

FisheryProgress

FIP Review Guidelines

Version 3.0 DRAFT

Effective Date: June 10, 2025

[Summary of Changes](#)

Note: FishChoice is continuing to make changes to the new FisheryProgress website, particularly to help ease the process for FIPs to make updates to and report on progress related to the components of FisheryProgress' Human Rights and Social Responsibility Policy (HRSRP). As of June 18th, FishChoice has paused HRSRP progress reporting requirements for FIPs. This document will be updated again to reflect the future changes to the fields and functionality within HRSRP component reporting sections on the site, but may be used now to guide FIPs through the new FIP Profile creation process for both environmental and social requirements, and environmental progress reporting. Please refer to the HRSRP to prepare for future social reporting in the meantime.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
Overview	4
2. General Requirements and Key Additional Information	4
2.1. FIP Categories	4
2.2. Language Requirements	5
2.3. Reporting Transparency	6
2.4. Reporting Timelines for HRSR Policy Requirements	6
2.5. FIP Progress Ratings	7
3. Prospective FIPs	8
3.1. Eligibility	8
4. Active FIPs	8
4.1. Eligibility	8
4.2. Review Process	8
4.2.1. New FIP Profile Review Process	8
4.2.2. Six-Month and Annual Progress Report Review Process	9
4.2.3. Three-Year Evaluation Reviews (for Comprehensive FIPs Only)	11
4.2.4. Missed Reports	12
4.2.5. Review Process for Extensions and Extension Requests for HRSR Policy Requirements	12
Extension Requests	12
Ongoing and Concluding Extensions	12
4.2.6. Review Process for FIPs Undergoing MSC Full Assessment	13
4.2.7. Reviewing FIP Scope Changes and Impact on the Review Process	13
General Information on Scope Changes	13
Transitioning to and/or Maintaining Comprehensive FIP Status	14
Scope Changes With Regard to the HRSR Policy Requirements	14
4.2.8. Unpublished FIPs	16
4.3. Review Criteria	16
4.3.1. Initial Review	16
General Information	16
Environmental Progress	21
Social Responsibility	22
4.3.2. Six-Month Progress Report Review Criteria	32
Environmental Progress	32
Social Responsibility	33
4.3.3. Annual Progress Report Review Criteria	35
General Information	35
Environmental Progress	36
Social Responsibility	37

4.3.4. Review of and Reporting on Extensions to the HRSR Policy Requirements	43
4.4. Supporting Evidence	44
5. Completed FIPs	44
5.1. Eligibility	44
5.2. Completing an Active FIP	45
6. Inactive FIPs	45
6.1. Reasons for a FIP To Be Marked As Inactive	45
6.2. How To Reactivate an Inactive FIP	46
7. Appendix A: Guidance on Evidence and Examples	47

DRAFT

1. Introduction

Overview

FishChoice is committed to transparency, consistency, and accuracy in decision-making about fishery improvement projects (FIPs) included on the FisheryProgress website. FishChoice developed these guidelines for use by FIP leads, FIP participants, FishChoice FIP reviewers (hereafter referred to as “reviewers”) and the FishChoice Technical Committee (TC) to provide clarity around how we determine eligibility for the site and evaluate FIP information and progress. Moreover, FishChoice developed the guidelines to provide clarity around how the site will implement the [FisheryProgress Human Rights and Social Responsibility \(HRSR\) Policy](#) and evaluate FIP social information and progress. It is important to note that FishChoice reviews the information that FIPs submit to determine whether that information is credible and effectively meets the site’s requirements, and FishChoice does not endorse or verify claims regarding social or environmental sustainability on the ground.

The guidelines include:

- **Eligibility for FisheryProgress** — The criteria FishChoice uses to determine whether FIPs are eligible to report their progress on the site, based on the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solution’s [Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects](#) (CASS Guidelines)
- **Initial review process** — The process and evaluation criteria the reviewer will use in assessing a FIP’s initial profile submission to the website as well as the initial implementation of the HRSR Policy requirements for both new and existing FIPs
- **Evaluating progress** — The process and evaluation criteria the reviewer will use in assessing six-month and annual progress reports; three-year evaluations; FIP changes; and FIPs that are in Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) full assessment, completed, or inactive and inactive FIPs that wish to reactivate.

If amendments to this version of the guidelines are necessary prior to the release of a fully updated version of the guidelines, FishChoice will communicate changes to FIPs via an email announcement.

Throughout the guidelines, the word “must” indicates a requirement. The words “should,” “could,” “may,” and “best practice” indicate a strong recommendation; however, FIPs will not be affected if they do not follow these recommendations. Only the requirements affect whether FIP Reviewers approve reports and updates. Other key terms from this document are defined in the FisheryProgress [Glossary](#).

References to HRSR Policy requirements throughout this document are based on the numbering of each requirement as noted in the HRSR Policy. Please refer to the [HRSR Policy](#) for the details on these requirements.

2. General Requirements and Key Additional Information

2.1. FIP Categories

The [CASS Guidelines](#) determine eligibility for publication on FisheryProgress. Please review the CASS Guidelines for details on what constitutes a FIP, types of FIPs (basic vs. comprehensive), and to learn about different FIP statuses and stages.

The Unit of the FIP delineates the boundaries of the project, defined by the characteristics of the fishery and the supply chain actors that are involved in the improvement project. The Unit of the FIP includes:

- The target stock(s)
- The fishing gear type(s)
- The defined subset of fishing vessels or individual fishing operators pursuing that stock (listed in the FIP's vessel list)
- The supply chain actors identified as FIP lead(s) and participants

FIP product is defined as seafood product(s) caught and sold within a Unit of the FIP (i.e., products are landed from vessels/fishers recorded on the FIP's vessel list and sold to supply chain actors identified as FIP lead(s) and/or participants in the improvement project on the FIP profile).

There are four statuses used on FisheryProgress profiles. All FIPs are eligible and/or required to report on **environmental and social progress**, dependent on their status as outlined below:

- **Prospective FIPs:** Prospective FIPs, as defined by the CASS Guidelines, are those that are currently at Stage 0 or 1 and intend to meet the requirements for basic or comprehensive FIPs and complete Stage 2 within one year. Prospective FIPs are not considered active and, therefore, are neither required nor eligible to report on their environmental or social progress. To transition to an active status, prospective FIPs must meet the requirements [here](#).
- **Active (Basic and Comprehensive) FIPs:** All active FIPs must report on their environmental and social progress in accordance with the HRSR Policy and associated review criteria outlined in this document.
 - **In Full Assessment:** FIPs with all units of assessment (UoAs) undergoing full assessment by MSC are marked as "In Full Assessment" on FisheryProgress. These FIPs no longer have to meet environmental reporting requirements but must continue to meet the requirements outlined in the HRSR Policy, including the six-month and annual reporting requirements.
 - FIPs with some, but not all, UoAs on FisheryProgress are marked as "Active" until all UoAs have entered the full assessment process. These FIPs must continue to report on environmental progress for each UoA not in full assessment alongside meeting the requirements outlined in the HRSR Policy.
- **Completed FIPs:** Completed FIPs are basic FIPs that have met their environmental objectives or comprehensive FIPs that have achieved MSC certification. These FIPs are not required to continue reporting on their compliance with the HRSR Policy but may do so voluntarily:
 - Completed FIPs that choose to continue to report must meet the requirements outlined in the HRSR Policy, including the six-month and annual reporting requirements, but will be unable to update previous environmental information.
 - To not have future reports considered missed, completed FIPs that are voluntarily reporting and would like to stop must contact FishChoice (contact@fisheryprogress.org) to indicate they are no longer reporting. There are no additional requirements or consequences for completed FIPs that choose not to continue to report on compliance with the HRSR Policy. All social progress information provided prior to and after the FIP reaches completion will be maintained on completed FIP profiles.
- **Inactive FIPs:** Inactive FIPs are those that have been suspended from reporting on FisheryProgress, due to reasons outlined in [Section 6: Inactive FIPs](#).

2.2. Language Requirements

English is FisheryProgress's official language. FIPs must provide in English action names, action goals, action descriptions, HRSR Policy requirement information, and six-month and annual progress report updates. Additionally, FIPs must always upload the following documents, if applicable to the FIP and report in question, to the FIP profiles in English:

- Environmental workplan and associated progress updates
- Pre-assessment and Environmental Rapid Assessment (Needs Assessment)
- Scoping document (if submitted)
- Budget
- Risk assessment, whether it is completed using the Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) tool or is an alternative assessment
- Social workplan and associated progress updates
- Alternative assessment summary Form
- Grievance mechanism summary assessment and ongoing appraisal forms
- Vessel List information

We encourage FIPs to provide in English evidence submitted as part of the six-month and annual progress reports. If it is not, the evidence is subject to secondary review and may take longer to publish on the profile.

2.3. Reporting Transparency

All information that FIPs submit as part of their reporting is shared publicly on their FisheryProgress profile. It is the FIP's responsibility to make sure it takes proper measures to ensure confidential information is not published. To promote clear and objective communication, we encourage FIPs to avoid personal comments and sensitive language in their reports. FishChoice strongly encourages FIPs to obtain consent for publishing information in advance of submission to FisheryProgress. FIPs that have legal or security concerns about sharing information in the public domain may request that required reporting information remain unpublished, though FishChoice will maintain documentation internally for review purposes.¹ Those requests must be supported with justification and will be reviewed and approved on a case-by-case basis. For more information, please see the [Permissions and Confidentiality of Reporting](#) documents and [Terms of Service](#) information on the website.

2.4. Reporting Timelines for HRSR Policy Requirements

With regard to the HRSR Policy, the review of each of the requirements is as follows:

¹ Note that while FIPs can request information be kept confidential and therefore not published on the profile, Sustainable Fisheries Partnership will not consider evidence of environmental progress that is not shared publicly to calculate a progress rating.

Policy Requirement	Initial Reporting ²	Progress Reporting
1.1 Policy statement	To be listed as active	Every annual report
1.2 Vessel and/or fisher info	To be listed as active	Every annual report
1.3 Fisher awareness of rights	First annual report	Every annual report, or every six months if still working toward the requirement
1.4 Grievance mechanism	First annual report	Every annual report, or every six months if still working toward the requirement
1.5 Self-evaluation of risk criteria	To be listed as active	Every annual report
2.1 Risk assessment (if required)³	First annual report, if one or more risk criteria were met (see Requirement 1.5) ⁴	Every three years, or more frequently if desired
2.2 Social workplan (if required)⁵	First annual report or six months after the submission of a risk assessment ⁶	Every six-month and annual report
3.1 Reporting on Voluntary Risk Assessments and Workplans	At any time	See HRSR Policy for details

Note: Although the above table indicates when requirements go into effect, **specific deadlines for FIPs to meet requirements vary according to their unique reporting cycle**, which is based on when the FIP is first listed as active on FisheryProgress. The document submission and review process occurs as part of the FIP's regular six-month and annual progress reporting. Furthermore, the table details both initial and progress reporting deadlines for each requirement, which ensures that information is kept up to date.

2.5. FIP Progress Ratings

² Timeline for new FIPs. As of the publication of the HRSR Policy (v1.0 in 2021 and v1.1 in 2022), existing FIPs had already begun implementing the requirements. All existing FIPs received detailed guidance in May 2025 on how to transition from v1.1 to v2.0.

³ FIPs that meet one or more of the criteria for increased risk of forced labor and human trafficking (see HRSR Policy Requirement 1.5) must complete a risk assessment.

⁴ If at any point a FIP's answers to the self-evaluation changes and they meet the risk criteria, a risk assessment (Requirement 2.1) is due 12 months later.

⁵ FIPs must develop and implement a workplan if they submitted an alternative assessment to meet HRSR Policy Requirement 2.1 or if their SRA had any high risk scores.

⁶ Once a FIP reports meeting one or more criteria for increased risk of forced labor and human trafficking, it has up to 18 months to complete the social workplan. Note that this is six months after the completion of the risk assessment (Requirement 2.1). FIPs are welcome and encouraged to submit their workplan actions at the same time as their risk assessment.

