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**Introduction**

Following the completion of a MSC assessment for the [name of fishery] fishery in [year], a number of Performance Indicators (PIs) were scored such that the fishery would fail under a full MSC assessment (score below 60), and require conditions for other PIs (score between 60 and 80). The scores awarded to the fishery for all PIs are set out in Table 1.

The definition of the Unit of Assessment (UoA) [[1]](#footnote-1) as outlined in the pre-assessment is:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The target stock(s)** |  |
| **The fishing method or gear type/s, vessel type/s and/or practice** |  |
| **The fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursing that stock.** |  |
| **Other eligible fishers that are outside the Unit of Certification (UoC)[[2]](#footnote-2)** |  |

The main purpose of this document is to identify and prioritise the PI categories under each of the three MSC Principles such that relevant tasks, or actions, may be developed as part of a Fishery Improvement Project (FIP). The goal of a FIP is to move the fishery toward performing at a level consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. FIPs are designed to bring the fishery to an 80 score for each performance indicator (PI) to ensure that the fishery could pass full assessment. Scores for each PI are determined by conformance with scoring guideposts, the level of performance established equating to numeric scores of 60, 80 or 100 for each PI.

The following summary table provides general information about each PI that might cause the fishery to either fail (High Priority), pass with conditions (Medium Priority), or likely to pass (Low Priority) (see Table 1). In addition, the likely timeframe for the completion of tasks associated with each PI have been highlighted.

This scoping document is designed to assist in the planning phase of a FIP and provides an example of the likely range of activities or steps that may be considered to reach one or more the MSC scoring guideposts (SG). These have been outlined in the following set of tables to demonstrate what outcome(s) or information is required to prevent a fail (score < 60) and achieve a conditional pass (score > 60 but < 80) or pass (score > 80).

Table 1: Summary information for Performance Indicators highlighted within the MSC Pre-assessment to be either a high (< SG60), medium priority (score > 60 but < 80), or low priority (> SG80).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Indicator Category** | | **Priority** | **Timeframe** | **Linkages** |
| **Principle 1** | | | | |
| 1.1.1 | Stock status |  |  | 1.1.2, 1.2.2 |
| 1.1.2 | Stock Rebuilding |  |  | 1.1.1 |
| 1.2.1 | Performance of the harvest strategy |  |  | 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, , 3.2.1 |
| 1.2.2 | Harvest control rules and tools |  |  | 1.1.1, 1.2.1 |
| 1.2.3 | Information/ monitoring |  |  | 1.2.1 |
| 1.2.4 | Assessment of Stock Status |  |  | 1.2.1 |
| **Principle 2** | | | | |
| 2.1.1 | Primary spp: Outcome Status |  |  | 2.1.2, 2.1.3 |
| 2.1.2 | Primary spp: Management Strategy |  |  | 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.1.3 | Primary spp: Information |  |  | 2.1.1, 2.1.2, |
| 2.2.1 | Secondary spp: Outcome Status |  |  | 2.2.2, 2.2.3 |
| 2.2.2 | Secondary spp: Management Strategy |  |  | 2.2.1, 2.2.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.2.3 | Secondary spp: Information/Monitoring |  |  | 2.2.1, 2.2.2 |
| 2.3.1 | ETP spp: Outcome Status |  |  | 2.3.2, 2.3.3 |
| 2.3.2 | ETP spp: Management Strategy |  |  | 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.3.3 | ETP spp: Information/Monitoring |  |  | 2.3.1, 2.3.2 |
| 2.4.1 | Habitat: Outcome Status |  |  | 2.4.2, 2.4.3 |
| 2.4.2 | Habitat: Management Strategy |  |  | 2.4.1, 2.4.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.4.3 | Habitat: Information/Monitoring |  |  | 2.4.1, 2.4.2 |
| 2.5.1 | Ecosystem: Outcome Status |  |  | 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 1.1.1, 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.4.1 |
| 2.5.2 | Ecosystem: Management Strategy |  |  | 2.5.1,2.5.3, 1.2.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2, 3.2.1 |
| 2.5.3 | Ecosystem: Information/Monitoring |  |  | 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3, 2.4.3 |
| **Principle 3** | | | | |
| 3.1.1 | Governance and policy: legal and/or Customary Framework |  |  | 3.1.2, 3.1.3 |
| 3.1.2 | Governance and policy: Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities |  |  | 3.1.1, 3.2.2 |
| 3.1.3 | Governance and policy: Long Term Objectives |  |  | 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 |
| 3.2.1 | Fishery Specific Management System: Fishery-Specific Objectives |  |  | 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2, 2.5.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.2.5. |
| 3.2.2 | Fishery specific Management System: Decision-Making Processes |  |  | 3.1.2, 3.2.1 |
| 3.2.3 | Fishery Specific Management System: Compliance & Enforcement |  |  | 1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3, 2.4.3 |
| 3.2.4 | Fishery Specific Management System: Monitoring and Management Performance Evaluation |  |  | 3.2.1 |

# Key MSC Performance Indicators to Inform FIP

The MSC assessment report has highlighted a number of PIs that may cause the [name of fishery] fishery to either fail assessment against some Performance Indicators (PIs) or pass a full assessment with conditions relating to other PIs.

