**Public consultation on proposed changes to the MSC Fisheries Standard and Fisheries Standard Toolbox –**

**Word Copy**

You can use this document to draft and discuss feedback you will provide as part of the survey, however, please note you will need to submit all feedback through the [online form](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/9TZTDR5).

**Welcome to the public consultation on proposed changes to the MSC Fisheries Standard and Toolbox**

**About this consultation**

This consultation is open to all stakeholders for 60 days from 10 July, closing on 10 September at 1700 Coordinated Universal Time (UTC).

The MSC Fisheries Standard Toolbox is a document that was introduced with Version 3 of the Standard and contains several tools that support fishery assessments. A review of the Toolbox is currently underway, focusing on two key tools: the Evidence Requirements Framework (ERF) and the Risk-based Framework (RBF).

This review began in July 2024. An updated Toolbox is expected to be published in early 2027, alongside an updated version of the Fisheries Standard.

Proposals for an updated Toolbox and Standard have been developed following initial pilot testing with CAB representatives and assessors. This public consultation seeks further feedback from stakeholders to help refine the proposals and ensure that intended outcomes within the Standard and Toolbox are achieved. There will be further testing and impact assessments carried out following this public consultation.

**Supporting material**

We encourage you to review the following documents before answering the questions below.

* The [Summary of Proposals](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-fisheries-standard-toolbox-review-summary-of-proposals.pdf) - we recommend starting with this.
* The full proposals can be found in draft versions of the [Fisheries Standard Toolbox](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-draft-changes-fisheries-standard-toolbox-2025.pdf) and the [Fisheries Standard](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-draft-changes-fisheries-standard-2025.pdf), with proposed text changes highlighted using track changes.

Familiarity with the MSC Fisheries Standard and certification process will help you participate effectively in this consultation.

If you would like to enroll in further training on the Standard, please email [onlinetraining@msc.org](mailto:onlinetraining@msc.org) with your full name, email address, and affiliation.

**Instructions for this survey**

In this survey you will be shown a list of three areas where changes are proposed and asked to indicate which changes you wish to comment on. The survey will then show you the questions related to those topics.

On each topic page you will see links to background information. It is recommended that you read the background information closely before answering the questions.

You may wish to download a Microsoft Word copy of the survey in advance. This will allow you to view, share, and discuss questions with colleagues before providing answers.

Unfortunately, you will not be able to save your progress and return later, so please be prepared to complete the full survey when you begin.

**Note:** Depending on your familiarity with the Standard and Toolbox, and the extent of feedback you wish to provide, the full survey may take approximately 1 hour to complete. However, if you choose to respond only to selected sections, it may take significantly less time. You are welcome to focus on the sections most relevant to your knowledge, experience, or interests. If a question falls outside your expertise, feel free to select "I don't know" where applicable. Each question also includes an open-ended section where you can provide additional comments or context, should you wish to do so.

If you are unable to complete this survey for any reason, feel that language is a barrier to participation, or have any other questions, please email us at [**fisheries@msc.org**.](mailto:fisheries@msc.org) We will do our best to accommodate any requests for support.

**GDPR and research ethics**

**The specific purpose of this consultation is research. All feedback will be analysed by the MSC Executive and may be discussed with external consultants, the MSC Technical Advisory Board, MSC Stakeholder Advisory Council and MSC Board of Trustees.**

**We will also use participant's information to evaluate whether the participants collectively constitute a broadly representative sample of key stakeholders for the issue(s) of interest.**

**Any project reports and case studies will have the names and organisations of**

**consultation participants redacted, depending on the preference you state below.**

**Finally, this survey is entirely optional and you may exit at any time. Any completed questions will be submitted.**

\* 1. Given the above would you like to continue?

I would like to continue and am willing to be named in any public report.

I would like to continue but do not want to be named in any public report.

I do not want to continue (end survey).

**Contact information**

\* 2. Please provide the following information.

**Full name**

**Email address**

\* 3. In which country are you based?

1. What organisation do you represent, if any? Name one only.
2. Are you part of any industry groups or coalitions? If so, please list them.

**Stakeholder categories**

\* 6. Please state which stakeholder category best describes your job.