FishChoice does not determine FIP progress ratings. [Sustainable Fisheries Partnership \(SFP\)](#) assigns a progress rating to active FIPs on FisheryProgress. That rating is established based on evidence for environmental progress each FIP provides to FishChoice through its six-month and annual reports.⁷ Progress ratings are only applicable to environmental progress; they do not evaluate social progress. Progress ratings are determined using the following [methodology](#). SFP determines a FIP's progress rating within one month of when its completed six-month or annual report is published. SFP releases updated ratings approximately the second week of each month, following the month that a report was completed. Any updated ratings are then reflected on the respective FIPs' profiles on the FisheryProgress website.

If a FIP wishes to discuss its progress rating, it must reach out directly to SFP at fipevaluation@sustainablefish.org.

3. Prospective FIPs

3.1. Eligibility

FIPs that are currently in Stage 0 or 1 may be listed on FisheryProgress as prospective. Prospective FIPs are not eligible to report on their compliance with the HRSR Policy.

Prospective FIPs may be listed for a maximum of 12 months. FishChoice will remove the FIP from the website if the FIP has not reached Stage 2 (either as a basic or comprehensive FIP) by the end of the 12-month period. Once a FIP has reached its expiration date and is removed from the site, it cannot be relisted again as a prospective FIP.

4. Active FIPs

4.1. Eligibility

FIPs that are currently in Stages 2 through 5 and meet the [CASS Guidelines](#) for basic or comprehensive⁸ FIPs may be listed as active FIPs on FisheryProgress. In accordance with the HRSR Policy v2.0, FIPs must also publish a Policy Statement(s) (Requirement 1.1), provide Vessel and/or Fisher Information (Requirement 1.2), and complete their Self-Evaluation of Risk Criteria (SERC) (Requirement 1.5) to be listed as active on FisheryProgress.

4.2. Review Process

The intent of the review process is to determine whether the information a FIP submits meets FisheryProgress' requirements. This section outlines the process reviewers follow when reviewing a new or existing FIP as well as the process that FIPs follow to submit a new FIP or report on their progress. In [Section 4.3: Review Criteria](#), we outline the requirements and expectations of FIP profiles and FIP reports.

⁷ Please note that any information requested to be confidential for progress reports will not be utilized in the FIP's progress rating unless it is publicly available — if SFP does not have access to supporting evidence, SFP will not consider it in progress rating evaluations.

⁸ Please review the CASS Guidelines for details on the requirements for a basic and comprehensive FIP.

FishChoice engages members of its Technical Committee to conduct a detailed review of requirements through spot checks to ensure consistency and maintain quality of reviews. Following the spot check process, FishChoice reserves the right to request FIPs update required information that another reviewer may have previously accepted and published.

4.2.1. New FIP Profile Review Process

The following steps outline the process to publish a new FIP profile on FisheryProgress:

1. *Complete a FisheryProgress Orientation:* The FIP coordinator must sign up for and complete a FisheryProgress orientation if they have not done so before. Please email contact@fisheryprogress.org for more information on this orientation.
2. *Obtain access for the FisheryProgress user account that will create and modify a FIP profile:* This is granted once the individual completes the orientation.
3. *Submit all profile information to adequately meet both environmental and HRSR Policy requirements:* All required documentation is outlined in [Section 4.3.1](#) of this document.
4. *Inform FishChoice that the new FIP profile is ready for publication:* The FIP must email contact@fisheryprogress.org to confirm it has uploaded all required documentation to the platform and that the FIP is ready for review. FishChoice will reach out to the FIP to address any feedback regarding the submitted materials or if any information is missing.
5. *Review of the new FIP profile:* The reviewer will aim to complete an initial review of the profile within one month of the date the profile is submitted.⁹ This timing will vary depending on the number of FIP profiles and progress reports awaiting review by FishChoice.
6. *Addressing the reviewer's feedback:* The FIP addresses the feedback received from the reviewer, makes changes to the FIP profile accordingly, and reaches out to the reviewer once the FIP is ready for re-review. Depending on the items that the FIP needs to address, there can be several rounds of feedback from the reviewer. There is no time constraint for how long this step may take; however, it will directly impact the timing of the publication of the FIP. Note that reaching the publication of the new FIP profile will depend on:
 - a. The amount of follow-up needed to secure additional information from the FIP implementer
 - b. How quickly the FIP addresses any feedback
7. *Publication of the new FIP:* Once the review process is complete and the FIP is ready for publication, the reviewer will publish the FIP profile on FisheryProgress, and the FIP will receive a message informing it that the profile is now public.

4.2.2. Six-Month and Annual Progress Report Review Process

Every six months from the end of the month that the FIP profile is published on FisheryProgress, FIPs must report on progress following the criteria outlined in [Section 4.3.2: Six-Month Progress Report Review Criteria](#). Every 12 months from the end of the month that the profile is published on FisheryProgress, FIPs must report on progress according to the criteria outlined in [Section 4.3.3: Annual Progress Report Review Criteria](#). For example, a FIP whose profile was published Jan. 12 would have a six-month report due July 31 and an annual report due the following Jan. 31. A FIP must submit all the

⁹ FishChoice considers a FIP profile submitted once the FIP has uploaded all required documentation and information on the profile is uploaded on the website. This process will depend on the diligence of the FIP when uploading the documentation into the new profile.

required information — for both environmental and social reporting — as part of the report. The review team will not begin its review until the FIP has submitted all required materials. A FIP may request a one-time extension of up to three months for its six-month or annual progress report due date.

A FIP that is in the process of having an Announcement Comment Draft Report (ACDR) completed is still required to complete the six-month and annual progress reports according to the FIP's reporting schedule.

FishChoice will send out two reminders to FIPs with regard to their upcoming reporting deadline. FishChoice will send those reminders out during the month prior to each FIP's progress report due date and the month the report is due. For example, a FIP whose progress report is due at the end of March would receive its first reminder in the first week of February and the second reminder in the first week of March. The FIP is responsible for keeping track of its progress reporting deadlines.

The following steps outline the submission, review, and approval process for both six-month and annual reports:

1. *Submission process:*
 - a. The FIP uploads all required environmental and social information and alerts FishChoice by emailing contact@fisheryprogress.org or the FIP's reviewer directly.
2. *Review process:*
 - a. The reviewer will complete a detailed review and contact the FIP with any feedback about the report. The reviewer assesses the progress details and evidence to confirm that they are credible and of acceptable quality.
 - b. The reviewer will aim to complete the initial review within two weeks of the date the FIP submits the report.¹⁰ This timing will vary depending on the volume of FIP profiles awaiting FishChoice's review.
 - c. Once the reviewer has completed the initial review, the completion of a report will depend on:
 - i. The time it takes the FIP to address feedback
 - ii. The amount of follow-up needed to secure additional information from the FIP
 - iii. How quickly the FIP addresses any follow-up feedback
 - d. If needed, the reviewer will consult with the Technical Committee when confronted with unique situations.
 - e. The FIP can request a conversation with the reviewer to clarify any feedback that the reviewer sent. Any inquiries and replies by the reviewer and FIP should occur within a reasonable time frame (five business days when possible).
 - f. All reported information the reviewer does not have feedback on will be published once reviewed. Any items, including action progress or score change information, that the reviewer does have feedback on will not be published until the FIP lead addresses the comments.

¹⁰ FishChoice will consider a report submitted once the FIP uploads all required documentation and information on the profile on the website. See [Section 4.3.2: Six-Month Progress Report Review Criteria](#) and [Section 4.3.3: Annual Progress Report Review Criteria](#) for details.

3. *Approval, publication, and notification process:*
 - a. Once the FIP lead has addressed any feedback and pending items about all the mandatory updates¹¹ that the reviewer flagged and all report information has been published, the report will be marked complete. **Note that FishChoice will consider the report missed if the FIP lead does not address outstanding items that fall under the mandatory updates.**
 - b. Once the report is completed, the reviewer will confirm with the FIP that the progress report has been marked as complete and inform SFP that the profile is ready for evaluation for an updated FIP rating.
 - c. Once SFP completes its progress rating evaluation, FishChoice updates the FIP progress rating or stage if SFP has determined there is a change.

4.2.3. Three-Year Evaluation Reviews (for Comprehensive FIPs Only)

Every three years, comprehensive FIPs are required to have an independent evaluation of action results and performance against the MSC Fisheries Standard.¹² Please review the [CASS Guidelines](#) for details on the independent evaluation's requirements.

Someone who is both experienced with the MSC Standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has [other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer](#)) and independent from the organization implementing the FIP (i.e., not a FIP participant or FIP lead and has not been an employee of either within the past three years) must complete the evaluation.

FIPs must use the [three-year evaluation template](#), which they must fill out in English. Additional guidance is available in the [three-year evaluation guidelines](#).

The following steps outline the process of submitting and reviewing the three-year evaluation:

1. *FishChoice confirms the date of the FIP's last evaluation:*
 - a. A FIP must complete an evaluation at least every three years after the publication of the FIP profile on FisheryProgress.
2. *FishChoice sends reminders to FIPs on the due date of the three-year evaluation:*
 - a. FisheryProgress will send three reminders to the FIP. The first reminder is sent out a year before the audit is due; the second reminder is sent three months before the audit is due; the third and last reminder is sent the first week of the month the audit is due.
3. *The FIP confirms its assessor meets the required qualifications:*
 - a. Before the assessor conducts the evaluation, the FIP must reach out to FishChoice to confirm the assessor chosen for the evaluation meets the qualifications to carry out the evaluation. **Failing to obtain the preapproval may result in additional costs to the FIP due to the need for a reevaluation by a qualified assessor.**
4. *Submission of the three-year evaluation:*
 - a. The FIP submits the evaluation along with the annual progress report and informs FishChoice.
5. *Review of the evaluation:*

¹¹ Mandatory updates for six-month reports are outlined in the table under [Section 4.3.2: Six-Month Progress Report Review Criteria](#). Mandatory updates for annual reports are outlined in the table under [Section 4.3.3: Annual Progress Report Review Criteria](#).

¹² All mentions throughout this document to the "MSC Standard" refer to the MSC Fisheries Standard specifically.

- a. **Assessor qualifications:** The reviewer will confirm that an assessor who has the required experience with the MSC Standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has [other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer](#)) completed the evaluation.
 - b. **Template:** The reviewer will confirm the FIP used the three-year evaluation template and that the FIP completed the template correctly and in English.
 - c. **Confirm the audit is submitted properly:** The reviewer will confirm the evaluation is uploaded to the profile in the “Independent Evaluation” document field found in the General > Supporting Documents page.
6. *Approval of the evaluation:* If the reviewer finds the evaluation is incomplete or the assessor incorrectly filled it out and/or it is not published on the FIP profile by the evaluation report deadline, FishChoice will render the FIP inactive. Note: On a case-by-case basis and under exceptional circumstances, FishChoice will grant FIPs with extensions for independent evaluations.

Note: A FIP reporting on FisheryProgress AND participating in the MSC Improvement Program may submit its most recent verification report as a substitute for a Three-Year Independent Evaluation.

4.2.4. Missed Reports

FishChoice will consider a report missed if the FIP does not submit it by the end of the month that it is due, e.g., a FIP with its progress report due in January must submit updates no later than Jan. 31. FishChoice will consider a report missed if the FIP does not address feedback on the report and the report is not published by the end of the month following the due date, e.g., a FIP with its progress report due in January must address all feedback on the report provided and have the report published by Feb. 28, unless a FIP reviewer otherwise specifies. **For FishChoice to consider a report completed, the FIP must submit its report and address all feedback that the reviewer flagged by the end of the month following the report’s due date.** If the FIP doesn’t complete a report and the report is marked as missed, it will be indicated on the FIP at a Glance section of the FIP’s profile.

FishChoice will move a FIP to inactive if it does not complete and publish a full report for 12 months or more. Furthermore, FishChoice reserves the right to move FIPs to inactive for consistently missing reports or consistently failing to submit all required materials for a report. A FIP can move back to active (reactivate) at any time by following the reactivation process (See [Section 6.2: How to Reactivate an Inactive FIP](#)).

4.2.5. Review Process for Extensions and Extension Requests for HRSR Policy Requirements

Extension Requests

As of June 2025, FIPs may no longer request extensions to HRSR Policy Requirements. If an extension was approved prior to June 2025, the timeline for meeting the requirement(s) will reflect the extension granted.

