy is being implemented successfully and **is achieving its objective as set out in scoring issue (a) or (b).** |
| Met? | |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **e** | **Review of alternative measures to minimise mortality of ETP species** | | | | |
| Guide post | | There is a review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of ETP species. | There is a **regular** review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of ETP species and they are implemented as appropriate. | There is a **biennial** review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality ETP species, and they are implemented, as appropriate. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.3.3 – ETP species information

| **PI 2.3.3** | | | **Relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA impacts on ETP species, including:**   * **Information for the development of the management strategy;** * **Information to assess the effectiveness of the management strategy; and** * **Information to determine the outcome status of ETP species** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** | | | |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is **adequate to estimate** the UoA related mortality on ETP species.  OR  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.3.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is **adequate to estimate productivity and susceptibility attributes** for ETP species. | Some quantitative information is **adequate to assess** the UoA related mortality and impact and to determine whether the UoA may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species.  OR  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.3.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is **adequate to assess productivity and susceptibility** **attributes** for ETP species. | Quantitative information is available to assess with a high degree of certainty the **magnitude of UoA-related impacts, mortalities and injuries and the consequences for the status** of ETP species. |
| 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 ETP species. | Information is adequate to measure trends and support a **strategy** to manage impacts on ETP species. | Information is adequate to support a **comprehensive strategy** to manage impacts, minimise mortality and injury of ETP species, and evaluate with a **high degree of certainty** whether a strategy is achieving its objectives. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.4.1 – Habitats outcome

| **PI 2.4.1** | | | **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(s) responsible for fisheries management in the area(s) where the UoA operates** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Commonly encountered habitat status** | | | |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the commonly encountered habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the commonly encountered 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 the commonly encountered habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **b** | **VME habitat status** | | | | |
| Guide post | | The UoA is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the VME habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the VME 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 the VME 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 VMEs.* | | |
| **c** | | **Minor habitat status** | | | |
| Guide post |  |  | There is **evidence** that the UoA is highly unlikely to reduce structure and function of the minor habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.4.2 – Habitats management strategy

| **PI 2.4.2** | | | **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 80 level of performance. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, if necessary, that is expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance 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 evaluation** | | | | |
| Guide post | | The measures are **considered likely** to work, based on plausible argument (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar UoAs/habitats). | There is some **objective basis for confidence** that the measures/partial strategy will work, based on **information directly about the UoA and/or habitats** involved. | **Testing** supports **high confidence** that the partial strategy/strategy will work, based on **information directly about the UoA and/or habitats** involved. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **c** | **Management strategy implementation** | | | | |
| Guide post | |  | There is **some quantitative evidence** that the measures/partial strategy is being implemented successfully. | There is **clear quantitative evidence** that the partial strategy/strategy is being implemented successfully and is achieving its objective, as outlined in scoring issue (a). |
| Met? | |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **d** | **Compliance with management requirements and other MSC UoAs’/non-MSC fisheries’ measures to protect VMEs** | | | | |
| Guide post | | There is **qualitative evidence** that the UoA complies with its management requirements to protect VMEs. | There is **some quantitative evidence** that the UoA complies with both its management requirements and with protection measures afforded to VMEs by other MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries, where relevant. | There is **clear quantitative evidence** that the UoA complies with both its management requirements and with protection measures afforded to VMEs by other MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries, where relevant. |
| Met? | | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.4.3 – Habitats information

| **PI 2.4.3** | | | **Information is adequate to determine the risk posed to the habitat by the UoA 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 main habitats are **broadly understood.**  OR  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is adequate to estimate the types and distribution of the main habitats. | The nature, distribution and **vulnerability** of the main habitats in the UoA area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the UoA.  OR  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to estimate the types and distribution of the main habitats. | The distribution of all 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 nature of the main impacts of gear use on the main habitats, including spatial overlap of habitat with fishing gear.  OR  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is adequate to estimate the consequence and spatial attributes of the main habitats. | Information is adequate to allow for identification of the main impacts of the UoA on the main habitats, and there is reliable information on the spatial extent of interaction and on the timing and location of use of the fishing gear.  OR  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to estimate the consequence and spatial attributes of the main habitats. | The physical impacts of the gear on all habitats have been quantified fully. |
| 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 the main habitats. | Changes in all habitat distributions over time are measured. |
| Met? | |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.5.1 – Ecosystem outcome

| **PI 2.5.1** | | **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** / **Partial** | **Yes / No** / **Partial** | **Yes / No** / **Partial** |
| Rationale | | *List/detail what “key ecosystem elements” are being assessed (SA3.14.3-SA3.14.4, GSA3.14.4).* | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.5.2 – Ecosystem management strategy