**Conformity assessment and/or accreditation** (please select if you work with a Conformity Assessment Body, as an independent assessor or with Assurance Services International)

**Commercial wild-capture fisheries** (please select if you work for or represent a

commercial wild-capture fishery)

**Non-governmental organisation**

**Fisheries governance/management**

**Academic/scientific professional**

**Fishery Improvement Project provider/Improvement Program provider**

Other (please specify)

\* 7. In your work, do you engage with or represent fisheries operating in areas beyond national jurisdiction (the high seas)?

Yes  No

Please explain in what capacity you work with these fisheries.

**Fisheries categories**

1. Please say what types of commercial fisheries you represent.

Mostly smaller scale fisheries

A mix of smaller and larger scale fisheries

Mostly larger scale

fisheries I don't know

1. Would you consider any of the fisheries you represent to be data deficient?

Yes No

I don't know

If 'yes', please feel free to share additional information about data gaps in the fishery.

**Selecting the issues that you want to comment on.**

\* 10. Please indicate which areas you want to comment on (select all that apply).

**Proposed changes to the Evidence Requirements Framework (ERF), and associated changes to scoring guideposts in the Standard** - this includes an entirely redrafted Evidence Requirements Framework and changes to all scoring issues where it applies

**Proposed changes to the prescriptive catch monitoring thresholds required of fisheries** - this includes changes to the catch monitoring systems required in certified fisheries, including the need for observers or electronic monitoring systems

**Proposed changes to the Risk-based Framework (RBF)** - this includes the introduction of a residual risk assessment process and changes to how stakeholders may be engaged with the RBF process

**Proposed changes to the Evidence Requirements Framework (ERF)**

**You’ve indicated that you would like to provide feedback on our proposed changes to the ERF and related scoring guideposts.**

**To help you understand the proposals, the following resources are available:**

* The [Summary of Proposals](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-fisheries-standard-toolbox-review-summary-of-proposals.pdf) - we recommend starting with this.
* The full proposals can be found in draft versions of the [Fisheries Standard Toolbox](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-draft-changes-fisheries-standard-toolbox-2025.pdf) and the [Fisheries Standard](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-draft-changes-fisheries-standard-2025.pdf), with proposed text changes highlighted using track changes.

**We encourage you to review these documents before answering the questions below.**

**If you have any questions about the proposals, please contact us at** [**fisheries@msc.org**](mailto:fisheries@msc.org)**.**

\* 11. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The proposed changes improve the clarity of the ERF."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

\* 12. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The proposed changes simplify the ERF.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

\* 13. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The process set out in the ERF for assessors to consider information accuracy and adequacy will be effective in ensuring rigorous and transparent assessment of the evidence used in fishery assessments.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 14. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“Overall, I support the proposed changes to the ERF.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

**Proposed changes to scoring guideposts where the ERF applies**

**The ERF applies to nine scoring guideposts in the MSC Fisheries Standard, across various Performance Indicators.**

**Performance Indicators are criteria by which qualified assessors evaluate the performance of fisheries against the Standard. Scoring guideposts are the levels at which the performance of a fishery is measured, ranging from minimum acceptable level (SG60), best practice (SG80), and state-of-the-art (SG100).**

**At the SG60 level, fisheries are issued a condition which they must clear within the first 5 years of their certification. At the SG80 level, fisheries pass without conditions.**

**For this consultation, these guideposts have been grouped into three categories based on the Performance Indicators they measure. Within each of these categories, the language used at the SG60, SG80 and SG100 levels is consistent. The categories are as follows:**

* **Information scoring guideposts — 2.1.3 (a), 2.1.3 (b), 2.2.3 (a) and 2.3.3 (b)**
* **Compliance information guideposts — 2.3.2 (c), 3.2.3 (c)**
* **Shark finning guideposts — 1.2.1 (e), 2.1.2 (d), 2.2.2 (d)**

# Information scoring guideposts

The following questions focus only on the information scoring guideposts.

* 15. The term "estimate" is used at the SG80 (best-practice) level. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“I support the use of the updated definition of ‘estimate’ (“to make a numeric approximation based on at least some quantitative data”) in the context of information guideposts."*

Note: The previous definition of ‘estimate’, in the context of Principle 2, related to assessors "forming an opinion or judgement”.

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 16. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“It is feasible for certified fisheries to have information that is adequate to estimate the impact of the fishery - either to pass certification without conditions, or to meet this requirement within five years if certified with conditions."*

Note: If your answer differs for information on in-scope species, ETP/OOS species, and habitats, please respond based on the area you feel most concerned about and explain the difference in the comment box below.