This section provides more detail of each PI likely to cause concern within three major MSC Principles and indicates the current status of the fishery against one or more of the MSC scoring guideposts at 60 and 80. If the fishery is likely to fail a full assessment based on the PI score, it is given a High Priority, whereas a fishery that might pass with conditions is given a Medium Priority, and likely to pass is given a Low priority. A short description of the type of information and/or research that might help the fishery attain the standard necessary to reach one or more scoring guidepost is also given to assist in developing a Fishery Improvement Project.

| PI 1.1.1 Stock Status | | The stock is at a level which 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 where recruitment would be impaired (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. |
| b | **Stock status in relation to achievement of 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Insert name of the fishery: | |
| Scoring comments | Stock status is not known quantitatively. The Risk Based Framework (RBF) methodology was therefore used to assess stock status. The RBF estimates risk based on the assumption that the risk to a species depends on two characteristics: (1) the extent of the impact due to the fishing activity, which will be determined by the susceptibility to the fishing activities (Susceptibility) and (2) the productivity of mahi mahi (Productivity), which will determine the rate at which recovery can occur after potential depletion or damage by fishing. Mahi mahi is a very productive species; however its high susceptibility to fishing activity determines that the risk would likely be estimated as high under any full assessment. |
| Priority | High | |
| FIP Comments | The application of the RBF determined that the fishery is likely to pose a high risk on the productivity of the stock. Therefore an important pre-requisite for scoring 60 and above is to develop reference points. Stock biomass (or stock biomass indicators) and fishing mortality should be estimated through stock assessment and the results compared with target and limit reference points. It is necessary to define a target reference point consistent with BMSY to reach an unconditional pass. | |

