Environmental Rapid Assessment

Report Template

Version 1.1, November 2020

# Purpose

This template is associated with the ERA methodology document, which contains detailed information about scoring each PI. Text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section.

# Executive summary

*Summarize the assessment results here.*

# Abbreviations

*Optional: list abbreviations and acronyms used in the report.*

# Methodology background

*Optional: we suggest including this background information on the assessment methodology for a general audience.*

The Environmental Rapid Assessment (ERA) methodology was co-developed by [Ocean Outcomes](http://www.oceanoutcomes.org/), [World Wildlife Fund US](https://www.worldwildlife.org/), and the [Sustainable Fisheries Partnership](https://www.sustainablefish.org/) and is based on their existing assessment tools and feedback from other non-profit groups. It is based on Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)'s performance indicators (PIs) and draws concepts/definitions from both the MSC and Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch (MBA SFW) standards, specifically the MSC Fisheries Standard Version 2.01 and the MBA SFW Standard for Fisheries Version 3.2. Although it relies heavily on concepts developed and tested by MSC and MBA SFW, this methodology does not replicate or replace either an MSC pre-assessment or a SFW assessment. This assessment is designed to present key information about the fishery and identify major deficiencies in ecological sustainability, for general scoping or to facilitate movement of a fishery into an improvement project. The assessment can also be used to post a basic or prospective fishery improvement project profile on [www.fisheryprogress.org](http://www.fisheryprogress.org).

To maintain consistency with MSC pre-assessment protocols and scoring ranges used on FisheryProgress.org, assessors assign a scoring range to each PI using a red-yellow-green traffic light system (Table 1). ‘Default priority’ refers to the general importance of addressing the identified deficiency; priority levels may be adjusted depending on the specific circumstances of the fishery under assessment.

Table 1. Environmental Rapid Assessment scoring ranges.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score range** | **Default priority** | **General definition of management performance** |
| <60 | High | * Key aspects of management remain insufficient or ineffective, due to a lack of resources, will, and/or framework. * There is limited information on stock status, or available information suggests that stocks are overfished. * There is limited information on ecosystem impacts from the fishery, or available information suggests that fishing activity causes some significant impacts to the habitat and ecosystem.   Relation to MSC assessment: this PI is likely to fail |
| 60-79 | Medium | * Some important management aspects may be lacking, but none are sufficient to prevent a passing rating by themselves. Monitoring and enforcement is in place and believed effective. * Information is available to estimate fishing mortality and effects on non-target and ETP species, and the fishery is unlikely to hinder ETP recovery. Habitat and ecosystem impacts are possible, though the fishery is unlikely to cause serious or irreversible harm.   Relation to MSC assessment: a condition may be needed for this PI |
| ≥80 | Low | * Management measures in place are expected to be effective, and precaution is accounted for. * Stock-specific reference points are available and show that biomass is highly likely above a limit and is fluctuating around a target (normally MSY). Information is available to assess fishing mortality and impacts on non-target and ETP species. There is strong evidence that the fishery is not causing serious harm to habitats or ecosystems.   Relation to MSC assessment: an unconditional pass for this PI appears likely |