| **PI 2.5.2** | | **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 take into account the **potential impacts** of the UoA on key elements of the ecosystem. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, if necessary, which takes into account **available information and is expected to restrain impacts** of the UoA on the ecosystem so as to achieve the Ecosystem Outcome 80 level of performance. | There is a **strategy** that consists of a **plan**, in place which contains 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 evaluation** | | | |
| Guide post | The **measures** are considered likely to work, based on plausible argument (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar UoAs/ ecosystems). | There is **some objective basis for confidence** that the measures/ partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the UoA and/or the ecosystem involved. | **Testing** supports **high confidence** that the partial strategy/ strategy will work, 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 | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.5.3 – Ecosystem information

| **PI 2.5.3** | | **There is adequate knowledge of the impacts of the UoA 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 on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, but **have not been investigated** in detail. | Main impacts of the UoA on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, and **some have been investigated in detail.** | Main interactions between the UoA and these ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, and **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 (i.e. P1 target species, primary, secondary and ETP species and Habitats) in the ecosystem are **known**. | The impacts of the UoA on P1 target species, primary, secondary and ETP species and Habitats 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 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 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

### Principle 3

#### Principle 3 background

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

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

*Reference(s): Fisheries Standard v2.01*

#### Principle 3 Performance Indicator scores and rationales

*The CAB shall include, in the Performance Indicator scoring tables in the report, sufficient rationale which makes direct reference to every scoring issue and whether it is fully met at each Scoring Guidepost (SG).*

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

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

| **PI 3.1.1** | | **The management system exists within an appropriate 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** which delivers 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 that 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

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

| **PI 3.2.3** | | **Monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms ensure the management measures in the fishery are enforced and complied with** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **MCS system** | | | |
| Guide post | Monitoring, control and surveillance **mechanisms** exist, and are implemented in the fishery and there is a reasonable expectation that they are effective. | A monitoring, control and surveillance **system** has been implemented in the fishery and has demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. | A **comprehensive** monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery and has demonstrated a consistent ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **b** | **Sanctions** | | | |
| Guide post | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied. | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, **are consistently applied** and thought to provide effective deterrence. | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, are consistently applied and **demonstrably** provide effective deterrence. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **c** | **Compliance** | | | |
| Guide post | Fishers are **generally thought** to comply with the management system for the fishery under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery. | **Some evidence exists** to demonstrate fishers comply with the management system under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery. | There is a **high degree of confidence** that fishers comply with the management system under assessment, including, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **d** | **Systematic non-compliance** | | | |
| Guide post |  | There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

### Additional scoring tables – delete if not applicable

*The CAB shall include in the report scoring tables for enhanced bivalve fisheries or salmon fisheries where relevant. The CAB shall copy scoring tables below into Sections 9.1–9.3 to replace default scoring tables and delete this section.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 (e.g. general experience, theory, or comparison with similar fisheries/species). | 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.6.1 – Translocation outcome

| **PI 2.6.1** | | **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 (species not already established in the ecosystem) 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.6.2 – Translocation management

| **PI 2.6.2** | | **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 2.6.1). | 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 2.6.1). | 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 (e.g. general experience, theory, or comparison with similar fisheries/species). | 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.6.3 – Translocation information

| **PI 2.6.3** | | **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 2.6.2). | 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

#### Salmon Fisheries – delete if not applicable

###### PI 1.1.1 – Stock status

| **PI 1.1.1** | | **The stock management unit (SMU) is at a level which maintains high production and has a low probability of falling below its limit reference point (LRP)** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | | **SG 80** | | **SG 100** | |
| **a** | **Stock status** | | | | | | |
| Guide post | It is **likely** that the SMU is above the limit reference point (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 target reference point (TRP, e.g. target escapement goal or target harvest rate)** | | | | | | |
| 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 target reference point, 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding

| **PI 1.1.2** | | **Where the stock management unit (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**. 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 which does not exceed **one generation time** for 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 measuresthat 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 measuresthat 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 may not have been fully **tested** but evidence exists that it is achieving its objectives. | The performance of the harvest strategy has been **fully evaluated** and evidence exists to show that it is achieving its objectives 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** | **Shark finning** | | | |
| Guide post | It is **likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | It is **highly likely** that shark finning is not taking place. | There is a **high degree of certainty** that shark finning is not taking place. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **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 the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of unwanted catch of the target stock. | There is a **regular** review 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. | There is a **biennial** review 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