| PI 1.1.2 Stock Rebuilding | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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 which does not exceed **one generation time** for the stock. |
| b | **Rebuilding evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 1.2.1 Harvest Strategy | | There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Issue | | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| a | **Harvest strategy design** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Harvest strategy evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Harvest strategy monitoring** | | | |
| Guidepost | Monitoring is in place that is expected to determine whether the harvest strategy is working. |  |  |
| d | **Harvest strategy** **review** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | The harvest strategy is periodically reviewed and improved as necessary. |
| e | **Shark** **finning** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| f | **Review of alternative measures** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 1.2.2 Harvest Control Rules and Tools | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | **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. |
| b | **HCRs robustness to** **uncertainty** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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. |
| c | **HCRs evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 1.2.3 Information/Monitoring | | Relevant information is collected to support the harvest strategy | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Issue | | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| a | **Range of** **information** | | | |
| Guidepost | **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 is 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. |
| b | **Monitoring** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Comprehensiveness of** **information** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | There is good information on all other fishery removals from the stock. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 1.2.4 Assessment of Stock Status | | There is an adequate assessment of the stock status | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Issue | | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| a | **Appropriateness of assessment to stock** **under consideration** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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. |
| b | **Assessment** **approach** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |  |
| c | **Uncertainty in the** **assessment** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| d | **Evaluation of assessment** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | The assessment has been tested and shown to be robust. Alternative hypotheses and assessment approaches have been rigorously explored. |
| e | **Peer review of** **assessment** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | The assessment of stock status is subject to peer review. | The assessment has been **internally and externally** peer reviewed. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.1.1 Primary Species Outcome Status | | The UoA aims to maintain primary species above the 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Minor primary species** **stock status** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | 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 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.1.2 Primary Species Management Strategy | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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 above the point where recruitment would be impaired. | 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 point where recruitment would be impaired. | There is a **strategy** in place for the UoA for managing main and minor primary species. |
| b | **Management strategy** **evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Management strategy implementation** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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). |
| d | **Shark finning** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| e | **Review of** **alternative measures** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.1.3 Primary Species Information | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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 adeqaute 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 susceptiblity 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. |
| b | **Information adequacy for** **assessment of impact on minor primary species** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | Some quantitative information is adequate to estimate the impact of the UoA on minor primary species with respect to status. |
| c | **Information adequacy** **for management strategy** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.2.1 Secondary Species Outcome Status | | 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 | **Main secondary species** **stock status** | | | |
| Guidepost | Main Secondary species are **likely** to be within 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 also 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 within biologically based limits. |
| b | **Minor secondary species stock status** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | 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 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.2.2 Secondary Species Management Strategy | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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 within 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 within 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. |
| b | **Management strategy** **evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Management strategy implementation** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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). |
| d | **Shark finning** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| e | **Review of alternative measures** **to minimise mortality of unwanted catch** | | | |
| Justification | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.2.3 Secondary Species Information | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Information adequacy for assessment of impacts on minor secondary species** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | Some quantitative information is adequate to estimate the impact of the UoA on minor secondary species with respect to status. |
| c | **Information adequacy for** **management strategy** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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**. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.3.1 ETP Species Outcome Status | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Direct effects** | | | |
| Guidepost | Known direct effects of the UoA are likely to not **hinder recovery** of ETP species. | Known 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. |
| c | **Indirect** **effects** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | Indirect effects have been considered 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 fishery on ETP species. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.3.2 ETP Species Management Strategy | | 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)** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Management strategy in place** **(alternative)** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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 |
| c | **Management strategy** **evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| d | **Management strategy** **implementation** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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). |
| e | **Review of alternative measures** **to minimize mortality of ETP species** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.3.3 ETP Species Information | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Information adequacy for management** **strategy** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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, minimize mortality and injury of ETP species, and evaluate with a **high degree of certainty** whether a strategy is achieving its objectives. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.4.1 Habitats Outcome Status | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **VME** **habitat status** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Minor habitat status** | | | |
| Guidepost |  |  | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.4.2 Habitats Management Strategy | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Management strategy** **evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Management strategy** **implementation** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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). |
| d | **Compliance with management requirements and other MSC UoAs’/non-MSC fisheries’ measures to protect VMEs** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.4.3 Habitats Information/Monitoring | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Information adequacy** **for assessment of impacts** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Monitoring** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | Adequate information continues to be collected to detect any increase in risk to the main habitats. | Changes in habitat distributions over time are measured. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.5.1 Ecosystem Outcome Status | | The UoA does 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.5.2 Ecosystem Management Strategy | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | There are **measures** in place, if necessary which take into account the **potential impacts** of the fishery 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. |
| b | **Management** **strategy evaluation** | | | |
| Guidepost | The **measures** are considered likely to work, based on plausible argument (e.g., general experience, theory or comparison with similar fisheries/ 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 |
| c | **Management strategy implementation** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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)**. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 2.5.3 Ecosystem Information/Monitoring | | There is adequate knowledge of the impacts of the UoA on the ecosystem. | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Issue | | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| a | **Information** **quality** | | | |
| Guidepost | Information is adequate to **identify** the key elements of the ecosystem. | Information is adequate to **broadly understand** the key elements of the ecosystem. |  |
| b | **Investigation of** **UoA impacts** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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**. |
| c | **Understanding of component** **functions** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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**. |
| d | **Information** **relevance** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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. |
| e | **Monitoring** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.1.1 Governance and policy: Legal and/or customary framework | | 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); and * 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Resolution of disputes** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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**. |
| c | **Respect for rights** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.1.2 Governance and policy: Consultation, roles and responsibilities. | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Consultation** **processes** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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 accept** 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**. |
| c | **Participation** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.1.3  Governance and policy: Long term objectives. | | The management policy 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | Long-term objectives to guide decision-making, consistent with the MSC fisheries standard and the precautionary approach, are **implicit** within management policy. | Clear long-term objectives that guide decision-making, consistent with MSC fisheries standard and the precautionary approach are **explicit** within management policy. | Clear long-term objectives that guide decision-making, consistent with MSC fisheries standard and the precautionary approach, are **explicit** within **and required by** management policy. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.2.1 Fishery specific management system: Fishery specific objectives | | The fishery-specific management system has 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | **Objectives**, which are broadly consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC’s 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’s 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’s Principles 1 and 2, are explicit within the fishery-specific management system. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.2.2 Fishery specific management system: Decision-making processes | | 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |  |
| b | **Responsiveness of** **decision-making processes** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Use of precautionary** **approach** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | Decision-making processes use the precautionary approach and are based on best available information. |  |
| d | **Accountability and transparency** **of management system and decision-making process** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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**, andexplanations 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. |
| e | **Approach to** **disputes** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.2.3 Fishery specific management system: Compliance and enforcement | | 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** **implementation** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Sanctions** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| c | **Compliance** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| d | **Systematic** **non-compliance** | | | |
| Guidepost |  | There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

| PI 3.2.4 Fishery specific management system: Monitoring and management performance evaluation. | | There is a system of 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** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |
| b | **Internal** **and/or external review** | | | |
| Guidepost | 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the Fishery | |
| Scoring comments |  |
| Priority |  |
| FIP Comments |  |

1. The Unit of Assessment (UoA) defines the full scope of what is being assessed. It may include other eligible fishers that may not be covered by the fishery certificate). The UoA is therefore equal or larger than the Unit of Certification (UoC). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The UoC is defined as what is to be covered by the certificate. MSC certification is specific to the fishery holding the certificate, defined as the UoC. MSC Fishery assessments may be defined as a wider unit, as the UoA, which may include other eligible fisheries. The MSC certification sharing mechanism allows other eligible fisheries assessed under the UoA to join the fishery certificate. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)