Ongoing and Concluding Extensions

Through 2026, at each six-month and annual report, the reviewer will confirm whether the FIP has any extensions for the HRSR Policy requirements that were granted prior to the discontinuation of extensions in June 2025. At the conclusion of the extension period, the FIP must meet the requirement as outlined in the HRSR Policy. The first review of a social requirement follows the same process and criteria regardless of whether an extension was granted. In other words, during the first review of a social requirement after the extension period is over, the reviewer will follow the steps outlined in the relevant table from the initial review in [Section 4.3.1](#).

Note that if an extension period has ended in line with a six-month report, the requirement will be due at that time, even if the requirement is typically due during the annual report. Updates for that requirement will then follow the update schedule provided in section [2.4 Reporting Deadlines for HRSR Policy Requirements](#).

See also [Section 4.3.4: Review of and Reporting on Extensions to the HRSR Policy Requirements](#) for details on the criteria followed during the review process.

4.2.6. Review Process for FIPs Undergoing MSC Full Assessment

A FIP that has had all of its units of assessment enter the full assessment process for MSC certification will remain active on the site, but reporting requirements will be reduced. The FIP must provide a link to the fisheries' subpage on the [MSC Track a Fishery page](#) or, in the event that the subpage is not yet published, a copy of the ACDR. FishChoice will then update the FIP's status on FisheryProgress, adding a banner to the FIP's profile noting it is under assessment and providing the link to its MSC Track a Fishery page. During the FIP's regular progress reports, FishChoice will ask the FIP to confirm it is still in assessment and meet the HRSR Policy requirements. It will no longer have environmental progress reporting requirements.

Note: Multispecies FIPs that have some, but not all, of their units of assessment undergoing MSC full assessment will remain active on the site until all units of assessment are undergoing full assessment. These FIPs will be required to continue reporting on environmental progress for the UoAs not undergoing full assessment. This could include reporting on Principle 1 species/stocks scores not under MSC full assessment, Principle 2 scores for gear types not under MSC full assessment, and Principle 3 scores for management systems not under MSC full assessment. The FIP is also required to continue reporting on its environmental actions that are not associated with units of assessment under MSC full assessment as well as ensuring that its workplan and budget documents remain up to date.

4.2.7. Reviewing FIP Scope Changes and Impact on the Review Process

General Information on Scope Changes

Changes occur over the FIP's lifespan, and as such, FIPs are allowed to submit scope changes between reports. FishChoice will aim to review scope changes within one month of the date that the scope change is submitted. For examples on common FIP scope changes, please see the [Guidance for Scope Changes in FIPs](#).

The following outlines the scope changes allowed for FIP profiles and how the reviewer will respond to minor and significant scope changes.

- Minor scope changes (e.g., change in FIP lead, new participants added): The FIP must inform the reviewer that an update was made to the profile, and the reviewer will ensure the change is published on the profile. Reporting deadlines will remain the same.
- Significant scope changes: FishChoice **strongly encourages FIPs to reach out to FishChoice before making significant scope changes on their profiles** to receive guidance on how to best carry out the scope change. A reviewer will work with the FIP to ensure it makes the appropriate changes to the profile. The reviewer will then conduct an initial review of the core components that the scope change affects, including any updated documentation such as an assessment or workplan. The review process and timeline can vary depending on the scope change. In all significant scope change scenarios, FishChoice will publish the FIP's new information after the FIP addresses any feedback FishChoice provides through the review process.
- Significant scope changes can be categorized as follows:
 - *Increases in scope* (e.g., transition from basic to comprehensive, expansion to include more species, expansion to include another fishing gear, expansion to include other geographies/exclusive economic zones [EEZs], new vessel flags, new participants, etc.)
 - *Reductions of scope* (e.g., reduction in FIP objectives, majority of participants leave)
 - *Shifts in scope* (e.g., more than 25% turnover in vessels or vessel owners, shifts in vessel flags)

Note: Reductions of scope that result in the FIP's completion will be made explicit in a note on the FIP's profile.

Transitioning to and/or Maintaining Comprehensive FIP Status

FIPs that transition from basic to comprehensive will need to comply with all the requirements for comprehensive FIPs, including the three-year evaluation. The three-year evaluation will be due at the same time of the FIP's third annual progress report deadline after its transition to comprehensive.

Comprehensive FIPs must address all of the fishery's environmental challenges — indicated by <60 (red) and 60-79 (yellow) scoring indicators — necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass (80±/green) of the MSC Fisheries Standard. A comprehensive FIP's workplan must include actions to improve all red and yellow MSC Performance Indicators (PIs) until the indicator achieves a green score. If at any point a comprehensive FIP's workplan no longer addresses all red and yellow indicators, FishChoice will proceed with the following steps:

1. Reach out to the FIP to inform them the FIP no longer meets the comprehensive FIP requirements. From the date of outreach, the FIP will have six months to update the FIP's workplan document and subsequently the Environmental Progress Actions & Tasks page with actions that address all red and yellow indicators. That can be done through either:
 - a. Updating existing action(s)
 - b. Adding new action(s)
2. The FIP will reach out to FishChoice once it has made all the necessary changes.
3. FishChoice will review the updates on the Environmental Progress Actions & Tasks page to ensure there are actions to address all red and yellow indicators.

If the FIP does not update the Environmental Progress Actions & Tasks page within six months from the date of outreach, FishChoice will change the FIP type to basic until the FIP updates its Actions & Tasks page so that actions address all red and yellow indicators. At that point, the FishChoice will change the FIP type back to comprehensive.

Scope Changes With Regard to the HRSR Policy Requirements

Changes in FIP Leads and FIP Participants:

- **Requirement 1.1 Policy Statement**
 - *New FIP lead, in cases where the FIP lead was one of the Policy Statement signatories:* If a FIP lead has changed, ensure the FIP has uploaded a new Policy Statement(s) and filled in all relevant information fields in the Policy Statement section of the FIP's profile (found when clicking into the HRSR Policy Requirements subsection of the Social Responsibility section of the profile). The review of the updated Policy Statement will follow the process for the initial review as outlined in [Section 4.3.1](#). Note that this can occur between reports.
 - *New FIP supply chain participant(s) and the FIP submits a new or revised Policy Statement on behalf of the participant(s):* If the FIP has changes to its participant(s), ensure the FIP has uploaded a new or revised Policy Statement that reflects the updated participant(s) and updated information in the Policy Statement section of the FIP's profile. The review of the new or revised Policy Statement and corresponding information will follow the process for the initial review as outlined in [Section 4.3.1](#). Note that this can occur between reports.
 - When a participant change occurs (either a participant being added or removed) between report cycles, reviewers should communicate to the FIP coordinator that the coordinator must provide updated documentation for the requirement as part of their next annual report.
- **Requirement 2.1 Risk Assessment**
 - *Changes to the FIP supply chain participant(s):* If FIP supply chain participants have been added or removed:
 - Any FIP that has published an SRA must engage a qualified, preapproved¹³ [HRSR consultant](#) to reconfirm that the existing risk assessment remains representative of the FIP. If the HRSR consultant indicates that the risk assessment is no longer representative of the FIP, the FIP must submit a new risk assessment within 12 months. Note: The FIP has an additional six months if desired to submit a new workplan, if applicable (workplan results are dependent on the assessment's findings). FIPs must notify FishChoice with the details of whom they engaged to confirm the SRA's continued representativeness and their findings.
 - Any FIP that has submitted an alternative assessment must update its description of the scope of the assessment and how it is relevant to the FIP. If the FIP identifies that the assessment is no longer relevant to the FIP, the FIP must submit a new assessment within 12 months. FIPs submitting new assessments must also submit a new workplan that reflects the updated assessment, either at the same time as the assessment or six months later (at the subsequent report).
- **Requirements 1.2-1.5**
 - *Changes to FIP supply chain participants:* For any changes to supply chain participants that affect Requirements 1.2 to 1.5, such as but not limited to vessels listed in the FIP and/or grievance mechanism availability, FIPs must provide the relevant updated documentation as part of progress reporting.

¹³ Before the SRA is conducted, the FIP must reach out to FishChoice to confirm that its selected consultant(s) meet(s) FisheryProgress qualifications. Failing to obtain the preapproval may result in additional costs to the FIP due to the need for a qualified assessor's reassessment and potentially the need to be moved to inactive status for failure to meet the initial requirement. Please refer to [this page](#) for more details on consultant qualifications.

Changes in Operating Conditions

- **Requirement 1.5 Self-evaluation**

- *If a FIP that previously met the criteria for increased risk of forced labor and human trafficking no longer meets the risk criteria, it may submit a new self-evaluation against the criteria. Additionally:*
 - As part of the process of reviewing the update, reviewers may ask for a rationale and/or evidence from the FIP related to the change in risk.
 - If the FIP has an SRA with high-risk-scoring indicators, it must continue to meet the Requirements 2.1 Risk Assessment and 2.2 Social Workplan until an updated SRA shows a reduction in risk level of all indicators to at least medium risk.
- *If a FIP that previously did not meet the criteria for increased risk of forced labor and human trafficking now meets one or more of the risk criteria (flagged either by changes in the FIP or verified inaccuracies), the FIP must update its self-evaluation to reflect that change during its next annual report and must also comply with Component 2 of the HRSR Policy.*

- **Requirements 2.1 Risk Assessment & 2.2 Social Workplan**

- *If there are significant¹⁴ changes to the FIP's vessel list OR if there are significant changes to the FIP's geographic scope:*
 - Any FIP that has published an SRA must engage a qualified, preapproved HRSR consultant to reconfirm that the existing risk assessment remains representative of the FIP. If the HRSR consultant indicates that the risk assessment is no longer representative of the FIP, the FIP must submit a new risk assessment within 12 months. If the updated SRA has any high-risk-scoring indicators, the FIP must also submit a new workplan to accompany the new assessment, either at the same time as the assessment or six months later (at the subsequent report).
 - Any FIP that has submitted an alternative assessment must ensure the assessment is still relevant under the FIP's new scope. If the scope of the existing assessment is still relevant to and aligned with the FIP's new scope, the FIP must update its description of the assessment's relevance by submitting a new alternative assessment summary form. If the FIP identifies that the assessment is no longer relevant to the FIP, the FIP must submit a new assessment within 12 months. The FIP must also submit a new workplan, either at the same time as the new assessment or six months later (at the subsequent report).

4.2.8. Unpublished FIPs

A FIP may not request to remove or unpublish its profile from FisheryProgress. If a FIP would like to stop reporting on the site, it may either provide evidence it is completed (as outlined above) or move to inactive.

4.3. Review Criteria

4.3.1. Initial Review

When a new FIP profile is created on FisheryProgress, reviewers must confirm that the FIP has provided the appropriate information and that the information meets the criteria for publishing a new profile. The

¹⁴ "Significant changes" in this context are defined as more than 25% turnover in vessels or vessel owners, new vessel flags, and/or fishing occurring in new countries or EEZs.

initial review for new FIPs includes both environmental and HRSR Policy requirements. Initial review of [General information](#) and [Environmental Progress](#) takes place prior to the publication of a new profile. Initial review of [Social Responsibility](#) information takes place according to the initial timelines for the HRSR policy requirements, with some requirements reviewed prior to publication of a new profile and others reviewed at the first annual report or later. Existing FIPs must meet all initial reporting timelines detailed in the HRSR Policy to retain active status on FisheryProgress.

The following tables outline the criteria required to create a new FIP profile on FisheryProgress and for initial review of all HRSR Policy requirements. The tables are organized by the relevant section in the FIP Profile and by fields under each section.

