

# FISHERYPROGRESS.ORG

---

## Review Guidelines

### Introduction

FisheryProgress.org is committed to transparency, consistency, and accuracy in decision making about fishery improvement projects (FIPs) included on the website. We developed these guidelines for use by FIPs and the FisheryProgress.org reviewer and technical oversight committee to provide clarity around how we determine eligibility for the site and evaluate FIP information and progress. The guidelines include:

- 1. Eligibility for FisheryProgress.org.** The criteria FisheryProgress.org uses to determine if FIPs are eligible for the site, based on the Conservation Alliance's [Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects](#).
- 2. Initial review process.** The process and evaluation criteria the reviewer will use in assessing a FIP's initial profile submission to the website.
- 3. Evaluating progress.** The process and evaluation criteria the reviewer will use in assessing six- and 12-month progress reports, three-year audits, FIP changes, and completed or inactive FIPs.
- 4. Quality control and appeals process.** The processes FisheryProgress.org will implement to ensure reviews are consistent and address objections.

We expect these guidelines will evolve over time. We will communicate any changes to all users of FisheryProgress.org via email when they occur.

### 1. Eligibility for FisheryProgress.org

Eligibility for FisheryProgress.org is determined by the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions' [Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects](#). A summary of relevant information from the Conservation Alliance Guidelines is included below. For additional details, please read the Conservation Alliance Guidelines.

#### Prospective FIPs

FIPs that are currently in stage 0, 1, or 2 and intend to meet the Conservation Alliance Guidelines for basic or comprehensive FIPs and complete stage 2 within one year may be listed on FisheryProgress.org as Prospective.

Prospective FIPs may be listed for 12 months. The reviewer will remove them if the FIP has not completed stage 2 by the end of 12 months.

The prospective designation is not for FIPs that claim to have completed stage 2 but don't meet the Conservation Alliance's requirements for stage 2 as outlined in the Guidelines.

**Active: Basic and Comprehensive FIPs**

FIPs must meet the Conservation Alliance Guidelines for basic or comprehensive FIPs to be listed as active FIPs on the site.

<b>Elements for Basic and Comprehensive FIPs</b>	
<b>Participation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must include active participation by at least one company in the supply chain (this includes fishermen or fishing associations).</li> <li>• Participation means contributing financial or in-kind support to the project and/or working on activities in the workplan.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Commitment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants must commit (e.g., a signed memorandum of understanding, commitment described in participant list) to financially invest in (directly or in-kind) and make improvements to the fishery.</li> <li>• Note “public” in this context only means being willing to have the above described evidence (MoU, etc.) available on FisheryProgress.org—it does not require further announcement or publications regarding involvement.</li> </ul>
<b>Workplan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must develop and implement a workplan, with an associated budget and deadlines, designed to address the deficiencies in the fishery necessary to achieve the project’s objectives.</li> <li>• The workplan and deadlines must be made publicly available via the FisheryProgress.org website.</li> <li>• The budget does not need to be made publicly available, but evidence of an appropriate budget for the project must be made available to the reviewer. A confidentiality agreement can be put in place if needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Progress Tracking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must publicly report progress on actions and their results with supporting documentation every six months, beginning with the date of initial publication of the FIP on FisheryProgress.org.</li> <li>• Must update indicator scores and provide supporting evidence every 12 months.</li> </ul>

<b>Additional Elements for Basic FIPs</b>	
<b>Needs Assessment (and Scoping Document, if applicable)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must complete a needs assessment based on the MSC standard to identify environmental challenges. The needs assessment must cover indicators in the three principle areas of the MSC standard.</li> </ul> <p>If the needs assessment does not:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Include recommended strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard, and/or</li> <li>2) Provide rationale for why all indicators were not included (e.g., lack of data available, financial resources, management cooperation)</li> </ol>

	<p>then the FIP must also complete a scoping document to provide this information.</p> <p>The needs assessment (and scoping document if applicable) must be made publicly available.</p>
<b>Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must define timebound objectives for addressing a specific set of the fishery’s environmental challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard.</li> </ul>

