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## Comprehensive Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Scoping Document

# **Introduction**

The purpose of a comprehensive FIP scoping document is to recommend strategies to address the fishery’s challenges, as identified in the MSC pre-assessment. Within the scoping document, the MSC performance indicators (PIs) will be prioritized to help guide the development of FIP actions. The goal of a comprehensive FIP is to move the fishery toward performing at a level consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. Comprehensive FIPs are designed to bring the fishery to an 80 score for each PI to ensure that the fishery could pass an MSC full assessment. Scores for each PI are determined by conformance with MSC scoring guideposts (SGs) (i.e., the level of performance established equating to numeric scores of 60, 80 or 100 for each PI).

The scoping document must be completed or audited by an entity experienced with applying the MSC standard (please see Appendix A: Comprehensive FIP Consultant Criteria in the [FisheryProgress Review Guidelines](https://www.dropbox.com/s/r6v4t6m4tbe2e3n/FisheryProgress%20org%20Review%20Guidelines%202018%20-%20FINAL.pdf?dl=0).)). The scoping document provides recommendations on the actions that may be taken to reach one or more of the MSC SG but is not meant to be prescriptive. It will recommend strategies to address the fishery’s challenges, as identified in the MSC pre-assessment. Within the scoping document, the MSC performance indicators (PIs) will be prioritized to help guide the development of FIP actions. The final FIP work plan activities should be agreed upon by FIP stakeholders.

# 

# **Outline of template content**

The comprehensive FIP scoping document template identifies information that should be included in the following four sections:

1) Definition of the FIP unit of assessment

2) Performance indicators (PIs) summary

3) Recommendations for Improvements by PI

4) Additional impacts

# **Template**

# **1. Definition of the FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA)1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the fishery |  |
| Commodity group |  |
| Species common name |  |
| Species scientific name |  |
| The target stock(s) |  |
| The fishing method or gear type(s) and/or practice |  |
| The fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing that stock |  |
| Country |  |
| Continent |  |
| FAO major fishing areas |  |

# 1 The FIP UoA identifies the full scope of what was assessed

# **2. Performance Indicators Summary**

**Note: The following text is included as reference and it is suggested to be used when developing your report.**

*“As part of an MSC pre-assessment for the [insert 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 (SG <60),and require conditions for other PIs (SG 60-79). The scores for all PIs are included in Table 1 including the likely time frame for the PI to be addressed”*

**Table 1. Summary information for each Performance Indicator highlighted within the MSC pre-assessment as scoring either as fail (SG <60), achieve a conditional pass (60-79), or pass (SG >80).**

### Principle 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI Category** | | **Scoring Range** | **Related PIs** |
| 1.1.1 | Stock Status | **Example:** SG<60 | 1.1.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4 |
| 1.1.2 | Stock Rebuilding |  | 1.1.1 |
| 1.2.1 | 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 and monitoring |  | 1.2.1 |
| 1.2.4 | Assessment of Stock Status |  | 1.2.1 |

### Principle 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI Category** | | **Scoring** | **Related PIs** |
| 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/Monitoring |  | 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, 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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI Category** | | **Scoring** | **Related PIs** |
| 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 |  | 1.21.,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 |

# 

# **3. Recommendations for Improvements by PI**

This section of the scoping document indicates the current performance of the fishery and provides more detail on the scoring issue level of each MSC PI that is likely to cause the fishery to either fail (SG <60) or pass with conditions (SG 60- 79).

The priority of addressing PIs should be listed as high, medium or low depending on several criteria, including the MSC pre-assessment scores (PI scores that are likely to cause the fishery to fail might be a high priority), sequencing of actions (output of one action needed to begin another action), and available funding for specific actions. The rationale for PI priority levels can also be included in the scoping document.

A brief description of the type of information and/or action that might help the fishery reach one or more scoring guideposts should be included. These recommendations can then be used to help inform the development of the FIP work plan with stakeholders. Table 1 below is a blank template to copy and paste as needed (grey shaded fields need to be completed). Table 2 below is an example of a completed template.

**Table 1. Template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI and Name** | **PI Description** | | |
| **Scoring Guidepost** | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| **Scoring issue description** | {Add description from the MSC standard for the specific PI} | {Add description from the MSC standard for the specific PI} | {Add description from the MSC standard for the specific PI} |
| **Scoring Range and Rationale** | {Add score and reasons for the scoring} | | |
| **Improvement Recommendations** | {Include recommendations} | | |
| **Priority** | {High, medium, or low} | | |

[**Copy and paste table as appropriate]**

**Table 2: Example**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1.1 Stock Status** | **The stock is at a level which maintains high productivity and has a low probability of recruitment overfishing** | | |
| **Scoring Guidepost** | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| **Scoring Issue Description** |  | | |
| 1. The stock status relative to recruitment impairment | 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 point where recruitment would be impaired.    The stock is at or fluctuating around its target reference point. | There is a high degree of certainty that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired.  There is a high degree of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around its target reference point, or has been above its target reference point, over recent years. |
| 1. The stock status in relation to achievement of MSY |  | 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. |
| **Scoring Range and Rationale** | Stock status is not known quantitatively. The Risk Based Framework (RBF) methodology was used to assess the stock status. 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. | | |
| **Improvement Recommendations** | 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. | | |
| **Priority** | High | | |

# **4. Additional Impacts**

Some FIPs may choose to address fishery challenges that go beyond the current MSC standard, such as labor and human rights or traceability improvements. This section will allow implementers to include these impacts.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Additional Impact Title** (e.g., Labor Rights, Traceability) | **Additional Impact Description** |
| **Status Summary** |  |
| **Improvement Recommendation** |  |

[**Copy and paste table as appropriate]**