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

| **PI 1.2.2** | | **There are well defined and effective harvest control rules (HCRs) in place** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **HCRs design and application** | | | |
| Guide post | **Generally understood** HCRs are in place **or available** which 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, and 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** | **HCRs 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 population(s). | It is **highly likely** that the HCRs and tools are consistent with maintaining the diversity and productivity of the wild component population(s). | There is a **high degree of certainty** that the HCRs and tools are consistent with maintaining the diversity and productivity of the wild component population(s). |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 SMU structure, SMU production and fleet composition is available to support the harvest strategy. **Indirect or direct information is available on some component populations.** | **Sufficient** relevant information related to SMU structure, SMU production, fleet composition and other data are available to support the harvest strategy, **including harvests and spawning escapements for a representative range of wild component populations.** | A **comprehensive range** of information (on SMU structure, SMU production, fleet composition, SMU abundance, UoA removals and other information such as environmental information), including some that may not be relevant to the current harvest strategy, **is available, including estimates of the impacts of fishery harvests on the SMU and the majority of wild component populations.** |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **b** | **Monitoring** | | | |
| Guide post | SMU wild abundance and UoA removals are monitored and at **least one indicator** is available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest control rule. | SMU wild abundance and UoA removals are **regularly monitored at a level of accuracy and coverage consistent with the harvest control rule**, and **one or more indicators** are available and monitored with sufficient frequency to support the harvest control rule. | **All information** required by the harvest control rule 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 control rule. | 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. 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 indicators selection. | 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 (i.e., those with a higher conservation risk) 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 (i.e., those with a higher conservation risk). |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **g** | **Definition of Stock Management Units (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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 (wild plus enhanced), and hatchery broodstock. | **Sufficient** relevant qualitative and quantitative information is available on the contribution of enhanced fish to the fishery harvest, total escapement (wild plus enhanced) and hatchery broodstock. | A **comprehensive range** of relevant quantitative information is available on the contribution of enhanced fish to the fishery harvest, total escapement (wild plus enhanced) 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.3.1 – ETP species outcome

| **PI 2.3.1** | | **The UoA meets national and international requirements for protection of ETP species**  **The UoA and associated enhancement activities do not hinder recovery of ETP species** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Effects of the UoA on population/stocks within national or international limits, where applicable** | | | |
| Guide post | Where national and international requirements set limits for ETP species, the **effects of the UoA** and associated enhancement activities on the population/stock are known and **likely** to be within these limits. | Where national and/ or international requirements set limits for ETP species, the **combined effects of the MSC UoAs and associated enhancement activities** on the population/stock are known and **highly likely** to be within these limits. | Where national and/ or international requirements set limits for ETP species, there is a **high degree of certainty** that the **combined effects of the MSC UoAs** and associated enhancement activities are within these limits. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | *Scoring issue need not be scored if there are no national or international requirements that set limits for ETP species.* | | |
| **b** | **Direct effects** | | | |
| Guide post | Known direct effects of the UoA including enhancement activities are likely to not **hinder recovery** of ETP species. | Direct effects of the UoA including enhancement activities are **highly likely** to not **hinder recovery** of ETP species. | There is a **high degree of confidence** that there are no **significant detrimental direct effects** of the UoA including enhancement activities on ETP species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **c** | **Indirect effects** | | | |
| Guide post |  | Indirect effects have been considered for the UoA including enhancement activities and are thought to be **highly unlikely** to create unacceptable impacts. | There is a **high degree of confidence** that there are no **significant detrimental indirect effects** of the UoA including enhancement activities on ETP species. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.3.2 – ETP species management strategy

| **PI 2.3.2** | | **The UoA and associated enhancement activities have in place precautionary management strategies designed to:**   * **meet national and international requirements and** * **ensure the UoA does not hinder recovery of ETP species.**   **Also, the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of ETP species.** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Management strategy in place (national and international requirements)** | | | |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place that minimise the UoA related mortality of ETP species due to the UoA including enhancement activities, and are **expected to be highly likely** to achieve national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species. | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the UoA and enhancement activities’ impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality, which is designed to be **highly likely to achieve** national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place for managing the UoA **and enhancement activities’** impact on ETP species, including measures to minimise mortality, which is designed to **achieve above** national and international requirements for the protection of ETP species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | *Scoring issue need not be scored if requirements for protection or rebuilding are provided through national ETP legislation or international agreements.* | | |
| **b** | **Management strategy in place (alternative)** | | | |
| Guide post | There are **measures** in place that are expected to ensure the UoA including enhancement activities do not hinder the recovery of ETP species. | There is a **strategy** in place that is expected to ensure the UoA including enhancement activities do not hinder the recovery of ETP species. | There is a **comprehensive strategy** in place for managing ETP species, to ensure the UoA including enhancement activities do not hinder the recovery of ETP species. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | | *Scoring issue need not be scored if requirements for protection or rebuilding are provided through national ETP legislation or international agreements.* | | |
| **c** | **Management strategy evaluation** | | | |
| Guide post | The measures are **considered likely** to work, based on **plausible argument**  (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar UoA/species). | There is an **objective basis for confidence** that the measures/strategy will work, based on **information**  directly about the UoA and/or the species involved. | The strategy/ comprehensive strategy is mainly based on information directly about the UoA and/or species involved, and a **quantitative analysis** supports **high confidence** that the strategy will work. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **d** | **Management strategy implementation** | | | |
| Guide post |  | There is some **evidence** that the measures/strategy is being implemented successfully. | There is **clear evidence** that the strategy/comprehensive strategy is being implemented successfully and is **achieving its objective as set out in scoring issue (a) or (b)**. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **e** | **Review of alternative measures to minimise mortality of ETP species** | | | |
| Guide post | There is a **review** of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of ETP species. | There is a **regular review** of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA and enhancement related mortality of ETP species and they are implemented as appropriate. | There is a **biennial review** of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA and enhancement related mortality of ETP species, and they are implemented, as appropriate. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.3.3 – ETP species information