General Information	
Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
FIP Overview	
FIP Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It follows FisheryProgress' naming conventions: <i>"Location species – gear."</i> It accurately reflects the FIP's scope and is as specific as possible about location, species, and gear(s). The location is specific in identifying the area where fishing occurs, beginning with the country and, if applicable, followed by the region, state, or coast/bay/sea. If fishing spans across multiple EEZs, the FIP name should include the ocean(s) where fishing occurs in place of a country. The species listed were scored against Principle 1 of the MSC Standard. If there are more than three target species, the species are aggregated into a group (e.g., small pelagics, groundfish). The gear(s) listed were scored against Principle 2 of the MSC Standard. If the FIP does not cover the whole fishery, the name should specify what portion is covered. If multiple FIPs exist within the same UoA, FishChoice reserves the right to add a FIP lead organization to the FIP name to distinguish between FIPs.
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a short description of FIP providing additional details on history, context, and scope. The description clarifies the scope of the fishery included in the FIP by listing: 1) the target stock or stocks and 2) the fishing method/gear. FIPs may also include any information related to the social dimensions of the fishery (e.g., general social, cultural, and economic importance of the fishery or social challenges that may be impacting the fishery).
FIP Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected
FIP Stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected
Project Timeline	

Start Date / Projected End Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The start date is when the FIP completes Stage 2 requirements. If the FIP met those requirements before creating a FIP profile, the start date should be consistent with when it completed Stage 2 requirements. • The projected end date is based on the expected completion date for all workplan actions.
Objective(s) / Objective End Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is one or more environmental objective(s) that define the FIP's scope of improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All objectives are time-bound (an objective end date is selected) and measurable. ○ The objective end date(s) is not later than the FIPs overall projected end date. ○ The scope of objectives is appropriate for the FIP type (see eligibility information in the Section 4.1: Eligibility and in the CASS Guidelines). ○ For comprehensive FIPs, the objectives address all the fishery's environmental challenges to achieve a level of performance consistent with a score of 80 or above for all MSC PIs. ○ For basic FIPs, the objectives address a specific set of the fishery's environmental challenges. A basic FIP aims to achieve a level of performance consistent with a score of 80 or above for the relevant MSC PIs. • There are one or more social objective(s) that define the FIP's scope of improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All objectives are time-bound (an objective end date is selected) and measurable. ○ The objective end date(s) is not later than the FIPs overall projected end date. ○ The objectives are relevant and appropriate for the FIP's scope.
Participants & Leads	
Participants and Leads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information for at least one public FIP contact is entered as the FIP lead. • No more than two leads are listed. • Must include at least one participant. • Must include at least one FIP supply chain participant. • FIP leads must be listed as FIP participants if they are implementing the workplan and/or funding the FIP. • All participants listed in the FIP's workplan document are listed. • Note: A FIP participant (including fishers/vessels) may be part of one or more active FIPs.
Species & Gear Type	
Species Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one target species selected matches those scored against Principle 1 of the MSC Standard.

Gear Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one gear type selected matches those scored against Principle 2 of the MSC Standard.
Landings	
Landing Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landing year refers to the year when the landings were recorded. Landings should be no more than two years old.
Estimated Total FIP Landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numbers must not include commas. <u>Estimated Total FIP Landings</u> are defined as: The estimated weight of the product a FIP catches at the time of landing. The estimated landings of the FIP are a subset of the Estimated Total Fishery Landings; however, this number should only include the landings from FIP participants or landings sold to FIP participants in the FIP's UoA.
Estimated Total Fishery Landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numbers must not include commas. <u>Estimated Total Fishery Landings</u> are defined as: The estimated weight of the product a fishery catches at the time of landing, regardless of the state in which it is landed (e.g., whole or gutted or fileted). The estimated landings of the fishery should match with the scope of the FIP's UoA, which is defined as 1) the target stock(s); 2) the fishing method or gear; and 3) the fleets, vessels, individual fishing operators, and other eligible fishers pursuing that stock.
Multispecies FIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIPs with multiple species should check the "Is this a multispecies FIP?" checkbox and enter the total FIP landings for each species within the FIP. The sum of the landing for each species should not exceed the Estimated Total FIP Landings. If the FIP is a multispecies FIP but does not have landings data for individual species, the FIP should leave the box unchecked.
Location	
UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Major Fishing Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP selects one or more FAO Major Fishing Areas.
Is this within an EEZ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP selects an option. If the FIP selected "Within one or more EEZs" or "Both within and outside of EEZs," the FIP must list all EEZs that fishing occurs in.
Is this within an Regional Fishery Management Organization (RFMO)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP selects an option. If the FIP selects "Managed by one or more RFMOs" or "Both managed by or outside the jurisdiction of RFMOs," the FIP must select all applicable RFMOs.

Flag of Vessel (Country)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP must select all countries represented by a flag of vessels within the FIP.
Geolocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP must select a point on the map to represent the FIP's location. The FIP may draw a boundary that represents the fishing area of the FIP. Note: Only one geolocation can be selected per FIP.
Supporting Documents <i>It is the FIP's responsibility to obtain permission to utilize any documentation that the FIP participant itself did not create or commission.</i>	
Pre-Assessment OR Needs Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-assessment or needs assessment, also known as environmental rapid assessments (ERA), is in English. The date of completion of the document is included. The author's name and affiliation are included in the document. <u>MSC pre-assessment:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Someone experienced with applying the MSC Standard (e.g., is a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by FishChoice) completed this. FIPs, qualified consultants, and conformity assessment bodies (CABs) use the MSC pre-assessment template available on FisheryProgress. <u>Needs Assessment (ERA):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP must use the ERA tool template, available on FisheryProgress. The author(s) of a pre-assessment or needs assessment performs due diligence in determining baseline scores for MSC PIs. If an indicator does not have information to support scoring, the reviewer may request additional detail about why the information is not available.
Proof of Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP uses the FIP budget template. The budget is in English. The budget extends to Year 2 of the FIP and is fully funded through at least Year 1. The budget provides specific detail on how activities and funds will contribute toward achieving stated outcomes. A more detailed budget could list all of the costs associated with each activity as well as secured funding and needed funding for each activity. A budget may anonymize or aggregate the sources of revenue and may include in-kind contributions and monetary contributions. Information provided on the budget indicates that there are enough funds to complete the workplan. Note: All FIPs must submit a budget to FisheryProgress but can choose to keep the budget private from users. FIPs that keep their budgets private may give FishChoice approval to anonymize their budgets for research purposes.

Scoping Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a basic FIP, the scoping document summarizes the results of the needs assessment and recommends strategies for addressing the fishery's challenges to improve its performance against the MSC Standard. For a comprehensive FIP, the scoping document summarizes the results of the MSC pre-assessment and recommends strategies for addressing the fishery's challenges to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC Standard. For all scoping documents, there is reasonable alignment between the challenges identified in the MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment and strategies recommended in the scoping document.
Documents (Other)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure additional documents have clear descriptions and are relevant to the FIP. The document completion date reflects the date the author finalized the document.

<i>Environmental Progress</i>	
Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
Indicators	
MSC Version	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP must select the version of the MSC standard that the FIP was scored against in its needs assessment or pre-assessment.
Environmental Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>For a comprehensive FIP</u>, all indicators include a score. <u>For a basic FIP</u>, all indicators that the FIP is directly addressing with one or more workplan actions include a score. Indicators that the FIP is not addressing through any actions are scored as "N/A" and accompanied by a short explanation for why the FIP is not addressing them. <p><u>Single-Species/Single-Gear FIPs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scores entered for Year 0 are the scores in the first pre-assessment/needs assessment that the FIP undertook in Stage 1. <p><u>Multispecies/Multigear/Multijurisdiction FIPs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the FIP includes multiple species/gear/jurisdiction types and the pre-assessment/needs assessment includes separate scores for each species/gear/jurisdiction combination, the FIP has entered the lowest score for each indicator on the main table. <i>Optional:</i> The FIP fills out the Multispecies/Multigear/Multijurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet, available on FisheryProgress, based on its pre-assessment/needs assessment. The FIP should upload this document to the Environmental > Supporting Documents > Other field
Environmental Actions & Tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP uploads all actions from the FIPs most recent environmental workplan document to the environmental actions and tasks section.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Name clearly reflects the intended work of the action. • Action Goal clearly reflects the intended outcome of the action. • Action Description briefly describes the steps involved to complete the action and why the action will help the FIP achieve its objectives. • The Action Start Date and Expected End Date are not outside of the FIPs overall Start and Projected End Dates. • The FIP selects at least one MSC PI for each action, and the FIP is addressing all MSC PIs scored in the FIP's pre-assessment through one or more actions. • At least one Responsible Party is entered for each action. • The FIP may enter specific tasks that the FIP will need to do to complete the action.
Supporting Documents	
Environmental Workplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For comprehensive FIPs, someone experienced with applying the MSC Standard (i.e., is a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by FishChoice) completes the environmental workplan. • FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs use the environmental workplan template. • The environmental workplan is in English. • Actions/tasks align with FIP environmental objectives and are paired with appropriate MSC PIs. • The workplan covers the FIP's expected lifetime (i.e., through the FIP's expected end date). • Time frames are plausible. • There are no major concerns or risks to achieving the workplan given the information provided. • Workplan includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Actions aligned with FIP objectives</u>. An action is a major activity from the FIP's workplan that addresses at least one deficiency identified in the needs assessment (for a basic FIP) or MSC pre-assessment (for a comprehensive FIP). Actions must always be linked to at least one MSC PI. For a comprehensive FIP, the FIP must address all PIs with a score lower than 80 with at least one action. The FIP can address a PI with multiple actions. Individual actions or a combination of actions must lead to an improvement in score of MSC PIs and must align with the FIP's objectives. ○ Actions should provide enough detail and clarity for users to understand the fundamentals the work the FIP will complete, the steps involved, and how the FIP will address the deficiencies identified in the needs assessment or pre-assessment. The FIP must provide that detail through the action description or through both the action description and tasks (optional). For examples of FIP actions and tasks, please refer to the FisheryProgress Glossary.

Documents (Other)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIPs may choose to upload additional documents in this section that further demonstrate the FIP's background and objectives. These might include Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) from FIP participants, documentation from other programs that the FIP is participating in (e.g., MSC Improvement Program), or summary documents related to monthly progress reports. Documents have a clear description. The document completion date reflects the author finalized the document.
--------------------------	--

Social Responsibility	
Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
Workforce Characteristics¹⁵	
Number of Large Vessels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number matches data that the FIP provided in the vessel list requirement section.
Number of Small Vessels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number matches data that the FIP provided in the vessel list requirement section.
Number of Fishers (total)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This refers to the approximate total number of fishers across the Unit of the FIP. FIPs must ensure consistency across all areas where this data is documented in FIP reporting, such as the vessel list, risk assessment, grievance mechanism assessment summary form, and other relevant sources.
Number of Hired Fishers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check that this information generally aligns with other information provided in the FIP's profile or HRSR Policy Requirement information (e.g., 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 3.1 when available).
Number of Migrant or Guest Workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check for alignment with other fields on the FIP's profile (i.e., nationality, languages spoken, visa/guest worker program). Confirm that the number matches data provided in the self-evaluation, based on a calculation of the percent of workforce based on the numbers provided in this field.
Fisher Nationality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check for alignment with other fields on the FIP's profile, e.g., in the SERC (migrant workforce), Fisher Awareness of Rights Requirement information.
Languages Spoken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check for alignment with other fields on the FIP's profile, e.g., in Fisher Awareness of Rights Requirement information.

¹⁵ For guidance on definitions related to workforce characteristics, please refer to the *Workforce Characteristics Guidance & Definitions* document found in the resources tab of the user dashboard.