<b>Additional Elements for Comprehensive FIPs</b>	
<b>MSC Pre-Assessment (and Scoping Document, if applicable)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must engage a party experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., a <a href="#">registered MSC technical consultant</a> or <a href="#">accredited conformity assessment body</a> or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer) to complete an MSC <a href="#">pre-assessment</a> evaluating the fishery against all MSC performance indicators.</li> <li>• If the MSC pre-assessment does not include recommended strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard, then the FIP must also complete a scoping document to provide this information. The scoping document must be completed or reviewed by a party experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., a <a href="#">registered MSC technical consultant</a> or <a href="#">accredited conformity assessment body</a> or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer).</li> <li>• The MSC pre-assessment (and scoping document if applicable) must be made publicly available.</li> </ul>
<b>Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must define timebound objectives for addressing all of the fishery’s environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Verification of Progress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every three years, comprehensive FIPs must arrange for an independent in-person audit of activity results and performance against the MSC standard by someone that is both experienced with the MSC standard (e.g., a <a href="#">registered MSC technical consultant</a> or <a href="#">accredited conformity assessment body</a> or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer) and independent from the organization implementing the FIP.</li> </ul>

**Completed FIPs**

Completed FIPs are those that have achieved their objectives and/or graduated to certification. A FIP can be considered completed if it achieves its objectives even if it chooses not to enter certification (or for basic FIPs, if performance doesn’t reach the level required for certification).

## Inactive FIPs

Inactive FIPs are those that suspended work before achieving their objectives, due to them reporting they are suspending work or the reviewer designating them as inactive due to one year of failure to report or three years of insufficient progress (note: insufficient progress is defined later in this document).

## 2. Initial Review Process

The reviewer will review all information submitted by FIPs requesting to be listed on FisheryProgress.org. Whenever feasible, the process will begin with an orientation call between the reviewer and the FIP implementer. The purpose of this initial review is to ensure that evidence submitted supports the FIP's stated type and stage, and to allow the reviewer to verify that the FIP has completed stage 2 (the point at which it can be displayed as an active FIP on the site). The reviewer also checks that the initial scoring against the site's indicators is supported by the information from the MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment.

The following outlines what the reviewer will look for in reviewing each piece of information.

Profile Information	
<b>FIP Name</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Accurately reflects the scope of the FIP, being specific as possible about location, species, and gear.</li><li>• If the FIP does not cover the whole fishery, name should specify what portion is covered.</li><li>• If multiple FIPs exist in the fishery, names should distinguish between them.</li></ul>
<b>FIP Type</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Selected.</li></ul>
<b>FIP Stage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Selected.</li></ul>
<b>Objective(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FIP listed one or more objectives that define the near-term scope of the FIP.</li><li>• Objectives are timebound (include end date), and measurable (e.g., by X date, the FIP will accomplish Y).</li><li>• Scope of objectives is appropriate for the FIP type (see eligibility information in previous section).</li></ul>
<b>Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Three to four sentences providing additional detail on the FIP's scope and objectives entered.</li></ul>
<b>FIP Lead(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Contact info for at least one public FIP contact entered.</li></ul>
<b>Project Dates</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Start date is when FIP completes stage 2 requirements but is backdated to when completed if FIP existed before the website.</li><li>• Expected end date is based on the workplan.</li><li>• Month/year entered for both.</li></ul>
<b>Species</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least one primary species selected.</li></ul>
<b>Gear Type(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least one gear type selected.</li></ul>
<b>Location(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FAO Major Fishing Area completed.</li><li>• Information on EEZ and RFMOs entered if relevant.</li></ul>

<b>Volume</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume completed (amount of catch represented by FIP participants or their source fishermen in metric tons).</li> </ul>
---------------	--