| **PI 2.3.3** | | **Relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA and enhancement activities impacts on ETP species, including:**   * **Information for the development of the management strategy;** * **Information to assess the effectiveness of the management strategy; and** * **Information to determine the outcome status of ETP species.** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts** | | | |
| Guide post | Qualitative information is **adequate to estimate** the impact of the UoA and associated enhancement related mortality on ETP species.  **OR**  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.3.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is **adequate to estimate productivity and susceptibility** attributes for ETP species. | Some quantitative information is **adequate to assess** the UoA related mortality and impact and to determine whether the UoA and associated enhancement may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species.  **OR**  **If RBF is used to score PI 2.3.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is **adequate to assess productivity and susceptibility** **attributes** for ETP species. | Quantitative information is available to assess with a high degree of certainty the **magnitude of UoA and associated enhancement related impacts, mortalities and injuries and the consequences for the status** of ETP species. |
| 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 ETP species. | Information is adequate to measure trends and support a **strategy** to manage impacts on ETP species. | Information is adequate to support a **comprehensive strategy** to manage impacts, minimise mortality and injury of ETP species, and evaluate with a **high degree of certainty** whether a strategy is achieving its objectives. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.4.1 – Habitats outcome

| **PI 2.4.1** | | | **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(s) responsible for fisheries management in the area(s) where the UoA operates** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | | **Commonly encountered habitat status** | | | |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the commonly encountered habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the commonly encountered 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 the commonly encountered habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **b** | | **VME habitat status** | | | |
| Guide post | The UoA is **unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the VME habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. | The UoA is **highly unlikely** to reduce structure and function of the VME 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 the VME 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 VMEs.* | | |
| **c** | | **Minor habitat status** | | | |
| Guide post |  |  | There is **evidence** that the UoA is highly unlikely to reduce structure and function of the minor habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? |  |  | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | | |  | | |
| **d** | **Impacts due to enhancement activities within the UoA** | | | | |
| Guidepost | | 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.4.2 – Habitats management strategy

| **PI 2.4.2** | | **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 80 level of performance. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, if necessary, that is expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance or above. | There is a **strategy** in place for managing the impact of all MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries UoA and **associated enhancement activities** on habitats. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **b** | **Management strategy evaluation** | | | |
| Guide post | The measures are **considered likely** to work, based on plausible argument (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar UoAs/ enhancement activities/habitats). | There is some **objective basis for confidence** that the measures/partial strategy will work, based on **information directly about the UoA, enhancement activities and/or habitats** involved. | **Testing** supports **high confidence** that the partial strategy/strategy will work, based on **information directly about the UoA, enhancement activities and/or habitats** involved. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **c** | **Management strategy implementation** | | | |
| Guide post |  | There is **some quantitative evidence** that the measures/partial strategy is being implemented successfully. | There is **clear quantitative evidence** that the partial strategy/strategy is being implemented successfully and is achieving its objective, as outlined in scoring issue (a). |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **d** | **Compliance with management requirements and other MSC UoAs’/non-MSC fisheries’ measures to protect VMEs** | | | |
| Guide post | There is **qualitative evidence** that the UoA complies with its management requirements to protect VMEs. | There is some **quantitative evidence** that the UoA and associated enhancement activities comply with both its management requirements and with protection measures afforded to VMEs by other MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries, where relevant. | There is **clear quantitative evidence** that the UoA and **associated enhancement activities** comply with both its management requirements and with protection measures afforded to VMEs by other MSC UoAs/non-MSC fisheries, where relevant. |
| Met? | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** | **Yes / No / NA** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.4.3 – Habitats information