Fisher Makeup (Optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fields add up to 100%, and information about genders is in line with other information provided.
Fisher employment structure (Optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fields when added generally match the description of the FIP/fishery and align with other HRSR Policy Requirement information.
HRSR Policy Requirements	
Requirement 1.1, Policy Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more policy statements has been uploaded. If the policy statement is posted on a website, the FIP may provide the hyperlink to the website and upload a screenshot of the webpage where it is featured. The FIP has filled out the Policy Statement information fields and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has filled in all required fields with adequate information to satisfy the requirement. The FIP affirmed that the policy statement(s) meets the criteria outlined in the HRSR policy. Information is in English. Information that the FIP provides aligns with the policy statement(s) and the general information that the FIP has provided, such as the participant list and the vessels and/or fishers harvesting FIP product. Document Completed On: Matches the date indicated in the uploaded document (the date the policy statement was signed). The Policy Statement has been endorsed by the relevant party or parties in the FIP, including one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP lead(s) has signed a policy statement on behalf of the FIP supply chain participants Each FIP supply chain participant signs a policy statement Each FIP supply chain participant has a policy statement published on its company's website.
Requirement 1.2, Vessel and/or Fisher Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP has provided vessel and/or fisher information¹⁶ in the 1.2 Vessel List section of its profile that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly answers all questions, including the sources used to provide the information and what type of information the FIP is providing (e.g. list or description). If the source is publicly accessible, a link has been provided. Is in English. In the Details field, the FIP has provided additional information as helpful to understand the vessels and fishers in the fleet. This may include but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A description and explanation of changes to the vessel list when the FIP makes updates (required) Additional information if the FIP has a mixture of land-based fishers, a vessel list, and/or a description of the fleet

¹⁶ Note that FIPs may use the FisheryProgress [vessel list template](#) to aid them in providing vessel/fisher information, but this does not have to be uploaded to the site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explanation regarding joint vessel ownership/operation where applicable ○ Link to any vessel data on Global Fishing Watch Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) or other public vessel registry ● The FIP has provided vessel and/or fisher information in accordance with the designated category of vessel(s)¹⁷ and/or fishers in the FIP, as outlined below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the FIP indicates it has large vessels or vessels fishing outside their EEZ: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The FIP provides a list of vessels in the built-in spreadsheet and completes all required fields for each vessel listed. ▪ That includes providing a vessel identification number with a unique vessel identifier (UVI)¹⁸ and/or other vessel identification number type indicated along with the number. ○ If the FIP indicates it has small vessels, the FIP either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides a list of vessels in the built-in spreadsheet and completes all required fields for each vessel listed OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides a description of the fleet that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of vessels ● Names and/or specific locations of landing sites for the catch ● Names and/or specific locations of home communities of the fishers ● Gear and vessel types ○ If the FIP indicates it has land-based or non-vessel fishers, the FIP provides a description in the “Fisher Description” tab that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The approximate number of fishers ▪ Landing sites for the catch ▪ Home communities of the fishers ▪ The type of fishing practice ● The information provided aligns with other information the FIP provides (e.g., the gear type, vessel flags, FIP description, species, workforce characteristics). ● There is no indication that the information is incomplete, inaccurate, or non-exhaustive (i.e., it covers the FIP’s full scope).
Requirement 1.3, Fisher Awareness of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>If the FIP is seeking to be in good standing with the requirement,</i> the reviewer confirms that the FIP has either completed #1 or #2 listed below:

¹⁷ Large vessels are those that weigh 10 GT or more or are 12 m or longer. Small vessels are those that weigh less than 10 GT and are shorter than 12 m. FishChoice may consider minor exceptions to these definitions based on local legal definitions.

¹⁸ FIPs must provide UVIs for all vessels that have a UVI. FishChoice accepts the following UVIs: International Maritime Organisation (IMO) number, Tuna Unique Vessel Identifier (TUVI), and the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation UVI (ISSF-UVI). Additionally, FishChoice requests that FIPs share information to help FishChoice better understand the barriers and reasons that currently prevent or discourage vessels that are eligible for a UVI from getting one.

Rights¹⁹	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The FIP has provided one or more actions for which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It has filled in all required fields. ▪ Information is in English. ▪ Collectively, the listed actions undertaken are adequate to communicate about the Policy Statement(s) and the availability of existing grievance mechanisms, and they are designed to reach all fishers in the Unit of the FIP. ▪ The FIP has uploaded evidence to demonstrate the action(s) it has described (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples). 2. The FIP has submitted an SRA that meets the criteria for review of Requirement 2.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If the FIP is reporting that it is still working toward the requirement</i>, the reviewer confirms the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FIP has utilized the “Share Work Toward Requirement” function to provide one or more planned, underway, and/or completed actions for which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It has filled in all required fields. ▪ Information is in English. ▪ Collectively, the list of actions that the FIP has undertaken and/or planned demonstrates its intent to work toward communicating about the Policy Statement(s) and the availability of existing grievance mechanisms designed to reach all fishers in the Unit of the FIP. ▪ The FIP has uploaded evidence, when necessary, to demonstrate the action(s) it has described (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples).
Requirement 1.4, Assess the Availability and Effectiveness of Grievance Mechanisms for Fishers in the FIP²⁰	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If the FIP is seeking to be in good standing with the requirement</i>, the reviewer confirms the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FIP has uploaded a copy of the grievance mechanism summary assessment form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The FIP has completed all required fields in the form in English ▪ Information in the form is consistent with itself and with other information about the FIP (e.g., vessel and/or fisher information, workforce characteristics, stated time at sea). ○ The FIP has uploaded a copy of any grievance mechanism referred to in the summary assessment form. ○ The FIP has uploaded evidence, when necessary, to document grievance systems and/or their availability and effectiveness (see

¹⁹ Please note that not all requirements in the HRSR Policy are due at publication, and their initial review will take place according to the initial deadlines noted in [Section 2.4](#). The FIP must submit information to meet requirements 1.3 and 1.4 during the FIP’s first annual report after becoming active on FisheryProgress. Note that FIPs that have provided an SRA may meet this requirement by meeting and reporting on Requirements 2.1 and 2.2.

²⁰ Ibid.

	<p>Appendix A for guidance on acceptable context-specific evidence and examples).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>If the FIP is reporting that it is still working toward the requirement</i>, the reviewer confirms the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FIP has utilized the “Share Work Toward Requirement” function to provide one or more planned, underway, and/or completed actions for which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The FIP has filled in all required fields. ▪ Information is in English. ▪ Collectively, the list of actions the FIP has undertaken and/or planned demonstrates its intent to work toward assessing the availability/effectiveness of existing grievance mechanisms to all fishers in the Unit of the FIP. ▪ The FIP has uploaded evidence, when necessary, to demonstrate the action(s) it has described (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples). Please note that the FIP may submit partial assessments (i.e., FIPs that have completed an assessment partially representative of the FIP’s scope) as evidence to demonstrate the FIP is working toward the requirement.
Requirement 1.5, Self-Evaluation of Risk Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FIP has responded to all questions from the self-evaluation of risk and associated fields (e.g., attestation of accuracy). ● The self-evaluation aligns with other information provided on the FIP, including but not limited to the pre-assessment, description of the FIP, workforce characteristics, and vessel/fisher information. The self-evaluation also aligns with the results of FIPs sharing similar characteristics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the FIP responded “no” to Criterion #4 (reported incident of forced labor, child labor, or human trafficking²¹) AND the SERC responses indicate that the FIP is not otherwise operating in a high-risk context (i.e., they are not required to meet Component 2), the reviewer must conduct due diligence on reported incidents by checking the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is not a reported incident submitted to FishChoice. ▪ None of the vessels on the FIP’s vessel list have been subject to a U.S. Customs & Border Protection Withhold Release Order within the past two years. The reviewer should consider both the vessel flag state and EEZ state when looking into any Withhold Release Orders. ▪ None of the vessels on the FIP’s vessel list²² are documented in the U.S. Department of Labor List of Goods Produced by Child

²¹ The Processes for Addressing Concerns About FIP Information on FisheryProgress outlines FisheryProgress’ criteria for reported incidents.

²² Presence of the fishery but not of FIP participants or FIP vessels, in the U.S. Department of Labor [List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor](#) is considered in context with other information about the FIP.

	<p>Labor or Forced Labor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no other readily available public evidence of forced labor, child labor, or human trafficking, including in nongovernmental organizations or media reports with documented worker testimony and government reports. If the FIP has a reported incident: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FishChoice will not publish the details of reported incidents on the website, but FIPs may provide an optional explanation of any reported incidents of forced labor, human trafficking, or child labor on their profiles. The FIP may provide its explanation of any reported incidents of forced labor, human trafficking, or child labor by uploading a document with additional information in the Documents (Other) section of the HRSR Policy Requirements section. Please note: FishChoice does not require FIPs to proactively submit evidence in support of the results of their self-evaluation. However, FishChoice reserves the right to ask for evidence as needed.
Requirement 2.1, Risk Assessment²³	<p><i>For FIPs that complete an SRA:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP has uploaded a document of its completed risk assessment that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses the FisheryProgress risk assessment template or the SRA Tool Assessment Template Is in English The FIP completed the SRA within the 12 months prior to the date of submission The FIP has fully and correctly completed all required sections in the SRA and template, including but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP and the assessor have provided adequate justification for SRA indicator scores The SRA includes scores for all Core FisheryProgress Indicators if the FIP was required to meet requirement 2.1 (i.e., the FIP meets one or more risk criteria in the SERC). The FIP clearly describes sources. If the source is publicly accessible, the FIP has provided a link. The SRA meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of the SRA covers the FIP's full scope. When a sampling approach is taken, the methodology is described, and the representativeness of the sample is justified. Additional guidance is available in the SRA Assurance Guidance. The data collection methodology aligns with the guidance

²³ These requirements are applicable to those FIPs who met one or more risk criteria in Requirement 1.5 Self-Evaluation as well as any FIP who chose to comply with Requirements 2.1 and 2.2 voluntarily. They are due according to the deadlines noted in [Section 2.4](#). The criteria confirmed during the review process for Requirements 2.1 and 2.2 are the same for FIPs regardless of whether they are completing the requirements voluntarily or on a mandatory basis. However, FIPs should provide voluntary SRAs or alternative assessments in the 3.1 Risk Assessment (Voluntary) section of the profile.

	<p>provided in SRA: A Guide to Data Collection AND/OR the FIP uses the equivalency mapping protocol to utilize data it already collected from a recognized social standard/program in which a qualified party conducted the audit (see Guidance For FIPs with Audits Through Other Standards located in the user dashboard resources tab).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The data collection methodology of the SRA includes consultation with fishers, trade unions, worker organizations, labor rights non-governmental organizations, and/or civil society organizations, when possible and applicable. ○ A pre-approved,²⁴ qualified individual or team conducted the assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In the document details field, the FIP has provided the following information, which may include but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A brief description of the document provided ○ A brief summary of the findings of the assessment, including the number of high-risk-scoring indicators from the SRA ○ Information about the audit data from a social standard or certification program (e.g., Seafood Task Force, Fair Trade Certified) that the FIP used to populate the SRA <p><i>For FIPs that submit an alternative assessment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FIP has uploaded a document that is either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The alternative assessment that includes information on areas of risk OR ○ A summary of findings that details the areas of risk ● The FIP has uploaded a PDF copy of its Alternative Assessment Summary Form that is in English, has a recent date, and has all required fields related to the assessment completed accurately and aligned with the information provided in the assessment. ● The assessment source is a social risk assessment, pre-assessment, or audit as part of a social standard or certification program, a recent research study, outputs of a partnership with a labor or human rights organizations focused on identifying and addressing risks, or similar. ● The assessment is relevant to the FIP. ● The assessment includes the required minimum themes. ● Note: While highly encouraged, FishChoice does not require the authors of alternative assessments to be qualified HRSR consultants. It is best practice that the authors demonstrate qualifications adequate to conducting social evaluations, audits, or assessments and that they do not have commercial interest in the FIP. ● In the document details field, the FIP has provided the following
--	---

²⁴ Before the assessor conducts the SRA, the FIP must reach out to FishChoice to confirm that their selected consultant(s) meet(s) FisheryProgress qualifications. Failing to obtain the pre-approval may result in additional costs to the FIP due to the need for a qualified assessor to reassess and potentially the need to be moved to inactive status for failure to meet the initial requirement.

	<p>information, which may include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A brief description of the document provided (e.g., alternative assessment summary, alternative assessment form, etc.) ○ A brief summary of the findings of the assessment, including the number of indicators/topics/requirements that were high risk, non-conformities, or equivalent. ○ Information about the audit data from a social standard or certification program (e.g., Seafood Task Force, Fair Trade Certified) if applicable ○ Additional information not included in the form about the alternative assessment, such as further description of its source or findings (e.g., areas of high risk).
Requirement 2.2, Social Workplan²⁵	<p><i>For FIPs that have completed an SRA:²⁶</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FIP has uploaded a social workplan to the Documents (Other) section that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uses the FisheryProgress social workplan template ○ Has all required sections in the template completed ○ Is based on the SRA's findings ○ Is in English ● The FIP has developed an initial social workplan within the 12 months prior to the date of submission. ● The described actions and tasks (optional) provide enough detail and clarity for users to understand the fundamentals of what the FIP will complete. ● Time frames are plausible and adequate based on the actions. ● There are no major concerns or risks to the FIP achieving the workplan given the information provided. ● If the FIP's risk assessment shows high-risk-scoring SRA indicators, then the workplan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes at least one action for every high-risk-scoring indicator. ○ Should include actions that provide enough detail and clarity for users to understand the fundamentals of what the FIP will complete, the steps involved, and how the FIP will address the high-risk indicators identified in the SRA. The FIP must provide that detail through the action description, or it can provide it through both the action description and tasks (optional). ● If the workplan includes activities addressing Core FisheryProgress SRA Indicators, the reviewer must confirm that a pre-approved²⁷ qualified party completed those sections of the workplan (as outlined in the qualifications for conducting risk assessments and creating social

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Note that as outlined in Requirement 2.2 in the HRSR Policy, a social workplan is compulsory for FIPs that complete an SRA only if they have high-risk scoring indicators.