## Scoring summary

*Fill in the likely scoring category (green, yellow, or red) for each performance indicator (PI) after the assessment is complete.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Principle** | **Component** | **PI #** | **Performance Indicator** | **Scoring category** |
| 1 | Outcome | 1.1.1 | Stock status outcome |  |
| 1.1.2 | Stock rebuilding outcome |  |
| Management | 1.2.1 | Harvest Strategy |  |
| 1.2.2 | Harvest control rules |  |
| 1.2.3 | Information and monitoring |  |
| 1.2.4 | Assessment of stock status |  |
| 2 | Other species | 2.2.3 | Other species information |  |
| 2.2.1 | Other species outcome |  |
| 2.2.2 | Other species management |  |
| ETP species | 2.3.3 | ETP species information |  |
| 2.3.1 | ETP species outcome |  |
| 2.3.2 | ETP species management |  |
| Habitats | 2.4.3 | Habitats information |  |
| 2.4.1 | Habitats outcome |  |
| 2.4.2 | Habitats management |  |
| Ecosystem | 2.5.3 | Ecosystem information |  |
| 2.5.1 | Ecosystem outcome |  |
| 2.5.2 | Ecosystem management |  |
| 3 | Governance & policy | 3.1.1 | Legal and customary framework |  |
| 3.1.2 | Consultation, roles and responsibilities |  |
| 3.1.3 | Long term objectives |  |
| Fishery specific management system | 3.2.1 | Fishery-specific objectives |  |
| 3.2.2 | Decision-making processes |  |
| 3.2.3 | Compliance and enforcement |  |
| 3.2.4 | Management performance evaluation |  |

# Basic fishery information

*Fill in the following table. The management authority is the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur.*

Table 2. Description of the fishery.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target species** | Scientific name:  Common name(s): |
| **Stock** | *Describe the target fishery stock* |
| **Fishery location** | *Describe the fishery location* |
| **Gear type(s)** | *Describe the gear type* |
| **Catch quantity (weight)** | *Approximate annual catch (kg or tonnes)* |
| **Vessel types and sizes** | *Description of the fishing vessel type(s)* |
| **Number of UoA vessels** | *Number of fishing vessels within the Unit of Assessment (UoA)* |
| **Management authority** | *Enter the name of the management authority (the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur)* |

*Optional: provide a broad description of the fishery, a table of catch quantities in recent years*

## Unit of Assessment(s)

*Define the Unit of Assessment(s) here.*

# Status of target stock(s) - Principle 1

Principle 1 considers the status of the target stock(s) and whether harvest is being conducted in a manner that does not lead to overfishing or depletion of the exploited populations.

*For all performance indicators under each principle, fill in the scoring category (red, yellow, green, or n/a) and the rationale (justification for the scoring category that was assigned). An example has been provided under the Stock Status Outcome PI (1.1.1).*

## Stock status outcome (1.1.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category | ≥80 |

Rationale:

According to the most recent stock assessment conducted in 2017, the estimated spawning stock biomass is above the target reference point of 50,000 metric tons. Estimates of spawning stock biomass from the past five years have shown a stable trend.

## Stock rebuilding outcome (1.1.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Harvest strategy (1.2.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Harvest control rules (1.2.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Information and monitoring (1.2.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Assessment of stock status (1.2.4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

# Ecosystem impacts - Principle 2

Principle 2 considers the impacts of the UoA on the ecosystem, including impacts on other species, habitats, and key ecosystem components.

*Table of Other species caught by UoA vessels.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Common name** | **Scientific name** | **Catch (kg or t)** | **Catch %**  **(by weight)** | **Classification** |
| Pacific herring | *Clupea pallasii* | 1000 t | 15 | Main other |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Other species information (score applied to PI 2.2.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Other species outcome (score applied to PI 2.2.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Other species management (score applied to PI 2.2.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## ETP species information (2.3.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## ETP species outcome (2.3.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## ETP species management (2.3.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Habitats information (2.4.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Habitats outcome (2.4.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Habitats management (2.4.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Ecosystem information (2.5.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Ecosystem outcome (2.5.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Ecosystem management (2.5.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

# Management - Principle 3

Principle 3 focuses on whether there is an institutional and operational framework appropriate to the size and scale of the UoA(s) for implementing Principles 1 and 2, capable of delivering sustainable fisheries.

## Legal and/or customary framework (3.1.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Consultation, roles, and responsibilities (3.1.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Long term objectives (3.1.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Fishery-specific objectives (3.2.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Decision-making processes (3.2.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Compliance and enforcement (3.2.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

## Monitoring and management performance evaluation (3.2.4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring category |  |

Rationale:

# References

*List references here.*