| **PI 2.4.3** | | **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 main habitats are **broadly understood.**  **OR**  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is adequate to estimate the types and distribution of the main habitats. | The nature, distribution and **vulnerability** of the main habitats in the UoA area are known at a level of detail relevant to the scale and intensity of the UoA.  **OR**  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to estimate the types and distribution of the main habitats. | The distribution of all 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 nature of the main impacts of gear use and enhancement activities on the main habitats, including spatial overlap of habitat with fishing gear.  **OR**  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Qualitative information is adequate to estimate the consequence and spatial attributes of the main habitats. | Information is adequate to allow for identification of the main impacts of the UoA and enhancement activities on the main habitats, and there is reliable information on the spatial extent of interaction and on the timing and location of use of the fishing gear.  **OR**  **If CSA is used to score PI 2.4.1 for the UoA:**  Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to estimate the consequence and spatial attributes of the main habitats. | The physical impacts of the gear and enhancement activities on all habitats have been quantified fully. |
| 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 the main habitats. | Changes in all habitat distributions over time are measured. |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.5.1 – Ecosystem outcome

| **PI 2.5.1** | | **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 a 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 a 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 a 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 a 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 a 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 a serious or irreversible harm. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.5.2 – Ecosystem management

| **PI 2.5.2** | | **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 take into account the **potential impacts** of the UoA on key elements of the ecosystem. | There is a **partial strategy** in place, if necessary, which takes into account **available information and is expected to restrain impacts** of the UoA on the ecosystem so as to achieve the Ecosystem Outcome 80 level of performance. | There is a **strategy** that consists of a **plan** in place, which contains 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 evaluation** | | | |
| Guide post | The **measures** are considered likely to work, based on plausible argument (e.g. general experience, theory or comparison with similar UoA/ ecosystems). | There is **some objective basis for confidence** that the measures/ partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the UoA and/or the ecosystem involved. | **Testing** supports **high confidence** that the partial strategy/ strategy will work, 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 60 level of performance. | 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 80 level of performance. | There is a **comprehensive and fully evaluated** artificial production strategy to verify with certainty that the Ecosystem Outcome 100 level of performance. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### PI 2.5.3 – Ecosystem information

| **PI 2.5.3** | | **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 the UoA impacts** | | | |
| Guide post | Main impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, but **have not been investigated in detail.** | Main impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information and **some have been investigated in detail.** | Main interactions between the UoA and associated enhancement activities and these ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information, and **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 (i.e., P1 target species, primary, secondary, and ETP species and Habitats) in the ecosystem are **known**. | The impacts of the UoA and associated enhancement activities on P1 target, primary, secondary, and ETP species and Habitats 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

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

| **PI 3.2.1** | | **The fishery-specific and associated enhancement management system(s) activities have clear, specific objectives designed to achieve the outcomes expressed by MSC’s 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’s 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’s 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’s 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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** | **Decision-making processes** | | | |
| 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 performance and management action is generally available on request to stakeholders. | **Information on fishery 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 for 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

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

| **PI 3.2.3** | | **Monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms ensure the management measures in the fishery and associated enhancement activities are enforced and complied with** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring issue | | **SG 60** | **SG 80** | **SG 100** |
| **a** | **MCS implementation** | | | |
| Guide post | Monitoring, control and surveillance **mechanisms** exist, and are implemented in the fishery and associated enhancement activities and there is a reasonable expectation that they are effective. | A monitoring, control and surveillance **system** has been implemented in the fishery and associated enhancement activities and has demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. | A **comprehensive** monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery and associated enhancement activities and has demonstrated a consistent ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **b** | **Sanctions** | | | |
| Guide post | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied. | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, **are consistently applied** and thought to provide effective deterrence. | Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, are consistently applied and **demonstrably** provide effective deterrence. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **c** | **Compliance** | | | |
| Guide post | Fishers and hatchery operators are **generally thought** to comply with the management system for the fishery and associated enhancement activities under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery. | **Some evidence exists** to demonstrate fishers and hatchery operators comply with the management system under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery and associated enhancement activities. | There is a **high degree of confidence** that fishers and hatchery operators comply with the management system under assessment, including, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery and associated enhancement activities. |
| Met? | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** | **Yes / No** |
| Rationale | |  | | |
| **d** | **Systematic non-compliance** | | | |
| Guide post |  | There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance. |  |
| Met? |  | **Yes / No** |  |
| Rationale | |  | | |

Draft scoring range and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

###### 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) has in place mechanisms to evaluate **some** parts of the management system. | The fishery and associated enhancement program(s) has in place mechanisms to evaluate **key** parts of the management system. | The fishery and associated enhancement program(s) has 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

### 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 and information gap indicator included in Announcement Comment Draft Report stage only

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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* |

Overall Performance Indicator scores added from Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall Performance Indicator score |  |
| Condition number (if relevant) |  |