²⁷ Before the assessor conducts the SRA, the FIP must reach out to FishChoice to confirm that its selected consultant(s) meet(s) FisheryProgress qualifications.

	<p>workplans).</p> <p>For FIPs that have submitted an Alternative Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has uploaded a workplan or corrective action plan to the Documents (Other) section of the profile that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uses the FisheryProgress social workplan template (<u>Note:</u> If the FIP is part of a formal, third-party social certification program,²⁸ it may present its Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in lieu of using the template available on the FisheryProgress website.) ○ Has all required sections in the template completed ○ Is relevant to the assessment’s findings, i.e., addresses any findings and risks related to the minimum required themes ○ Is in English • The FIP developed its initial social workplan within the 12 months prior to the date of submission. • The described actions and tasks (optional) provide enough detail and clarity for users to understand the fundamentals of the work the FIP will complete and how the FIP will address the identified risks and/or impacts. • Time frames are plausible and adequate based on the actions. • There are no major concerns or risks to achieving the workplan given the information provided. <p>For all FIPs with workplans (based on either an SRA or an Alternative Assessment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has added each action from its social workplan document to the Social Workplan section of the HRSR Policy Requirements section of the profile. • The information in the actions provided aligns with the action information in the workplan document (e.g., action name, description, etc.).
<p>Requirement 3.1, Reporting on Voluntary Risk Assessments and Workplans</p>	<p>FIPs that are reporting voluntarily fall into two categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIPs that are not required to meet Requirements 2.1 and 2.2 but voluntarily choose to • FIPs that are required to meet Requirements 2.1 and 2.2 but voluntarily choose to assess and report on risk themes, workplan actions, and/or progress beyond what is required²⁹ <p>For FIPs that completed an SRA, the FIP must meet the same criteria outlined in 2.1, with the following exceptions:</p>

²⁸ For example, this could be audits conducted for Fair Trade USA or the Responsible Fishing Vessel Standard. The certification program must assess the minimum required themes but may have a much broader scope (e.g., other labor themes, environment, or other).

²⁹ This may take many forms, including but not limited to: A FIP may expand the scope of its risk assessment to include themes beyond the minimum; a FIP with an SRA may choose to include medium-risk-scoring indicators in their workplan; or a FIP that conducted an SRA focused on the FisheryProgress Core SRA Indicators may submit an alternative assessment that assesses additional themes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIPs that are not required to meet Requirement 2.1 may choose which SRA indicators they assess (but a pre-approved³⁰ qualified HRSR consultant must still complete the assessment). If the FIP voluntarily submits an SRA, Requirement 2.2 is also voluntary.³¹ <p>For FIPs that submitted evidence of an alternative assessment, the FIP must meet the same criteria outlined in 2.1, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIPs may choose the focal areas of their alternative assessment. If the FIP voluntarily submits an alternative assessment, Requirement 2.2 is also voluntary.
Documents (Other)	<p>This section is used for the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For FIPs with an SRA or Alternative Assessment (either by requirement or voluntarily): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIPs must upload their social workplan document in this section using the FisheryProgress social workplan template (or Corrective Action Plan if the FIP is participating in a formal, third-party, social standard/certification program). For FIPs with additional information (optional/voluntary): Any FIP may use this section to provide documentation relevant to its social improvement journey. If documentation relates to HRSR Policy requirements, the documentation provided is relevant to/supports information provided in the associated requirement(s) (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples). Existing FIPs with outstanding extension requests for requirements 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2: FIPs in transition to HRSR Policy v2.0 may use this section to provide and report on their existing extension actions efforts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A FIP must upload its extension request template (and, as necessary, progress reporting updates) and supporting evidence to this section. Criteria for reviewing extensions requests are found in 4.3.4 Review of and Reporting on Extensions to the HRSR Policy Requirements.

4.3.2. Six-Month Progress Report Review Criteria

The following table outlines the **criteria required during each six-month progress report** for all FIPs published on FisheryProgress. Reviewers review and confirm those criteria to ensure the profile is kept up to date. FIPs must meet the criteria below for a report to be marked as completed. The first table outlines general and environmental criteria, and the second includes the social criteria.

³⁰ Before the SRA is conducted, the FIP must reach out to FishChoice to confirm that their selected consultant(s) meet(s) FisheryProgress qualifications.

³¹ FIPs that voluntarily complete an SRA are not required to submit a corresponding workplan, even if their SRA shows areas of high risk. However, FIPs are strongly encouraged to consider the findings of the SRA, decide how and when to prioritize areas of risks, and develop and submit workplans to address some or all of their identified risks.

Environmental Progress

Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
Actions & Tasks	
Action Updates, Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP updates each action on the Actions & Tasks page, providing a detailed update on all actions that it is currently implementing. If the FIP has not made progress on an action, the FIP states that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity or a legislative session break). Note: Actions with a start date later than the due date of the progress report do not require an update.
Action Evidence³²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP provides adequate evidence for progress it claims on actions and uploads that as a document or through a provided link. Note: FishChoice encourages the FIP to submit that evidence in English. If it is not, the evidence may be subject to a secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site. Additionally, it is best practice for the FIP to submit evidence as a Word document or PDF.
Completed Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP submitted evidence for completed actions and tasks that resulted in its relevant indicators achieving green scores. A FIP may mark an action as complete if the FIP provides evidence showing that it achieved the action goal regardless of whether it resulted in an indicator score change. Note: In this case, the FIP must ensure that all remaining red and yellow relevant indicators associated with the completed action are included in other actions the FIP continues to report on.
Removed Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a FIP no longer plans to work on an action page, the FIP may remove the action from its workplan document and must add “Removed” to the title of the action on the Actions & Tasks page. Note: The FIP must ensure that all remaining red and yellow relevant indicators associated with the completed action are included in other actions the FIP continues to report on A FIP may also mark an action as “removed” if the relevant indicator(s) associated with the action achieved an 80+/green score and the FIP no longer needs to implement the action.

Social Responsibility

³² See guidance on evidence in [Section 4.4: Evidence of Progress](#).

Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
HRSR Policy Requirements	
Requirement 1.1, Policy Statement	<i>No updates required. If the FIP has provided an update due to changes in scope, please see the following section on annual review criteria.</i>
Requirement 1.2, Vessel and/or Fisher Information	<i>No updates required. If the FIP has provided an update due to changes in scope, please see the following section on annual review criteria.</i>
Requirement 1.3, Fisher Awareness of Rights	<p>FIPs that are in good standing with the requirement: <i>No updates required.</i></p> <p>Confirm that FIPs working toward the requirement have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided a detailed update on all actions underway or planned. If a FIP has not made progress on an action, the FIP should state that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity). • Note: If a FIP has not yet started an action (i.e., the report due date falls before the action's start date), actions do not require an update. <p>Supporting Evidence:³³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has provided adequate evidence for progress claimed on actions. • Note: FishChoice encourages FIPs to submit that evidence in English. If not, the evidence may be subject to a secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site. Additionally, it is best practice for FIPs to submit evidence in PDF form.
Requirement 1.4, Assess the Availability and Effectiveness of Grievance Mechanisms for Fishers in the FIP	<p>FIPs that are in good standing with the requirement: <i>No updates required.</i></p> <p>Confirm that FIPs working toward the requirement have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided a detailed update on all actions underway or planned. If the FIP has not made progress on an action, the FIP has stated that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity). • Note: If the FIP has not yet started an action (i.e., the report due date falls before the action's start date), actions do not require an update. <p>Supporting Evidence³⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP provides adequate evidence for progress claimed on actions. • Note: FishChoice encourages the FIP to submit evidence in English. If not, the evidence may be subject to a secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site. Additionally, it is best practice for the FIP to submit evidence in PDF form.

³³ See guidance on evidence in [Section 4.4: Supporting Evidence](#).

³⁴ See guidance on evidence in [Section 4.4: Supporting Evidence](#).

Requirement 1.5, Self-Evaluation of Risk Criteria	<i>No updates required. If the FIP has provided an update due to changes in scope, please see the following section on annual review criteria.</i>
Requirement 2.1, Risk Assessment	<i>No updates required. If the FIP has provided an update due to changes in scope, please see the following section on annual review criteria.</i>
Requirement 2.2, Social Workplan	<p><i>Confirm the FIP is required to submit a progress update, according to the following situations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIPs with SRAs must report on social workplan progress every six months, as part of their existing six-month and annual reports, until their SRA shows that all indicators have scored as low or medium risk.³⁵ FIPs with Alternative Assessments must report on social workplan progress every six months, as part of their existing six-month and annual reports, until the three-year reassessment is conducted and their social workplan is updated according to the findings of the new assessment. <p><i>For ALL FIPs that have submitted a social workplan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm that the FIP has provided the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive update for each action and task, if applicable, listed in the Social Workplan section of its profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions with a start date later than the due date of the progress report do not require an update. If the FIP does not make progress on an action, the FIP states that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity, difficulty bringing fishers and other relevant partners together, etc.). The FIP submitted evidence for any stated progress (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples). If the FIP has marked an action and/or task as completed, confirm the FIP has submitted evidence demonstrating the following, according to the type of assessment on which the workplan is based: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For SRA-based workplans: The FIP achieved the action goal and/or the indicator it was addressing has moved to at least the medium-risk level (determined by an updated assessment only). Any remaining high-risk indicators need to have a corresponding workplan action. For Alternative Assessment-based workplans: The FIP achieved the action goal. See Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples.
Requirement 3.1, Reporting on Voluntary Risk Assessments and	Voluntary Risk Assessment Reporting: FIPs that voluntarily submit a risk assessment (SRA or alternative assessment) may reassess at a frequency of their choosing, but FishChoice encourages FIPs to do so at least every three years.

³⁵ FIPs may voluntarily continue to report on indicators after their score has reached medium or low risk.

Workplans	Voluntary Workplan Reporting: FIPs that submit a social workplan must adhere to the progress reporting timelines and review criteria, as outlined in Requirement 2.2, even when that workplan is voluntary.
------------------	--

4.3.3. Annual Progress Report Review Criteria

This section outlines the criteria required during each annual progress report for all FIPs published on FisheryProgress. Reviewers review and confirm these criteria to ensure the profile is kept up to date. FIPs must meet the criteria below for a report to be marked as completed.

<i>General Information</i>	
<i>Project Timeline</i>	
Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
Start Date, Projected End Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP's projected end date has not passed. If the end date has passed, the FIP must revise its end date to reflect a more accurate timeline and provide a reason for the extension.
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the FIP has revised its end date, the FIP must review its objectives and make timeline updates as necessary.
<i>Landings</i>	
Landings Year, Estimated Total FIP Landings, Estimated Total Fishery Landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP must provide landings data from the most recent year for which data exists.
<i>Supporting Documents</i>	
Environmental Workplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the FIP's end date has passed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP updated the environmental workplan to reflect the new extended timelines for actions. The environmental workplan must be in English. The FIP may additionally upload the environmental workplan in other

	<p>languages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Note: If the environmental workplan requires significant changes, the reviewer may choose to approve a report and mark it as complete with the condition that the FIP will provide the updated environmental workplan during its next report.
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The budget is in English. ● The budget covers, at a minimum, the year the report takes place.