<b>Required Documentation</b>	
<b>MSC Pre-assessment OR Needs Assessment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>MSC pre-assessment</u> is completed by someone experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., is a <a href="#">registered MSC technical consultant</a> or <a href="#">accredited conformity assessment body</a> or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer).</li> <li>2. <u>Needs assessment</u>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is based on one of the following tools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Marine Stewardship Council pre-assessment</a>.</li> <li>▪ Completed FishSource profile (see <a href="#">guidance on what's included in a profile</a>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. If not based on one of the above tools, meets the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Specifies the scope of the assessment (e.g., species, stock, fishery management area, gear type).</li> <li>▪ Covers indicators within all three principle areas of the MSC standard: target fish stock status, environmental impact of fishing, and management quality.</li> <li>▪ Describes strengths and weaknesses, as relevant, for each of the principle areas.</li> <li>▪ Lists sources for all data.</li> <li>▪ Describes methodology used.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<b>Scoping Document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NOTE: if all elements below are included in the MSC pre-assessment or needs assessment, no need for scoping document.</b></li> <li>• For <u>basic FIPs</u>, the scoping document summarizes the results of the needs assessment and recommends strategies for addressing the fishery's challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. If the needs assessment doesn't include all indicators, the scoping document must also include an explanation for what was excluded and why.</li> <li>• For <u>comprehensive FIPs</u>, the scoping document summarizes the results of the MSC pre-assessment and recommends strategies for addressing the fishery's challenges to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. The scoping document was completed or audited by an entity experienced with applying the MSC standard (required for comprehensive FIPs only).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all scoping documents, assess reasonable alignment between challenges identified in the MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment and strategies recommended in the scoping document.</li> <li>• Scoping documents should also take into account where cumulative impacts will need to be assessed in Principle 2 (see Appendix 4 for details), and indicate where the needs assessment is relying on the MSC Risk-Based Framework (see Appendix 3 for how to assess progress in this context).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Workplan (See Appendix 1 for examples)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workplan includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Actions aligned with FIP objectives.</li> <li>○ Specific tasks under each action (if appropriate).</li> <li>○ Organizations or people responsible for completing each action/task.</li> <li>○ A month/year deadline for completing each action.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Confirm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Actions/tasks align with FIP objectives.</li> <li>○ Timeframes are plausible.</li> <li>○ There are no major red flags or risks to achieving the workplan given the information provided.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>MOU or Participant List</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>MOU</u> includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FIP scope or name.</li> <li>○ Names and organizations of participants.</li> <li>○ Specific terms of agreement (funding/in-kind support and/or activities to be conducted by each participant).</li> <li>○ End date.</li> <li>○ Confirmation that all parties have signed the MOU.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Participant List</u> includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FIP scope or name.</li> <li>○ Organizations participating.</li> <li>○ Nature of each organization’s engagement in the FIP (funding/in-kind support and/or activities to be conducted by each participant).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reviewer to assess whether participants are contributing financial or in-kind support to the project and/or working on activities in the workplan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Proof of Budget</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At minimum, must include a list of main expenses and revenue sources for the FIP.</li> <li>• A more detailed budget could list all of the costs associated with each activity, as well as secured funding and needed funding for each activity.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A budget may anonymize or aggregate the sources of revenue and may include in-kind contributions and monetary contributions.</li> <li>• Must be updated once per year.</li> <li>• Reviewer looks for red flags indicating budget may be insufficient for completing the workplan.</li> <li>• <b>NOTE: the budget does not need to be made publicly available.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Additional Documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure additional documents have clear descriptions and are relevant to the FIP.</li> </ul>

The reviewer will follow up with the FIP implementer to address any questions regarding the submitted materials, and will review additional materials submitted by the FIP after follow-up is complete if necessary.

The reviewer will aim to complete the review within one month of the date the report is submitted. This timing may vary depending on the volume of FIPs on the site and the amount of follow-up needed to secure additional information from the FIP implementer. Once this process is complete, the reviewer will make the FIP public on FisheryProgress.org.

### 3. Evaluating FIP Progress

#### Six-Month Review

Every six months from the date the profile is posted on FisheryProgress.org, FIPs must report on action progress. The reviewer will:

1. Confirm the FIP met its six-month reporting deadline by providing a comprehensive update on progress for all actions, including a narrative description of progress.
2. Confirm the FIP submitted evidence for completed actions.
3. Publish the updates to the website if complete, but wait to review the details of the progress update until the annual review.

#### Annual Review

Every 12 months from the date the profile is posted on FisheryProgress.org, FIPs must report on action progress AND provide an update on the FIP's indicator scores. The reviewer will:

1. Re-familiarize with the FIP by reviewing the FIP's profile and MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment, scoping document (if available), and workplan.
2. Confirm that the FIP met its 12-month reporting deadline by providing a detailed update on progress for all actions, including a narrative description of progress; evidence for completed actions; and a description of/evidence for indicator score changes. See Appendix 2 for examples

of progress against indicators warranting a score change or “plus.” See Appendix 3 for indicators relying on reducing risk level within the MSC Risk-Based Framework.

3. Assess the progress details and evidence to confirm that they are accurate, of acceptable quality, and do not raise red flags that would cause site users to doubt the veracity of the FIP’s progress reports. Guidance on evidence is below.
  - **Public evidence.** Evidence for action progress or score changes should be publicly available. If not publicly available, it must meet the following criteria to be acceptable:
    - Be documented in writing.
    - Have a date.
    - Have a source (e.g., person, organization).
    - Have a contact person who can verify it.
    - Be able to be made public on FisheryProgress.org with appropriate anonymizing.
  - **Evidence for action progress** will vary depending on the action. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence for action progress:
    - Signed agreements with consultants, government, or others demonstrating progress on specific activities such as research.
    - Meeting agendas, notes, and/or participant lists.
    - Letters sent to governments, suppliers, or others.
    - Media articles, blog posts, and/or statements posted on a website.
  - **Evidence for score change.** Changes in indicator scores are shown in two ways on FisheryProgress.org: 1) A color change (red to yellow or yellow to green) indicates a FIP has progressed to the next scoring range for that indicator; and 2) A plus sign indicates a FIP has made positive progress within a scoring range but not yet reached the next scoring range.