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 17. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The proposed changes simplify the scoring guidepost language, as compared to the language used in the same scoring guideposts in the Fisheries Standard v3.1.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 18. MSC propose to remove references to 'degrees of accuracy' at SG80 and SG100. The ERF now requires the assessment team to explicitly evaluate the accuracy of information sources. This evaluation will inform the team's decision on whether information is adequate to reach SG60, SG80 or SG100.

Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“Noting that accuracy is considered by assessors within the ERF, I support the removal of degrees of accuracy from the scoring guidepost language.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 19. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The proposed wording of the information scoring guideposts sets an appropriate sustainability bar for MSC-certified fisheries, noting the prescriptive monitoring thresholds at SG80 and the requirement for assessors to use the ERF."*

Note: If your answer differs for information on in-scope species, ETP/OOS species, and habitats, please respond based on the area you feel most concerned about and explain the difference in the comment box below.

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 20. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“Overall, I support the proposed changes to the information scoring guideposts."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

# Compliance information scoring guideposts

The following questions focus on the compliance information scoring guideposts in 2.3.2 (c) and 3.2.3 (c).

* 21. The term "estimate" is used at the SG80 (best-practice) level. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“I support the use of the updated definition of ‘estimate’ (“to make a numeric approximation based on at least some quantitative data”) in the context of compliance information."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 22. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The proposed changes simplify the scoring guidepost language compared to the language in the Fisheries Standard v3.0 / 3.1.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.



* 23. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“It is feasible for certified fisheries to have information that is adequate to estimate its compliance - either to pass certification without conditions, or to meet this requirement within five years if certified with conditions."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 24. MSC propose to remove references to 'degrees of accuracy' at SG80 and SG100. The ERF now requires the assessment team to explicitly evaluate the accuracy of information sources. This evaluation will inform the team's decision on whether information is adequate to reach SG60, SG80 or SG100.

Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“Noting that accuracy is considered by assessors within the ERF, I support the removal of degrees of accuracy from the scoring guidepost language.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 25. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The proposed language of the scoring guideposts set appropriate expectations for compliance information for MSC-certified fisheries, noting the requirement for assessors to use the ERF."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 26. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“Overall, I support the proposed changes to the compliance information scoring guideposts.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

# Shark finning scoring guideposts

The following questions focus on the shark finning scoring guideposts in 1.2.1 (e), 2.1.2 (d), and 2.2.2 (d), and associated requirements in SA2.4.4 of the draft Standard.

**Important note:**

Shark finning scoring issues apply to any fishery that interacts with shark species. For the purposes of these requirements, “shark” refers to all species within the taxonomic groups Selachimorpha and Rhinopristiformes. The need for a Fins Naturally Attached or non- retention policy has not changed.

When responding to these questions, please keep in mind that these requirements would apply across all fisheries with shark interactions, regardless of whether they operate in high- risk or low-risk contexts for shark finning.

* 27. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“I support the proposal for the scoring guidepost to include the requirement for a fins naturally attached or non-retention policy for sharks.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 28. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“It is feasible to require that fisheries have information that is adequate to estimate compliance with a fins naturally attached or non-retention policy".*

Note that the MSC propose a revised definition of estimate: "to make a numeric approximation based on at least some quantitative data”.

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 29. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“The text in SA2.4.4.a sets an appropriate bar for the level of information required to confirm compliance with a fins naturally attached or non-retention policy, noting the requirement for assessors to use the ERF.”*

Note that SA2.4.4.a states: "Information is adequate to estimate conformance/compliance in the UoA"

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 30. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*“Overall, I support the proposed changes to the shark finning scoring guideposts.”*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

**Changes to prescriptive catch monitoring thresholds**

**We recommend that you review the** [**Summary of Proposals**](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/stakeholders/consultations/fisheries-program-revisions/msc-fisheries-standard-toolbox-review-summary-of-proposals.pdf) **before answering the following questions.**

**You indicated that you wish to provide feedback on our proposals for changes to prescriptive catch monitoring thresholds.**

**As currently written, the Toolbox contains certain prescriptive requirements for fishery monitoring systems.**

**As the redrafted ERF is a document intended for use only by assessors, any prescriptive requirements related to the performance of fisheries have been moved to the Fisheries Standard. This includes requirements for catch monitoring systems, which have been modified in this review to ensure that these requirements are set appropriately, reflecting widely adopted science and management practices. These requirements are now located only in the proposed Standard.**