<i>Environmental Progress</i>	
<i>Indicators</i>	
Performance Indicators (PI) Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FIP adds new scores for all MSC PIs for the current year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note: Basic FIPs must use the N/A score for any indicators they are not tracking. ● PIs with an increase in score must include a rationale and evidence to support the score change. Please see Section 4.4: Evidence of Progress for details on acceptable evidence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note: It is best practice to provide rationale and evidence for decreases in scores. <p>Communicating score changes resulting from a new/different assessor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If there is a different assessment author from the previous year, the FIP must state that in the rationale on the FIP profile for the relevant PIs. <p>Transitioning from MSC version 2 to version 3 indicators: If a FIP wants to transition from using MSC version 2 indicators to MSC version 3, it must first complete a pre-assessment against MSC v3 Indicators. Then, the FIP can use those scores as the next year of indicator scores in an upcoming annual report. A FIP that transitions from reporting against v2 indicators to v3 indicators will be unable to switch back to v2 indicators in the future.</p>
Actions and Tasks	
Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
Action Updates, Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FIP updates each action on the Actions & Tasks page, providing a detailed update on all actions that it is currently implementing. If it has not made progress on an action, the FIP states that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity or a legislative session break). ● Note: Actions with a start date later than the due date of the progress report do not require an update.

Action Evidence³⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP provides adequate evidence for progress it claimed on actions, uploaded as a document or through a provided link. Note: FishChoice encourages FIPs to submit evidence in English. If not, the evidence may be subject to a secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site. Additionally, it is best practice for the FIP to submit evidence as a Word document or PDF.
Completed Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP submitted evidence for completed actions and tasks. Note: An action may be considered complete when the FIP provides evidence showing that the FIP achieved the action goal, regardless of whether it resulted in an indicator score change, or if the indicator it was addressing changed to green. Additionally, a FIP may mark an action as “completed” if the indicator(s) the FIP was addressing has achieved an 80+/green score and the FIP no longer needs to implement the action. Comprehensive FIPs have at least one action addressing all red and yellow indicators.
Removed Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a FIP no longer plans to work on an action page, the FIP may remove the action from its workplan document and must add “Removed” to the title of the action on the Actions & Tasks page. Note: The FIP must include all remaining red and yellow indicators associated with the removed action in other actions that the FIP is reporting on. A FIP may mark an action as “removed” if the relevant indicator(s) associated with the action achieved an 80+/green score and the FIP no longer needs to implement the action.

<i>Social Responsibility</i>	
Field	Criteria Confirmed in the Review Process
Workforce Characteristics	
Multiple fields	The FIP’s workforce characteristics data is up to date and accurate.
HRSR Policy Requirements	
Requirement 1.1, Policy Statement	<p>FIPs must confirm during their annual report that the information they provided remains current or submit updated documentation.</p> <p><i>If there have been changes to the Policy Statement(s)³⁷ since the last report:</i></p>

³⁶ See guidance on evidence in [Section 4.4: Evidence of Progress](#).

³⁷ FIPs that have undergone a scope change may be required to update their Policy Statement(s) (see [Section 4.2.7: Reviewing Scope Changes and Impact on the Review Process](#)). For example, changes to the FIP lead and/or FIP supply chain participants will trigger an update. FIPs may also voluntarily adapt their approach to the Policy Statement(s) over time (e.g., starting with multiple statements and then converging around a single shared Policy Statement).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has uploaded one or more policy statement(s). If the policy statement is posted on a website, the FIP may provide the hyperlink to the website and a screenshot of the page as the associated file. • The FIP has provided updated Policy Statement information and it is in accordance with the criteria listed in the initial review process for Requirement 1.1 and includes a recent date for the Document Complete On field. • Note: In cases where the FIP lead endorsed the policy statement and there were changes to the FIP participants but no changes to the statement itself, reviewers will confirm with the FIP that the FIP has made any new participants aware of the Policy Statement and that it was signed on their behalf by including the updated information in the Description and/or Endorsement fields where Policy Statement information is provided. <p><i>If there have been no changes to the Policy Statement(s)</i> since the last report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has confirmed that the information provided remains current and meets the requirement details. That confirmation has a current date associated with it.
Requirement 1.2, Vessel and/or Fisher Information	<p>FIPs must confirm during their annual report that the information provided remains current or submit updated documentation.</p> <p><i>If there have been any changes to the vessel and/or fisher information</i> since the last report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has provided updated vessel and/or fisher information that is in accordance with the criteria listed in the initial review process for Requirement 1.2. • Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If there are major changes in the FIP's vessel information, the FIP may provide an explanation of changes in the Details field and the reviewer may follow up to confirm the cause for the changes.³⁸ <p><i>If there have been no changes to the vessel and/or fisher information</i> since the last report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has confirmed that the information provided remains current and meets the requirement details.
Requirement 1.3, Fisher Awareness of Rights³⁹	<p>Due to the ongoing nature of this work, all FIPs must provide regular updates on their continuing efforts to make fishers aware of their rights.</p> <p><i>If the FIP was in good standing with the requirement</i> at their most recent</p>

³⁸ FIPs that have undergone a scope change may be required to update their Vessel and/or Fisher Information (see [Section 4.2.7: Reviewing Scope Changes and Impact on the Review Process](#)).

³⁹ Note that FIPs who have provided an SRA may continue to meet this requirement by reporting on Requirements 2.1 (every three years) and 2.2 (every six months).

	<p>prior report, the reviewer confirms the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has provided an update that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes current information about the FIP’s continuing efforts to make fishers aware of their rights within the past year. ○ The FIP has provided evidence to demonstrate the action(s)/updated efforts it has described (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples). <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the FIP has an SRA and opted to not report separately on 1.3, the FIP continues reporting on its SRA and/or social workplan. <p><i>If the FIP was working toward the requirement</i> at its most recent prior report, the reviewer confirms the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has provided a detailed update on all actions underway or planned. If the FIP has not made progress on an action, the FIP states that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity). • When necessary and applicable, the FIP has provided evidence to support its progress. (Please see the section on Supporting Evidence for details.) • Note: If the FIP has not yet started an action (i.e., the report due date falls before the action’s start date), actions do not require an update.
<p>Requirement 1.4, Assess the Availability and Effectiveness of Grievance Mechanisms for Fishers in the FIP⁴⁰</p>	<p>All FIPs must provide regular updates on the availability of grievance mechanisms and their effectiveness.</p> <p><i>If the FIP was in good standing with the requirement</i> at its most recent prior report, the reviewer confirms the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP has submitted a PDF copy of its grievance mechanism ongoing appraisal form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FIP has completed all required fields in the form in English ○ Information in the form is consistent with itself and with other information about the FIP (e.g., vessel list, stated time at sea). • The FIP has indicated to which mechanism(s) the appraisal applies. • The appraisal form(s) individually or collectively cover all of the FIP’s grievance mechanisms. • If the FIP provided a new grievance mechanism or there are changes to existing grievance mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FIP has provided an updated grievance mechanism summary assessment form. ○ The FIP has provided new documentation as outlined in the initial review process for Requirement 1.4. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the FIP has an SRA and opted to not report separately on 1.4, the FIP continues reporting on their SRA and/or social workplan.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

	<p><i>If the FIP was working toward the requirement</i> at its most recent prior report, the reviewer confirms the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP has utilized the Share Work Toward Requirement function and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided an updated on existing actions, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided a new set of actions (planned, underway, or completed) for which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required fields are filled in. Information is in English Collectively, the list of actions the FIP has undertaken and/or planned demonstrates intent to work toward assessing the availability/effectiveness of existing grievance mechanisms to all fishers in the Unit of the FIP. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP has uploaded evidence for all stated progress and for any actions marked as completed (see Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples). Please note that a FIP may submit partial assessments (i.e., FIPs that have completed an assessment partially representative of the FIP's scope) as evidence to demonstrate that the FIP is working toward the requirement. OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP has submitted evidence demonstrating they have achieved good standing with this requirement, either via submission of the grievance mechanism summary assessment form and related information and evidence, or via publication of an SRA and corresponding workplan.
Requirement 1.5, Self-Evaluation of Risk Criteria	<p>FIPs must repeat the SERC each year as part of their annual report. Reviewers confirm that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A FIP has completed a new SERC and that it aligns with the initial review criteria. <p><i>If there were no changes in the SERC (e.g., did not meet risk criteria and still does not or did meet risk criteria and still does),</i> no additional steps are needed.</p> <p><i>If there were changes in the SERC so that the FIP now meets the risk criteria but it previously did not,</i> the FIP will report according to the guidance in section Scope Changes With Regard to the HRSR Policy Requirements.</p> <p><i>If there were changes in the SERC so that the FIP now does not meet the risk criteria but it previously did,</i> the FIP will report according to the guidance in section Scope Changes With Regard to the HRSR Policy Requirements.</p>
Requirement 2.1, Risk Assessment	<p>A new or an updated risk assessment is required in the following situations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIP does not currently have a risk assessment, but the SERC completed in the past 12 months indicated it meets one of the criteria. The FIP has completed an SRA or alternative assessment but three years

	<p>have passed since the last published assessment.</p> <p>Note: A FIP may voluntarily submit a new or updated risk assessment (SRA or alternative assessment) more frequently (such as at every annual report) if desired. For example, a FIP that previously submitted evidence of an alternative assessment may submit a more recent alternative assessment, additional information about its prior alternative assessment, or an updated SRA.</p> <p>A new risk assessment is not required for any FIP that does not meet any of the aforementioned situations.</p> <p><i>If the FIP provided a new or updated risk assessment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reviewer will follow the initial review process outlined in Section 4.3.1 of these guidelines for a FIP that either completed an SRA or submitted an alternative assessment. • A FIP may choose to include in its update a summary of changes from the FIP's past SRAs or additional information about the alternative assessment that it did not provide previously.
Requirement 2.2, Social Workplan	<p><i>FishChoice requires FIPs to submit a progress update, according to the following situations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIPs with SRAs must report on social workplan progress every six months, as part of their existing six-month and annual reports, until their SRA shows that all indicators have scored as low or medium risk.⁴¹ • FIPs with alternative assessments must report on social workplan progress every six months, as part of their existing six-month and annual reports, until the three-year reassessment is conducted and their social workplan is updated according to the findings of the new assessment. • FIPs that updated their SRA or alternative assessment (e.g., due to a required reassessment) must update their social workplan to reflect the updated assessment. The FIPs may submit the workplan at the same time as their assessment or at the latest six months later. <p><i>For ALL FIPs that have submitted a social workplan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIP must provide the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A comprehensive update for each action and task, if applicable, listed in the Social Workplan section of their profile: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Actions with a start date later than the due date of the progress report do not require an update. ▪ If the FIP has not made progress on an action, the FIP states that in the update (best practice is to provide a reason for no progress, such as a lack of funding for an activity, difficulty bringing fishers and other relevant partners together, etc.). ▪ The FIP submitted evidence for any stated progress (see

⁴¹ FIPs may voluntarily continue to report on indicators after their score has reached medium or low risk.

	<p>Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If the FIP has marked an action and/or task as complete, the reviewer confirms the FIP has submitted evidence demonstrating the following, according to the type of assessment on which the workplan is based: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For SRA-based workplans: The FIP achieved the action goal and/or the indicator that the FIP was addressing has moved to at least the medium-risk level (determined by an updated assessment only). Any remaining high-risk indicators need to have a corresponding workplan action. ○ For alternative assessment-based workplans: The FIP achieved the action goal, regardless of whether an updated assessment was provided. ○ See Appendix A for guidance on acceptable evidence and examples. <p><i>For FIPs that have submitted an updated SRA-based workplan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The workplan reflects the FIP's most recent SRA indicator scores. The reviewer will confirm the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whether any scores have changed between the most recent SRA and the prior SRA. ○ The FIP updated any changed scores in its most recent social workplan document. ○ <u>If a high-risk indicator becomes medium or low risk</u>, the FIP may stop reporting on any actions and tasks (if applicable) related to the indicator going forward. No additional evidence is required for score changes, but the FIP must properly document justification for the score change in the most recent risk assessment. ○ <u>If the FIP has a new high-risk indicator (either due to expanding the scope of the risk assessment or due to a low- or medium-risk indicator becoming high risk)</u>, the reviewer will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirm that the FIP has updated its workplan to include at least one action for every new high-risk-scoring indicator. ▪ Confirm that the new action(s) meet the criteria outlined in the social workplan initial review in Section 4.3.1. <p><i>For FIPs that have submitted an updated alternative assessment-based workplan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The workplan reflects the FIP's most recent alternative assessment findings.
<p>Requirement 3.1, Reporting on Voluntary Risk Assessments and Workplans</p>	<p>Voluntary Risk Assessment Reporting: FIPs that voluntarily submit a risk assessment (SRA or alternative assessment) may reassess at a frequency of their choosing, but FishChoice encourages them to do so at least every three years.</p> <p>Voluntary Workplan Reporting: FIPs that submit a social workplan must adhere to the progress reporting timelines and review criteria, as outlined in Requirement 2.2, even when that workplan is voluntary.</p>

4.3.4. Review of and Reporting on Extensions to the HRSR Policy Requirements

As outlined in [Section 4.2.5 Review Process for Extensions and Extension Requests for HRSR Policy Requirements](#), at each report (six-month and annual), the reviewer will confirm whether the FIP has extensions for any requirements in the HRSR Policy that are currently active or that have ended.⁴² If an extension request was approved prior to June 2025, the end date for that extension will be considered as the timeline for meeting the requirement. As of June 2025, no additional extensions shall be granted.

