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# *Purpose*

*This template is associated with the Environmental Rapid Assessment methodology document, which contains detailed information about scoring each performance indicator (PI). This template can be used to develop a Needs Assessment for posting a basic FIP on FisheryProgress.org. Text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section and should be removed from the final version of this document. Highlighted text should be replaced to reflect the information for your fishery.*

# Executive summary

*Summarize the assessment results here.*

# Abbreviations

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

# Methodology background

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

The Environmental Rapid Assessment 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.

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 | Primary species | 2.1.1 | Primary species outcome |  |
| 2.1.2 | Primary species management |  |
| 2.1.3 | Primary species information |  |
| Secondary species | 2.2.1 | Secondary species outcome |  |
| 2.2.2 | Secondary species management |  |
| 2.2.3 | Secondary species information |  |
| ETP species | 2.3.1 | ETP species outcome |  |
| 2.3.2 | ETP species management |  |
| 2.3.3 | ETP species information |  |
| Habitats | 2.4.1 | Habitats outcome |  |
| 2.4.2 | Habitats management |  |
| 2.4.3 | Habitats information |  |
| Ecosystem | 2.5.1 | Ecosystem outcome |  |
| 2.5.2 | Ecosystem management |  |
| 2.5.3 | Ecosystem information |  |
| 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

*Provide a written description of the fishery. Information may include the history of resource extraction, the main targeted species, the fishery location, vessel and gear types used, the approximate number of vessels, the estimated catch quantity of the fishery, and the management authorities (the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur).*

*Optional: a table of catch quantities in recent years.*

## Unit of Assessment(s)

*Fill in the following table, which will be considered the scope against which the fishery is assessed against the MSC Fisheries Standard.*

**Table 2. Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UoA 1** | **Description** |
| **Target species (common and scientific name)** | Example: Mahi mahi (*Coryphaena hippurus)* |
| **Stock** | Example: Eastern Pacific |
| **Geographical area** | Example: The exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of Peru |
| **Fishing method or gear type** | Example: Surface longline |
| **Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock** | Example: Artisanal Peruvian fleet |
| **UoA 2 (Add/delete as appropriate)** | **Description** |
| **Target species (common and scientific name)** |  |
| **Stock** |  |
| **Geographical area** |  |
| **Fishing method or gear type** |  |
| **Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock** |  |

# 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 | Example: ≥80 |

Rationale:

Example: 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 primary and secondary 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 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Primary species outcome (PI 2.1.1)

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

Rationale:

## Primary species management (PI 2.1.2)

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

Rationale:

## Primary species information (PI 2.1.3)

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

Rationale:

## Secondary species outcome (PI 2.2.1)

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

Rationale:

## Secondary species management (PI 2.2.2)

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

Rationale:

## Secondary species information (PI 2.2.3)

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

Rationale:

## ETP species outcome (2.3.1)

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

Rationale:

## ETP species management (2.3.2)

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

Rationale:

## ETP species information (2.3.3)

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

Rationale:

## Habitats outcome (2.4.1)

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

Rationale:

## Habitats management (2.4.2)

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

Rationale:

## Habitats information (2.4.3)

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

Rationale:

## Ecosystem outcome (2.5.1)

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

Rationale:

## Ecosystem management (2.5.2)

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

Rationale:

## Ecosystem information (2.5.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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.*