Environmental Rapid Assessment

Report Template

Version 2.0, November 2021

# Purpose

This template is associated with the [ERA methodology document](https://fisheryprogress.org/sites/default/files/ERA_Methodology_v2.1_Mar2022_final.pdf), 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/), with version 2.0 developed by Ocean Outcomes. 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 categories used on FisheryProgress.org, assessors assign a scoring category to each PI using a red-yellow-green traffic light system (Table 1).

*Table 1. General definitions of management performance for each scoring category.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Numeric scoring range** | **General definition of management performance** |
| <20 | * No management system or strategy exist, and no control over the fishery is exercised or planned. The fishery may be completely open access with no framework with which to develop management, nor political desire to do so. * No information on stock status, nor indication of species productivity or susceptibility from basic biological characteristics, exists. There are no scientific or commercial fishery data and no proposed program to collect such data.   Relation to MSC assessment: this PI is likely to fail. |
| 20-39 | * Management is very poor and/or critically flawed due to either a lack of resources or lack of political will. * Poor information is available on the fishery’s impacts on target stocks, non-target species, ETP (endangered, threatened or protected) species, habitats, and ecosystems. The limited information can only allow for a rudimentary assessment of likely productivity and susceptibility. There is no basis on which to develop reference points. Available information suggests high susceptibility; high overfishing or stock depletion is assumed.   Relation to MSC assessment: this PI is likely to fail. |
| 40-59 | * Some key aspects of management remain insufficient or ineffective, likely due to a lack of resources but not a lack of will or basic management framework. There is evidence that no local, national, or international laws are being broken. * Generic stock reference points are available, but available information suggests that target and/or non-target stocks are overfished (below limit reference points) and/or that overfishing is occurring. For data-limited stocks, productivity susceptibility analysis (PSA) can be performed, but results suggest low productivity and high susceptibility. Information suggests that the fishery is negatively impacting non-target and/or ETP species, or fishing mortality is unknown. Fishing activities cause some impact to habitats and ecosystems, which is not clearly quantified or mitigated.   Relation to MSC assessment: this PI is likely to fail. |
| 60-79 | * Some important management aspects may be lacking, but none are sufficient to prevent a certification or passing rating by themselves. Monitoring and enforcement is in place and believed effective. * Generic reference points are available and show that biomass is likely above PRI (point of recruitment impairment); fishing mortality is fluctuating around FMSY or BMSY (as relevant). Information is available to estimate fishing mortality and impacts on non-target and ETP species. The fishery is unlikely to hinder ETP species recovery. Habitat and ecosystem impacts are possible, though it is unlikely that the fishery causes serious or irreversible harm.   Relation to MSC assessment: a condition may be needed for this PI. |
| 80+ | * 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 PRI and/or MSY related targets (as relevant). Information is available to assess fishing mortality and impacts on non-target and ETP species. The fishery is highly unlikely to hinder ETP species recovery. 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 |  |
| 1.1.1A | Status of LTL stocks |  |
| 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 | 2.2.1 | Other species outcome |  |
| 2.2.2 | Other species management |  |
| 2.2.3 | Other 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

*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.

## LTL stock status outcome (1.1.1A)

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

Rationale:

## 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.

*Principle 2 species*

Table. Principle 2 species classification table.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Species common and scientific names** | **Annual UoA catch** | **% of UoA catch**  **(by weight)** | **Classification** |
| Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*) | 1000 t | 15 | Main other |
|  |  |  |  |

**Primary/secondary species outcome (2.1.1, 2.2.1)**

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

Rationale:

**Primary/secondary species management (PIs 2.1.2, 2.2.2)**

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

Rationale:

**Primary/secondary species information (2.1.3, 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.*