## Appendices

### Assessment information

#### Previous assessments – delete if not applicable

*The CAB shall include in the report:*

* *A list of any previous full assessments of the client operations, and provide a link to the fishery page on the Track a Fishery (MSC) website.*

### Evaluation processes and techniques

#### Site visits

*The CAB shall include in the report:*

* *An itinerary of site visit activities with dates.*
* *A description of site visit activities, including any locations that were inspected.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.14*

#### Stakeholder participation

*The CAB shall include in the report:*

* *Details of stakeholders that were interviewed or attended site visits*
* *A description of stakeholder engagement/consultation strategy.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.14*

#### Evaluation techniques

At Announcement Comment Draft report stage, if the use of the RBF is triggered for this assessment, the CAB shall include in the report:

* The plan for RBF activities that the team will undertake at the site visit.
* The justification for using the RBF, which can be copied from previous RBF announcements, and stakeholder comments on its use.
* The RBF stakeholder consultation strategy to ensure effective participation from a range of stakeholders including any participatory tools used.
* The full list of activities and components to be discussed or evaluated in the assessment.

At Client Draft Report stage, if the RBF was used for this assessment, the CAB shall include in the report:

* A summary of the information obtained from the stakeholder meetings including the range of opinions.
* The full list of activities and components that have been discussed or evaluated in the assessment, regardless of the final risk-based outcome.

*The stakeholder input should be reported in the stakeholder input appendix and incorporated in the rationales directly in the scoring tables.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 7.14, FCP v2.2 Annex PF Section PF2.1*

#### Modified assessment tree – delete if not applicable

*For each change to the default assessment tree, the CAB shall include in the report:*

* *New or altered Performance Indicators.*
* *Weights of relative importance assigned to each Performance Indicator.*
* *Justification for each of the changes and weights.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.10.5*

### Peer Review reports

To be drafted at Public Comment Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report unattributed reports of the Peer Reviewers in full using the relevant templates. The CAB shall include in the report explicit responses of the team that include:*

* *Identification of specifically what (if any) changes to scoring, rationales, or conditions have been made; and,*
* *A substantiated justification for not making changes where Peer Reviewers suggest changes, but the team disagrees.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.12*

### Stakeholder input

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall use the ‘MSC Template for Stakeholder Input into Fishery Assessments’ to include all written submissions from stakeholders received during the stakeholder input opportunities (Announcement Comment Draft Report, site visit and Public Comment Draft Report). The team shall respond to all written stakeholder input within the ‘MSC Template for Stakeholder Input into Fishery Assessments’ identifying where changes to scoring, rationales and conditions have been made in response.*

*The CAB shall also use the ‘MSC Template for Stakeholder Input into Fishery Assessments’ to include a summary of verbal submissions made by stakeholders during the site visits that are likely to cause a material difference to the outcome of the assessment and responses from the team as required by FCP 2.3/3.0 7.20.6.c and 7.20.7.b.*

*The CAB may use the ‘Supporting Information’ section of the template (Section 10.14) to include in the report any key information referenced by stakeholders that is not published or available online.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Sections 4.2, 7.20.6 and 7.20.7.b.*

### Conditions – delete if not applicable

#### Summary of conditions closed under previous certificate

*If the assessment is a reassessment, the CAB shall include a summary of conditions that were closed during the previous certificate.*

#### Open conditions at reassessment or transition assessment announcement – delete if not applicable

*The CAB shall complete this section if:*

* *The assessment is a reassessment or transition assessment, and*
* *There are open conditions when the reassessment or transition assessment is announced.*

*The CAB shall identify conditions that are open at the time of the reassessment or transition assessment announcement, conditions that will be closed during the reassessment or transition assessment including an outline of how and when the condition will be closed, and conditions that are being carried over into the next certificate.*

*The CAB shall confirm the status of progress for each open condition. For the ACDR the CAB shall base this on the most recent surveillance audit. For the PCDR the CAB shall base this on the site visit.*

*The CAB shall include details regarding the closing of conditions during the reassessment or transition assessment following Section 5.2 from the MSC Surveillance Reporting Template.*

*The CAB shall only include information on conditions that are being carried over in the ACDR. In the Client and Peer Review Draft Report and subsequent reports the CAB shall incorporate all conditions that are being carried over into Section 8.5.2.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.30.5, Section 7.31.5.*