Score changes may be driven by action progress (see above) or by demonstrated improvements in policy, management, or fishing practices or improvements on the water. Evidence will vary depending on the improvement reported. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence for improvements a FIP may report:

- **Policy change:** management plan, ministerial decree, or media coverage documenting policy change.
- **Change in fishery status:** government or third-party reports showing improvement in fishery (e.g., stock assessment).
- **Changes in fishing practices (e.g., gear changes):** government or consultant report, or summary report from FIP coordinator. For fishing practice changes, evidence must clearly state what proportion of the fishery has implemented the changes.
- **Research (e.g., research done or data collection made more accurate):** peer-reviewed study, consultant or government report, or grant report that confirms data being collected.

For more detailed examples of acceptable evidence for specific changes in indicator scores, see Appendix 2.

4. Focus on areas where specific progress is reported. Where no progress is reported, the reviewer will only spot-check to confirm there are no setbacks in progress (e.g., data collection program with fishermen ended).
5. Consult with Technical Oversight Committee in tough situations (see Proactive Quality Control section below).
6. Address any missing or unclear information by following up with FIP implementer as needed, who can also request a conversation with the reviewer when submitting documentation. Any inquiries and replies by the reviewer and FIP implementer should occur within a reasonable timeframe (five business days when possible).
7. Update the FIP stage based on progress reported.
8. Aim to complete the annual review within one month of the date the report is submitted. This timing may vary depending on the volume of FIPs on the site, amount of follow-up needed to secure additional information from the FIP implementer, and whether or not the FIP reports progress earlier than the 12-month deadline.

### **Three-Year Audit Review (for comprehensive FIPs only)**

Every three years from the date the profile is posted on FisheryProgress.org, comprehensive FIPs are required to have an independent in-person audit of action results and performance against the MSC standard by someone who is both experienced with the MSC standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer) and independent from the organization implementing the FIP. The reviewer will:

- Reach out around the FIP's two-year mark to remind the implementer of FisheryProgress.org's auditor criteria (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer) and answer any questions.
- Confirm the audit report includes information on the auditor's qualifications, and consequently confirm that the auditor has the required experience with the MSC standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer).
- Confirm audit is complete and sufficiently detailed, covering all MSC indicators and mapping to the FIP workplan. (No need to review all elements of the audit in detail.)

## Changes to Timeframes within the FIP Review Process

**Early reporting.** FIPs may submit their six- or 12-month progress reports early if they choose. If this happens, the reviewer will aim to complete the appropriate level of review as soon as practicable, and then reset the six- or 12-month deadline accordingly.

**FIP changes.** Changes may occur over the life of a FIP. The following outlines how the reviewer will respond to minor and significant scope changes (the FIP will submit changes to actions, tasks, and deadlines in the workplan during its six- and 12-month progress reports).

- For minor changes (e.g., change in FIP lead, new participants added), the reviewer will ensure the change is made on the website. Reporting deadlines will remain the same.
- For significant scope changes, the reviewer will work with the FIP to ensure it uploads updated materials, repeat the initial review, and reset the annual review date. If the change is due to increased ambition or scope (e.g., transition from basic to comprehensive), the FIP's new information will be published as soon as it's reviewed. For other changes (e.g., reduction in FIP objectives, majority of participants leave), the reviewer may remove the FIP from the website for a maximum of six months.

## Completed and Inactive FIPs

**Completed FIPs.** When a FIP reports that it is complete and provides independent verification for the final claim it's making about the performance level it has achieved, the reviewer will move it to the Completed section of the website. Examples of claims and appropriate verification include:

Claim	Independent Verification
Certified	Certification report
In MSC full assessment	Publicly announced and not on exited list
Rated	Assessment report
Met specific objective such as bycatch reduction	Independent evidence – government report, peer-reviewed paper, etc.

The reviewer will check to ensure a FIP has adequate evidence to back up its completion claim. The reviewer *will not* track whether the FIP has maintained completion.