**In this proposal, all catch monitoring requirements are proposed to sit at SG80. Therefore, a pass without condition would require meeting these thresholds.**

* 31. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"I support the proposal to require that assessors use the ERF to evaluate whether information is adequate for a 'broad understanding' of impacts at the SG60 level, noting that this would remove the prescriptive monitoring requirement."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 32. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"I support the proposal to require that fisheries have a catch reporting system in place to meet SG80."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 33. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"I support the proposal to require all certified fisheries to have a system in place to independently verify self-reported catch data to meet SG80."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 34. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"I support the proposal to require at least 20% observer or electronic monitoring coverage to meet SG80 for fisheries operating in areas beyond national jurisdiction, in addition to the default requirements to meet SG80."*

Note: Pole and line, handline and troll gear types are proposed to be excluded from the 20% requirement, but these fisheries would still have to meet the default requirements proposed for all fisheries at SG80.

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 35. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"It is fair to exclude pole and line, handline and troll gear type fisheries from the requirement for 20% observer or electronic monitoring coverage, noting they still must meet the scoring guideposts required of every other non-high-seas fishery."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 36. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The proposed SG80 minimum thresholds for catch monitoring and independent verification are feasible for all fisheries seeking to gain or maintain MSC certification."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 37. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The proposed SG80 minimum thresholds for catch monitoring and independent verification are feasible for fisheries operating in areas beyond national jurisdiction seeking to gain or maintain MSC certification."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 38. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"I support the proposal to require that assessors use the ERF to evaluate whether information is adequate for a 'detailed understanding' of impacts at the SG100 level, noting the removal of a prescriptive catch monitoring requirement."*

Note: In order to meet SG100, fisheries must first meet SG80.

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

**Fisheries operating in areas beyond national jurisdiction**

**You responded that in your work you engage with or represent fisheries that operate either in whole or in part in areas beyond national jurisdiction (the high seas).**

**Please respond to the following questions about these fisheries.**

1. Which high seas fisheries do you work with?

*If this fishery is already engaged with the MSC, please provide the MSC fishery name. If not please provide a description of the fishery (target species, gear type, region, approximate vessel size).*

Fishery 1

Fishery 2

Fishery 3

Fishery 4

1. What level of observer coverage or electronic monitoring is currently in these fisheries?
   * *If you work with multiple fisheries please include an answer for each fishery in a different text box below and align it with the fishery numbers and names above.*
   * *If the fishery has electronic monitoring in place, please outline the proportion of vessels with cameras onboard and the review rate of footage (i.e. 100% coverage, 10% review rate).*

Fishery 1

Fishery 2

Fishery 3

Fishery 4

1. When do you believe it is realistic to implement 20% observer or electronic monitoring coverage in the fisheries you work with?

It is already implemented in all fisheries.

Realistic to implement within the next 5 years.

Realistic to implement in 5-10 years.

Not realistic or feasible within the next 10 years.

If you work with multiple fisheries, please explain how your response may differ between these fisheries here.

1. What do you believe are the most significant barriers to fisheries reaching 20% observer coverage in the fisheries you work with?

Cost of implementing a program or scaling up a current program

Logistical challenges onboard vessels associated with carrying human observers

Logistical challenges onboard vessels associated with implementing electronic monitoring technology

Fishing industry resistance to implementing observer or electronic monitoring programs

Delays in action from decision makers (i.e. RFMO delays in adopting policies)

Difficulties recruiting human observers

Limitations in electronic monitoring or footage review technology

Other (please specify)

**Proposed changes to the Risk-Based Framework (RBF)**

**You indicated that you wish to provide feedback on our proposal for changes to the RBF.**

**The following materials are available to help you understand the proposals:**

* **You can find a summary of the proposals, we suggest reading this first [here].**
* **You can find the full drafted proposals in the Fisheries Standard Toolbox [here]. We suggest that you review these documents to ensure you can answer the questions below.**

**If you have questions on the proposals, please email** [**fisheries@msc.org**](mailto:fisheries@msc.org)**.**

**The questions follow the same order as the requirements in the drafted Toolbox. We recommend keeping the draft Toolbox open as you go through the questions.**

**Clarifications to remove inconsistencies**

**The following questions are about clarifications that are being made to the RBF to remove inconsistencies. The aim of these proposals is to better reflect MSC intent by providing clearer guidance and clarifying how the RBF interacts with the default tree in the MSC Fisheries Standard. These proposed changes are in the guidance added in G5.2 and in the additions to Table A1.**