Table 15: Open Condition X *(use existing numbering)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| Score | *State score for Performance Indicator.* |
| Justification | *Cross reference to page number containing scoring template table or copy justification text here.* |
| Condition | *State condition.* |
| Condition start | *State when the condition was set.*  *The CAB shall report the ‘condition start’ as both the assessment/audit process during which the condition was set (e.g., initial assessment, 3rd surveillance audit, scope extension etc.), and the date (YYYY) the condition was set. The CAB should consider the date a condition is set as the date the final assessment/audit report was published – this depends on assessment/audit process during which the condition was set. If the condition was set during a full assessment the start date of the condition is the date the Public Certification Report was published. If the condition was set during a surveillance audit the start date of the condition is the date the Surveillance Report was published, etc. For example, Initial assessment, 2021. The CAB may report the date the condition was set as MM/YYYY.* |
| Condition deadline | *State deadline for the condition.*  *The CAB shall report the “condition deadline” as both the audit process by which the condition will be closed, and the date (YYYY). For example, 4th Surveillance Audit, 2022. The CAB may report the condition deadline as MM/YYYY.* |
| Milestones | *State milestones and resulting scores where applicable.* |
| Progress on Condition | *State a summary of the progress made by the fishery client to address the condition.*  *Identify if milestones have been revised as part of remedial action at previous Surveillance Audits.* |
| Progress status | *Identify whether this condition is ‘on target’, ‘ahead of target’, ‘behind target’, or progress is inadequate, and provide justification as per FCP v2.3 7.29.16.1 and 7.19.16.2.* |
| Carrying over condition | *Is the condition is being carried into the next certificate?*  *YES/NO (delete as applicable)*  *If YES, include a justification for carrying over the condition (FCP v2.3 7.31.5.2.a).* |
| Closing the condition during the reassessment or transition assessment | *Outline how and when the condition will be closed during the reassessment or transition assessment.* |

#### Conditions – delete if not applicable

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall document in the report all conditions in separate tables.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.16, 7.31.5 and 7.31.6*

Table 16: Condition 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Indicator |  |
| Score | *State score for Performance Indicator.* |
| Justification | *Cross reference to page number containing scoring template table or copy justification text here.* |
| Condition | *State condition.* |
| Condition start | *State when the condition was set.*  *The CAB shall report the ‘condition start’ as both the assessment/audit process during which the condition was set (e.g., initial assessment, 3rd surveillance audit, scope extension etc.), and the date (YYYY) the condition was set. The CAB should consider the date a condition is set as the date the final assessment/audit report was published – this depends on assessment/audit process during which the condition was set. If the condition was set during a full assessment the start date of the condition is the date the Public Certification Report was published. If the condition was set during a surveillance audit the start date of the condition is the date the Surveillance Report was published, etc. For example, Initial assessment, 2021. The CAB may report the date the condition was set as MM/YYYY.* |
| Condition deadline | *State deadline for the condition.*  *The CAB shall report the “condition deadline” as both the audit process by which the condition will be closed, and the date (YYYY). For example, 4th Surveillance Audit, 2022. The CAB may report the condition deadline as MM/YYYY.* |
| Exceptional circumstances | *Do exceptional circumstances apply and condition deadline is longer than the period of certification (FCP v2.3 7.16.6)?*  YES/NO *(delete as applicable).*  *If YES, provide a justification.* |
| Milestones | *State milestones and resulting scores where applicable.* |
| Verification with other entities | *Include details of any verification required to meet requirements in FCP v2.3 7.19.8.* |
| *Complete the following rows for reassessments and/or transition assessments.* | |
| Carried over condition | *Is the condition is being carried over from a previous certificate?*  YES/NO *(delete as applicable).*  *If yes, include a justification for carrying over the condition (FCP v2.3 7.31.5.2.a).*  *Include a justification that progress against the condition and milestones is adequate (FCP v2.3 7.31.5.3). The CAB shall base its justification on information from the reassessment or transition assessment site visit.* |
| Related condition | *Does the condition relates to a previous condition that was closed during a previous certification period, where a new condition on the same Performance Indicator or Scoring Issue is set?*  YES/NO *(delete as applicable)*  *If YES, provide a justification for why is a related condition is being raised. (FCP v2.3 7.31.6 & G7.31.6).* |
| Condition rewritten | *Has the condition has been rewritten?*  YES/NO *(delete as applicable)*  *If YES, include a justification (FCP v2.3 7.31.5.4).* |

### Client Action Plan

To be drafted at Public Comment Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report the Client Action Plan from the fishery client to address conditions.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.19*

### Surveillance

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report the program for surveillance, timing of surveillance audits and a supporting justification.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Section 7.29*

Table 17: Fishery surveillance program

| **Surveillance level** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *e.g. Level 5* | *e.g. On-site surveillance audit* | *e.g. On-site surveillance audit* | *e.g. On-site surveillance audit* | *e.g. On-site surveillance audit & re-certification site visit* |