**Inactive FIPs.** The reviewer will move a FIP to the Inactive section of the site if:

1. The FIP self-reports that it is ending without achieving its objectives.
2. The FIP misses two sequential six-month reporting deadlines. (A FIP must fully update its progress to move back to Active.)
3. The FIP reports no changes in fishing practice or management or change on the water in three years. (A FIP must provide evidence of at least one change in fishing practice or management or change on the water to move back to Active.)

Inactive FIPs will be removed to the archives of the site after two years if they are not reinstated as Active.

## 4. Quality Control and Appeals Process

### Proactive Quality Control

FisheryProgress.org is committed to consistent, accurate reviews of FIP progress, results, and impact. Our Technical Oversight Committee serves as an expert advisor providing a second opinion to the reviewer in situations where evaluating progress is difficult due to technical issues that require additional capacity, issues of interpretation relative to MSC criteria that present complex scope considerations, or use of complex portions of the standard (e.g. non-DAT fisheries).

In second opinion situations, the reviewer will send his or her specific question(s) to two expert advisor members of the Technical Oversight Committee. These advisors will provide separate and independent answers/interpretations to the reviewer within a few days (as soon as practicable), or if the advisor cannot, the advisor will decline and the reviewer will ask another member of the committee instead. In cases where the issues/questions are too complex for this process, the reviewer will schedule a short conference call with the committee members with at least a week for them to review the issue(s) first.

In addition, the Technical Oversight Committee conducts random spot checks of 12-month progress reviews to ensure consistency and accuracy.

### Conflict Resolution and Appeals Process

**Communication first.** If the reviewer finds that a FIP's self-reporting of type/stage or progress does not have the appropriate evidence (e.g., if the FIP says it is comprehensive but evidence only supports basic, a FIP reports progress on an indicator score but the evidence does not support it), the reviewer will go back to the FIP implementer to discuss the issue and request additional information before making the profile or progress report live on the website.

If a FIP implementer or stakeholder has concerns about the outcome of a type/stage or progress review, he/she will first contact the reviewer to discuss these concerns, address questions, or correct inaccuracies in the reporting so that the issue can be resolved informally if possible.

**Appeals process.** If the challenge cannot be addressed informally, the FIP implementer or other stakeholder can enter into a formal appeals process to challenge the decision by the reviewer:

- **Appeal filed.** The FIP implementer or stakeholder files a notice of appeal within 30 calendar days of the reviewer's decision. The appeal template document will be available on the website and will request basic information for appeals (including FIP name, appeal requester's information, explanation of appeal, etc.). Once completed, the party requesting appeal will send it to Albert Arthur ([albert@fishchoice.com](mailto:albert@fishchoice.com)).
- **Initial review.** A majority of the Technical Oversight Committee reviews the appeal and makes a recommendation to the Advisory Committee within 30 calendar days.
- **Final decision.** The Advisory Committee reviews the Technical Oversight Committee's recommendation. If there is disagreement, a joint meeting is held between the Advisory Committee and the Technical Oversight Committee to discuss the disagreement. At the end of

the meeting, the Advisory Committee makes the final decision about how to proceed. A final decision must be reached within 30 calendar days.

- Decision communicated. The reviewer communicates the final decision back to the party requesting appeal within one week. This communication should be a standardized written communication. The communication will not be public, though the FIP may do its own communication about its status.
- Conflict of interest. Any member of the Technical Oversight Committee or Advisory Committee with a conflict of interest (i.e., not independent from the FIP or the appealing party) will abstain from any discussions/decisions about the appeal.

## Appendix 1: Examples of FIP Actions & Timeframes

This appendix is designed to be used by the FIP reviewer in evaluating whether workplans are sufficiently detailed and realistic to meet the specifications of the website. The examples given are illustrative of the type and granularity of information to expect in an appropriately detailed action plan. The timeframes attached to each action are meant to give the FIP reviewer at least a rough gauge of whether the amount of time allocated to certain types of actions within a FIP workplan are reasonable and appropriate, recognizing a high degree of variability possible here contingent upon the specific circumstances of each fishery and FIP.

While timeframes below are given in relative terms, it is also possible to see absolute timeframes given with fixed end dates (and sometimes even fixed start dates). However, in most cases, certain actions are deemed higher priority than others and thus will start before others, and must be completed before the next tier of priorities is started. Therefore, the timeframes may be given in relative terms as below.

FIP implementers should be encouraged to use the MSC's action plan guidance and template to ensure complete and sufficiently detailed workplans are submitted to the website. FIP implementers may also use the below set of examples in laying out their workplans, but the main intended audience for this appendix is the FIP reviewer.