* 43. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:

*"The guidance added in G5.2 clarifies what is meant by “independent source” when determining if the RBF is applicable to ETP/OOS species outcome."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 44. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:

*"The additions to Table A1 clarify how management strategy Performance Indicators should be scored when the RBF is used to score outcome."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

# Stakeholder involvement

The following questions are about changes that are being made to the RBF to improve and simplify stakeholder involvement in the risk assessment process. Several changes are proposed to:

1. Reduce the number of announcements that need to be made for the RBF,
2. Include information gaps/draft RBF scores in the Announcement Comment Draft Report to allow earlier engagement, and
3. Make requirements less prescriptive so that stakeholder engagement can be conducted in a way that is most appropriate for the fishery.

These proposed changes are detailed in A2.1 to A2.3.

\* 45. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The revisions in A2.1 to A2.3 improve the way stakeholders are engaged in the RBF process."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

\* 46. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"I support the revisions in A2.1 to A2.3."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 47. If the RBF announcement is included within the Fishery Announcement, will it be sufficiently clear to stakeholders that the RBF will be used in the assessment?

Yes No I don't know

If you selected 'no', please explain your reasons below. Please be as concise as possible.

* 48. If the RBF announcement is included within the Fishery Announcement, will this simplify the way stakeholders are notified about different components of a fishery assessment?

Yes No I don't know

If you selected 'no', please explain your reasons below. Please be as concise as possible.

* 49. Will the inclusion of information gaps and/or draft RBF scores in the Announcement Comment Draft Report help stakeholders better engage in the site visit?

Yes No I don't know

If you selected 'no', please explain your reasons below. Please be as concise as possible.

* 50. Is it practical for the assessment team to gather the information required in A2.2 before the fishery announcement rather than before the site visit?

Yes No I don't know

If you selected 'no', please explain your reasons below. Please be as concise as possible.

* 51. Are the revised requirements in A2.2.4 practical?

Yes No I don't know

If you selected 'no', please explain your reasons below. Please be as concise as possible.

* 52. Is it practical for stakeholders to provide information on the productivity of a species to assist the assessment team in scoring as per A4.2.1.b?

Yes No I don't know

If you selected 'no', please explain your reasons below. Please be as concise as possible.

# Using an optional Residual Risk Analysis to adjust scoring element scores when using the PSA

The following questions focus on a proposed addition to the RBF to provide clearer criteria to allow assessors to adjust a PSA score. These criteria are based on the concept of residual risk assessment and focus on the management system that the fishery has in place to avoid interactions with specific in-scope or ETP/OOS species.

To be able to adjust the PSA score, certain population status criteria must be met. These changes will allow for the improvement of the PSA score of some species with inherently low productivity and low susceptibility, if it can be shown that robust management is in place.

The proposed changes are primarily detailed in A5.2. They result in the removal of current requirements under A5.3.

* 53. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The addition of the optional requirements in A5.2 provide a clear pathway to adjust scoring element scores determined during the PSA, if required."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 54. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The requirements in A5.2 are achievable by most fisheries within a 5-year period."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 55. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The requirements in A5.2 improve the accessibility of the MSC Program to fisheries."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 56. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"Information on population status should be considered when deciding whether the adjustment of scoring element scores can be applied."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 57. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The proposed population status criteria in A5.2.1.a to A5.2.1.c are appropriate."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 58. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"There will be sufiicient information for assessors to evaluate the population status using one of the criteria in A5.2.1.a - c for most fisheries where the PSA is used for an in-scope or ETP/OOS species."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 59. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The score modification criteria in Table X are appropriate."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 60. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The score modification criteria in Table Y are appropriate."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 61. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The score modification criteria in Tables X or Y are achievable for most fisheries seeking to gain or maintain MSC certification."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

Please feel free to share additional feedback, or let us know if you would change anything about the proposal. Please be as concise as possible.

* 62. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The requirements in A5.2.4 are acceptable."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 63. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The requirements in A5.2.5 are acceptable."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

* 64. Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

*"The guidance added in GSA6.1.4 clarifies when the process described in A5.2 can be used at a subsequent assessment."*

Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree I don't know

If you selected ‘disagree’, please share more about your reasons below.

**End of consultation survey**

**Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback!**

**Please watch the MSC website for future updates and email** [**fisheries@msc.org**](mailto:fisheries@msc.org) **if you have any questions.**