Table 18: Timing of surveillance audit

| **Year** | **Anniversary date of certificate** | **Proposed date of surveillance audit** | **Justification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *e.g. 1* | *e.g. May 2018* | *e.g. July 2018* | *e.g. Scientific advice to be released in June 2018, proposal to postpone audit to include findings of scientific advice* |

Table 19: Surveillance level justification

| **Year** | **Surveillance activity** | **Number of auditors** | **Justification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *e.g.3* | *e.g. On-site audit* | *e.g. 1 auditor on-site with remote support from 1 auditor* | *e.g. From client action plan it can be deduced that information needed to verify progress towards conditions 1.2.1, 2.2.3 and 3.2.3 can be provided remotely in year 3. Considering that milestones indicate that most conditions will be closed out in year 3, the CAB proposes to have an on-site audit with 1 auditor on-site with remote support – this is to ensure that all information is collected and because the information can be provided remotely.* |

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

To be drafted at Client and Peer Review Draft Report stage

#### Consequence Analysis (CA)

*The CAB shall 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: FCP v2.3 Annex PF Section PF3*

Table 20: 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 shall 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 FCP v3.0 MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox Section A4. If species are grouped together, the CAB shall list all species and group them indicating which are most at-risk.*

*Reference: FCP v2.3 Annex PF Section PF4*

Table 21: 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 size  Not scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average size at maturity  Not scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Reproductive strategy |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Trophic level |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Density dependence  Invertebrates only |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| **Susceptibility** | | |
| Fishery  Only where the scoring element is scored cumulatively | *Insert list of fisheries impacting the given scoring element (FCP v2.3 Annex PF4.4.3a)* | |
| **Attribute** | **Justification** | **Score** |
| Areal Overlap | *Insert attribute justification. Note specific requirements in FCP v2.3 Annex PF4.4.6.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 FCP v2.3 Annex PF4.4.7.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* | **1 / 2 / 3** |

Table 22 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 23 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 24 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 25 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 26 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 size  Not scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Average size at maturity  Not scored for invertebrates |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Reproductive strategy |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Trophic level |  | **1 / 2 / 3** |
| Density dependence  Invertebrates 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 27: Species grouped by similar taxonomies (if FCP v2.3 Annex PF4.1.5 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 shall complete the Consequence Spatial Analysis (CSA) table below for PI 2.4.1, if used, including justifications for scoring each of the CSA attributes.*

*Reference: FCP v2.3 Annex PF Section PF7*

Table 28: CSA justification table for PI 2.4.1 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 shall complete the Scale Intensity Consequence Analysis (SICA) table below for PI 2.5.1, if used, including rationales for scoring each of the SICA attributes.*

*Reference: FCP v2.3 Annex PF Section PF8*

Table 24: SICA scoring template for PI 2.5.1 Ecosystem

| **Performance Indicator PI 2.5.1 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 |  | | | | |

### 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 v2.3/3.0 Annex PB requirements, the CAB shall describe in the report the processes, activities and specific outcomes of efforts to harmonise fishery assessments, including annual harmonisation activities (PB1.4). The report shall identify the fisheries and Performance Indicators subject to harmonisation.*

*Reference(s): FCP v2.3 Annex PB, Table PB1*

Table 30: Overlapping Units of Assessment

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

Table 31: 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 32: 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 33: Rationale for scoring differences

|  |
| --- |
| **If exceptional circumstances apply, outline the situation and whether there is agreement between or among teams on this determination (FCP v2.3 PB1.3.2.1).** |
|  |
| **If applicable, explain and justify any difference in scoring and rationale for the relevant Performance Indicators (FCP v2.3 Annex PB1.3.2.2).** |
|  |

### Peer reviewers – summary of qualifications and competencies

*The CAB shall include in an appendix to the report summaries of the peer reviewers’ qualifications and competencies.*

### 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.*

### Objections – delete if not applicable

To be added at Public Certification Report stage

*The CAB shall include in the report all written decisions on objections arising from the MSC Disputes Process.*

*Reference(s): MSC Disputes Process v1.0.*

### Supporting Information – delete if not applicable

*The CAB may use this section to make available any key information that is unpublished or not available online. Key information includes any information required by stakeholders to be able to properly review the logic used by the assessment team within the report.*

### References (Bibliography)

*The CAB shall 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 Reporting Template v1.3’ and its content is copyright of “Marine Stewardship Council” - © “Marine Stewardship Council” 2022. All rights reserved.

*The CAB shall* *delete the table below:*

Table 34: Template version control

| **Version** | **Date of publication** | **Description of amendment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.0 | 17 December 2018 | Date of first release |
| 1.1 | 29 March 2019 | Minor document changes for usability |
| 1.2 | 25 March 2020 | Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.2 |
| 1.3 | 26 October 2022 | Release alongside Fisheries Certification Process v2.3 |

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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