### 1. Development of Revised Data Collection Form

Provide a brief review of the current data collection procedures for the target species to determine the type, quality, and quantity of data available. This will be used to identify key information gaps and develop a revised data collection form.

The form should be used to collect information about the target species, as well as primary, secondary, and ETP species, sufficient to detect any increase in risk on the populations. Inclusion of categories for species other than target species on the data form will help to demonstrate the level of impact from the fishery. An ability to demonstrate a negligible impact would support a lack of management strategy necessary to maintain these non-target species above relevant levels. A review and modification of the form is expected to take less than six months to complete, given sufficient resources.

<b>Working Group</b>	Fishery agency, processors, external consultant (assessment) [note these would be specifically named entities in a real workplan]
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Status</b>	Ongoing/New
<b>Timeframe</b>	<6 months
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s)</b>	1.1.1. Stock status 2.1.3. Primary Species: Information and monitoring 2.2.3. Secondary Species: Information and monitoring 2.3.3. ETP Species: Information and monitoring 2.5.3. Ecosystem: Information and monitoring

## 2. Update and Maintenance of Fisheries Information System

Revise existing electronic fisheries information system (database) to accommodate new data from collection form. A number of routine checks can be employed to monitor data quality, including surveillance audits to cross-check fishers' reported catch with processors records. The results can also be used to target regions with lower compliance to increase efficiency of monitoring and surveillance. It is expected this task will take about 18 months to complete, given sufficient resources.

<b>Working Group</b>	Fishery agency
<b>Priority</b>	Medium/High
<b>Status</b>	New
<b>Timeframe</b>	18 months
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s)</b>	1.1.1. Stock status 1.2.2. Harvest control rules and tools 1.2.3. Information and monitoring

## 3. Campaign to Educate Fishers on Species Management Regulations

Develop a poster to inform public sector of key target species management measures (minimum size, season length, etc.). These can be placed at processing facilities, landing sites, etc., to increase awareness. Conduct Public Service Announcement (PSA) about new government initiatives on species management. These activities are expected to take 24 months to complete, given sufficient resources.

<b>Working Group</b>	Fishery agency, NGOs
<b>Priority</b>	Medium/High
<b>Status</b>	New
<b>Timeframe</b>	24 months
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s)</b>	1.2.3. Information and monitoring 3.2.3. Compliance and enforcement

## 4. Formalize Designated Landing Sites

At present, catches are normally landed at one of a number of recognized landing sites. However, if fewer regional landing sites can be designated to land the target species, this will permit fisheries inspectors to focus on specific areas thus increasing their efficiency. Furthermore, fishers landing outside designated ports would be liable for prosecution since this catch would not be available for monitoring. The government could increase benefits to fishers landing at designated sites (e.g., providing facilities for gasoline, boat repair, ice). Formalization of landing sites is expected to take 36 months to complete.

<b>Working Group</b>	Fishery agency
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Status</b>	New
<b>Timeframe</b>	36 months
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s)</b>	1.2.1. Harvest strategy 3.2.3. Compliance and enforcement

## 5. Develop Surveillance Program at Landing Sites

Following the development of designated landing sites, the current fisheries monitoring program should be updated to take into account the likelihood of infringements occurring at each site. Hence landing sites that have statistically higher level of infringements could be targeted more often than areas with greater compliance. Development of a revised monitoring program is expected to take 60 months to complete.

<b>Working Group</b>	Fishery agency
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Status</b>	Ongoing/New
<b>Timeframe</b>	60 months
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s)</b>	1.2.1. Harvest strategy 1.2.3. Information and monitoring 2.1.3. Primary Species: Information and monitoring 2.2.3. Secondary Species: Information and monitoring 2.3.3. ETP Species: Information and monitoring 3.2.3. Compliance and enforcement

## Appendix 2: Examples of Progress Resulting in a “Plus” or Increase in Scoring

When evaluating evidence for progress against the indicators, the reviewer will consider the following:

- On the MSC scale, movement on single scoring issues (SIs) within a Performance Indicator (PI) from 0-59, 60-79, or 80-100 would be an acceptable degree of progress warranting a plus. For the 0-59 scoring range, if a fishery has met one or more interim activities, it would earn a plus sign.
- In the 60-80+ scoring range, meeting a scoring guidepost (SG) results in an increase in scoring.
- That positive progress is not unduly warranted by simply completing single tasks that contribute to interim activities.

Examples of progress against activities (in the 0-59 scoring range) or achievement of single SIs (in the 60-80+ scoring range) with sufficient evidence to warrant a “plus” or an increase in scoring include:

- **Progress leading to eventual increase in scoring for PI 1.2.4 (assessment of stock status):**
  - Evidence of a completed data-gathering workshop – Workshop agenda and report, including attendees present, topics covered, and resulting actions.
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence of consultation and data collection – Record of stakeholder correspondence and meetings and presentation of identified sources of data relevant to the planned stock assessment.
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence of a completed draft stock assessment appropriate to the size and scale of the fishery – Copy of stock assessment document.
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence of a completed stock assessment – Copy of final stock assessment document that has been independently reviewed. (Note: The outcomes of this set of actions will also bear on the progress against PI 1.1.1.)
    - Recommended change: increase in scoring
- **Progress leading to eventual increase in scoring for PI 2.1.1 (primary species outcome):**
  - Evidence of catch composition data – Collated logbook reports, aggregated dockside sampling reports, etc. If this is non-public information, reviewer must be confident that it meets the specification for non-public information (see above). Identification of main primary species is expected as an outcome of this work.
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence of stock status with regard to point of recruitment impairment (PRI) – Stock assessments appropriate for the scale and size of the fishery or, where such information does not exist, completed Productivity Susceptibility Analysis (PSA) together with references for source data. (See more on use of the Risk-Based Framework [RBF] in Appendix 3.)
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence of determination of stock status with regard to PRI/PSA outcome for some main primary species.

- Recommended change: + sign
  - Where none of the main primary species are below PRI, evidence of the determination of stock status with regard to PRI/PSA outcome for all main primary species.
    - Recommended change: color change
  - Where some/all main primary species are below PRI, evidence of recovery for those species.
    - Recommended change: color change
  - Where some/all main primary species are below PRI and there is no evidence of recovery, evidence that an effective strategy is in place between all fisheries that categorize the relevant species as main. (See Appendix 4 for more details on how primary, secondary, and ETP species are categorized and when to consider cumulative impacts on these species.)
    - Recommended change: increase in scoring
- **Progress leading to eventual increase in scoring for PI 3.2.3 (compliance and enforcement):**
  - Evidence for development of a monitoring, control, and surveillance (MCS) mechanism – Report of control and surveillance activities present in the fishery, formal or informal together with a qualitative account from local stakeholders as to their effectiveness (e.g., Is there widespread subverting of the system? Landing of undersized animals? Taking too many? Fishing in closed areas?).
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence in case where deficiencies are identified – Plan presented to address them includes system of formal or informal sanctions and/or incentives for complying with operational fishing regulations or bylaws with evidence of stakeholder consultation/buy-in.
    - Recommended change: + sign
  - Evidence provided that the plan has been put in place and is functioning (with good compliance) – New fisheries regulations, including the MCS system and associated sanctions for non-compliance, as well as evidence that fishermen and other relevant stakeholders are aware of these. Where the fishery is locally controlled through informal control measures, a description of these measures together with evidence that they are effective could be provided by the fishery as long as there is a way for the reviewer to verify its authenticity and accuracy (see details on non-public information above).
    - Recommended change: increase in scoring

**Additional examples of evidence that could be sufficient to warrant increase in scoring include:**

- Evidence of recovery of a stock – Time-series data in a stock assessment appropriate to the size and scale of the fishery. Where status is unknown and PSA shows medium or high risk, it is possible to demonstrate that the fishery is unlikely to be hindering recovery if measures are put in place to lower the PSA risk score by reducing susceptibility. Either of these is sufficient for SG60 in PI 1.1.2.
- Evidence of a completed stock assessment that estimates stock status relative to generic reference points (whether or not it has been independently reviewed and deemed appropriate and valid) is sufficient for SG60 in PI 1.2.4.
- Evidence for mechanisms to evaluate some parts of the management system – Signed contracts or MOUs with management system experts (internal or external consultants), reports or

minutes from meetings or workshops held with expert stakeholders for the purpose of management system evaluation, formal management strategy evaluation models and reports, etc. This would be sufficient for SG60 in PI 3.2.5.

## Appendix 3: Workplans for Fisheries Using the MSC Risk Based Framework (RBF) for One or More Indicators

### Standard Requirement if Using the RBF<sup>1</sup>

The required improvement might relate to one of the species and/or habitat-related outcome PIs. In data-deficient cases, a PSA and/or a Consequence Spatial Analysis (CSA) may have been conducted. Alternatively, it might be possible that the RBF will have to be used to score one element within a particular performance indicator (e.g., a species or sub-habitat) in a full assessment. In such cases, the workplan action should refer to the relevant attributes listed in the PSA/CSA sections of the RBF of the fisheries assessment methodology.

In effect, in cases where performance improvement is required because the fishery poses too high a risk to certain attributes affecting the sustainability of a species/habitat, the goal will be to reduce risks of the fishery to the particular attribute(s). For example, a PSA may have been conducted on some of the primary species taken in the fishery. This could have revealed that one species scores highly (i.e., the risks are too high) on the selectivity attribute. The action could read: “Reduce the risks posed by the selectivity of [xxx] fishing method to [abc] species.” Progress on such an improvement should therefore aim to reduce the risk score, thus resulting in a lower risk that the fishing method in use poses an unacceptably high risk to the sustainability of the species in question. This could be accomplished, for example, by changing when or where the gear is set, or modifying the gear design (e.g., using circle hooks to avoid turtles). Another example of reducing susceptibility could be adopting safer handling techniques for bycatch/discard species to lower the post-capture mortality. The main thing to remember here is that the improvement is directly related to reducing the risk in the context of the MSC’s RBF, normally by reducing susceptibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> Much of this text was taken from: [https://www.msc.org/documents/developing-world/fishery-improvement-projects/Fisheries\\_Improvements\\_Action\\_Plan\\_Guidance.pdf](https://www.msc.org/documents/developing-world/fishery-improvement-projects/Fisheries_Improvements_Action_Plan_Guidance.pdf)

## Appendix 4: Threshold Values and Associated Definitions Used to Categorize Primary, Secondary, and ETP Species and Cumulative Impacts

Definitions of P2 Species and Categories	“Main” Thresholds	“Less Resilient” Threshold	“Considerable Catch” Threshold	Cumulative Impacts Threshold
<p>Primary species: A species that is caught but is not the target species, that is within scope of the MSC program (i.e., not an amphibian, reptile, bird, or marine mammal), and that has management tools and measures in place.</p>	<p>Catch of a species by the unit of assessment (UoA; i.e., what’s being assessed) is 5% or more by weight of the total catch of all species by the UoA.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Species is classified as less resilient.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Exceptionally large catch occurs.</p>	<p>Catch of a species is 2% or more by weight of the total catch of all species by the UoA.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p><i>Only for species that are below point of recruitment impairment (PRI):</i> All MSC UoAs that categorize the species as main primary.</p>
<p>Secondary species: A species that is not considered primary or is a species that is out of scope (i.e., amphibian, reptile, bird, or marine mammal) but is not ETP (see ETP definition below).</p>	<p><i>For in-scope species:</i> Catch of a species by the UoA is 5% or more by weight of the total catch of all species by the UoA.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Species is classified as less resilient.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Exceptionally large catch occurs (see definition below).</p>	<p>Catch of a species is 2% or more by weight of the total catch of all species by the UoA.</p>	<p>A main secondary species that comprise more than 10% of the total catch by weight of the UoA.</p>	<p><i>Only for main secondary species that are outside a biologically based limit and catch is “considerable”:</i> All MSC UoAs that have “considerable catch” of that secondary species.</p>

	<i>For out-of-scope species:</i> Species that are non-ETP but are out of scope.			
ETP species: A species recognized by national ETP legislation; species listed in a binding international agreement (refer to MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements SA3.1.5.2 for the list of relevant binding international agreements); or out-of-scope species that are listed in the IUCN Red List as vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered.	N/A – All ETP species encountered by the UoA are to be assessed independent of amounts.	N/A	N/A	<i>Only in cases where there are national and/or international set limits:</i> All MSC UoAs encountering the species.
<b>Other Relevant Definitions</b>				
Unit of assessment (UoA): The target stock combined with the fishing method/gear and practice pursuing that stock. In short, it is the fishery being assessed.				
Less resilient: When the productivity of the species indicates that it is intrinsically of low resilience (which can be determined by the productivity part of the Productivity Susceptibility Analysis) or when their resilience has been lowered by anthropogenic or natural changes to their life history.				
Exceptionally large catch: Take account of the relative catches of both target and the P2 species and determine whether the risk to the population of the impacted P2 species is significant enough to warrant a designation as “main.” In the absence of full information, a catch by the UoA of 400,000 mt of the target species is “exceptionally large.”				
MSC UoAs: Those UoAs that are in assessment or certified at the time the UoA in question announces its assessment or reassessment on the MSC website.				