If the extension period has concluded, then:

- The FIP must meet the requirement as outlined in the HRSR Policy.
- The reviewer will follow the review process for initial review of the requirement as outlined in [Section 4.3.1](#) or [Section 4.3.2](#) above (as appropriate to the requirement).

If extension period is still ongoing, the reviewer will confirm the FIP has provided a progress update as follows:

- The FIP has provided an updated [Extension Request Form](#) or [Additional Extension Request Form](#) (if it is not the first extension the FIP has requested) for the relevant requirement that includes information on the progress the FIP has made on the activities toward meeting the requirement in the Progress Reporting section within Section 5 of the HRSR Extension Request Form.
 - Note: The reviewer may request evidence for progress reported.
 - Note: If the FIP has requested an extension for Requirements 1.3 and/or 1.4, the FIP may switch its extension reporting to working toward the requirement.
- The FIP has optionally provided additional details such as a summary of key progress or the anticipated date of when the FIP expects to fully meet the requirement, if before the extension deadline.

4.4. Supporting Evidence

Evidence submitted to support progress claimed on environmental and social actions (either for action updates or action completion), increases in MSC PI scores, changes in social risk assessment results, or compliance with the requirements of the HRSR Policy **must** meet the following criteria to be acceptable:

- Be documented in writing.
- Have a date.
- Have a source (e.g., person, organization).
- Be publicly available (with anonymization where appropriate). If not publicly available, there must be a way to make it public on FisheryProgress with appropriate anonymizing. Any evidence submitted must not include personally identifiable information or any other confidential information. If the only available evidence for an action or task includes this confidential information, the FIP may contact the reviewer to discuss options for verifying it. For more information, please see the [Permission and Confidentiality of Reporting](#) documents and information on the website.

⁴² Note that by July 2026, this section of the Review Guidelines will become defunct because all extensions will have reached their end date by that time.

- **Note:** In rare and unique circumstances where evidence cannot be anonymized and contains commercially sensitive or otherwise restricted information by statute or law, evidence can be kept confidential and submitted directly to FishChoice. In such cases, FishChoice will sign a nondisclosure agreement upon request. **However, for SFP to consider progress as a Stage 4 or Stage 5 result, the FIP must make supporting evidence publicly available.**

Evidence and Timing for MSC Score Changes: FishChoice will on a case-by-case basis review data/evidence that the FIP provides that supports MSC score changes to determine whether the evidence meets the proposed score change requirements as the MSC defines. FishChoice reserves the right to determine which year (Year 0, Year 1, etc.) the MSC scores changed based on when the evidence that the FIP provided first became publicly available (as opposed to the date when the FIP uploaded the documentation). For example, a FIP currently in its third year submits evidence to increase the score of a PI for Year 3. However, the publication date of the evidence (the date the evidence became publicly available) is from the FIP's first year (Y1). In this case, FishChoice may determine that the score change should be applied to Y1 instead.

SRA Indicator Score Changes: Any changes to SRA indicator scores must be based on an updated SRA that is conducted according to the requirements of the HRSR Policy and associated guidelines and assessor qualification requirements.

Examples of evidence: Please see [Appendix A](#) for guidance and examples on acceptable evidence to support action progress, MSC PI score increases, and HRSR Policy compliance.

5. Completed FIPs

5.1. Eligibility

Completed FIPs are those that have independent verification showing they have achieved their environmental objectives and/or achieved MSC certification. A FIP can be considered complete if it achieves its objectives even if it chooses not to enter certification (or for basic FIPs, if performance doesn't reach the level required for certification). For basic FIPs, independent verification (i.e., completed by someone not affiliated with the FIP) could include a revised assessment report, government report, or peer-reviewed paper.

For FIPs pursuing certification, the certification report serves as independent verification. However, FishChoice still considers FIPs active on FisheryProgress while in MSC full assessment. FIPs will need to continue to meet the social reporting requirements during the FIP's six-month and annual progress reports while in MSC full assessment. Once an MSC Track a Fishery page or Announcement Comment Draft Report (ACDR) is uploaded and published to FisheryProgress, FishChoice will waive environmental progress report requirements (i.e., reporting on action progress and updating indicator scores). Reviewers will confirm that the FIP is in MSC full assessment during the FIP's six-month and annual reporting cycles. If the review team discovers that the FIP has withdrawn from MSC full assessment, FishChoice will reach out to the FIP and ask whether it wishes to start tracking environmental progress again on FisheryProgress or be moved to inactive. If the FIP wishes to remain active, it will have six months (i.e., until its next progress report is due) to update its FIP profile (end date, objectives, workplan, etc.). Failure to update the FIP profile such that it meets the minimum requirements for publication will result in moving the FIP to inactive.

Completed FIPs no longer report on their environmental performance but may choose to voluntarily report against the requirements of the HRSR Policy. In particular, FishChoice strongly encourages completed FIPs with an active social workplan to continue reporting. FishChoice will leave completed FIPs on FisheryProgress indefinitely.

5.2. Completing an Active FIP

Examples of claims and appropriate verification include:

Claim	Independent Verification
Certified	MSC Public Certification Report (PCR Report)
Meets a level of performance equivalent to an unconditional pass of the MSC Standard (i.e., a comprehensive FIP that does not pursue certification)	Independent evaluation that affirms all indicators are green posted publicly on FisheryProgress
Rated	Assessment report
Met specific objective such as bycatch reduction	Independent evidence — government report, peer-reviewed paper, etc. — that meets the site's criteria for evidence (see Appendix A)

The reviewer will check to ensure a FIP has adequate evidence to support its completion claim.

6. Inactive FIPs

6.1. Reasons for a FIP To Be Marked As Inactive

FishChoice may move a FIP to the inactive section of the site for many reasons. The reasons are outlined throughout this document; however, the main reasons are:

1. The FIP self-reports that it has suspended work without completing its objectives.
2. The FIP no longer wishes to report on FisheryProgress.
3. The FIP misses two consecutive reporting deadlines. (A FIP must fully update its progress to move back to active.) FishChoice will consider a report missed if the FIP does not submit it by the end of the month that it is due or if the FIP does not address feedback on the report by the end of the month following the due date (as outlined in [Section 4.2.4](#)).
4. The reviewer finds the three-year evaluation to be incomplete and/or the FIP does not submit it by the end of the month that it is due (as outlined in [Section 4.2.3](#)).
5. A FIP had entered MSC full assessment but withdrew from the certification process and does not wish to continue reporting on FisheryProgress (as outlined in [Section 5.1](#)).
6. The FIP makes changes such that it now reports under another FIP profile (e.g., the FIP merges with another FIP). In that case, the inactive profile will note the FIP's active profile.
7. The FIP fails to meet the HRSR Policy:

- a. **The FIP did not meet the initial deadline for completing requirements 1.1 to 1.5 and, if applicable, 2.1 to 2.2.** FishChoice will consider FIPs out of compliance with the HRSR Policy if they do not meet the requirements by the end of the calendar month of the original deadline.⁴³ If they fail to meet this deadline, FishChoice will move them to inactive status.
- b. **The FIP did not report regularly as outlined in each requirement.** FIPs must meet future and progress reporting requirements through their existing six-month and annual report schedule, as outlined in these guidelines.

Inactive FIPs are not eligible to actively report on FisheryProgress in any form. Inactive FIP profiles remain on the site indefinitely.

6.2. How To Reactivate an Inactive FIP

Reactivating an inactive FIP. A FIP that is inactive may move back to active (reactivate) at any time by uploading the required documentation and providing the necessary progress updates. Based on the date the FIP is moved back to active, FishChoice may adjust its reporting cycle. The FIP will maintain the original profile's start date.

- *Inactive for three months or less:* For FIPs that have been inactive for less than three months and have submitted the relevant materials and updates to move back to active, the reviewer will carry out a review based on the most recent progress report type (i.e., six month or annual). See the details on the requirements for progress reports in [Section 4.3.2: Six-Month Progress Report Review Criteria](#) and [Section 4.3.3: Annual Report Progress Review Criteria](#).
- *Inactive for more than three months:* For FIPs that have been inactive for more than three months, the reviewer will carry out an initial review. See the details on the requirements for an initial review in [Section 4.3.1: Initial Review](#).

If the FIP went inactive due to failure to comply with the HRSR Policy, one of the following applies:

- **If the FIP did not meet a deadline for completing Requirements 2.1 and/or 2.2,** the FIP must undergo a full annual review, including meeting the review criteria immediately as outlined in the guidelines above.
- **If the FIP did not report regularly as outlined in each requirement,** the FIP must undergo a full annual review, including the review criteria outlined in the guidelines above.

Impact on the three-year evaluation cycle. Comprehensive FIPs that are reactivating a profile will maintain the profile's original three-year evaluation report due date unless it is due within 12 months of reactivating, in which case the three-year cycle report date will be adjusted to 12 months from the reactivation date.

In instances where a FIP's reporting cycle is adjusted based on the date it reactivates, FishChoice will align the three-year evaluation report due date with the closest annual report preceding the original audit report deadline.

If the FIP moved to inactive due to failure to complete a three-year audit, it must submit the audit to be reactivated.

⁴³ If FishChoice approved an extension request prior to June 2025, it will treat the deadline as the end date for that extension. As of June 2025, FishChoice will not grant any additional extensions.

7. Appendix A: Guidance on Evidence and Examples

FishChoice encourages FIPs to submit evidence in English (see [Section 2.2: Language Requirements](#) for documentation that must be in English). If not, the evidence is subject to secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site. FishChoice reserves the right to ask for additional evidence as needed for verification purposes. Guidance on evidence is below.

General Examples of Evidence (environmental and social reporting)

This will vary depending on the action/task or proposed activities. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence:

- Signed agreements with consultants, government agency staff, or other individuals demonstrating progress on specific activities such as research
- Meeting or training agendas, notes, and/or participant lists
- Letters sent to government agencies, suppliers, or other entities
- Credible media articles, blog posts, and/or statements posted on a website
- White papers, summary reports, rapid assessments, formal stock assessments, data analyses, or social impact assessment reports or studies
- Data collection protocols, log books and catch documentation, or raw data
- Official government laws, regulations, or policies
- Evidence of trainings (documented with agendas and participant signatures)
- Internal or external policies or templates (e.g., handbooks, onboarding materials, worker contracts)
- Evidence of worker interviews (e.g., a summary report of findings)
- Links to videos or photos (e.g., demonstrating improvements, new gear, new health and safety equipment, meetings, announcements on bulletin boards or landing sites)
- Signed agreements (e.g., with community members, with service providers)

Examples of Evidence of “Working Toward” the Requirement (HRSR Policy Requirements 1.3 and 1.4)

If FIPs are still in the planning stages or currently undertaking actions to either 1) make fishers aware of the FIP’s Policy Statement(s) and/or available grievance mechanisms or 2) to document and assess grievance mechanism availability and effectiveness, supporting evidence for their actions may include but is not limited to:

- A budget and/or grant proposal demonstrating fundraising efforts to carry out activities
- Contracts with consultants or relevant experts to lead or collaborate with on this work
- Meeting minutes from planning sessions with partners
- Partnership agreements or MOUs with local organizations to co-design or facilitate fisher rights trainings and/or grievance documentation
- A draft or outline of a training or awareness plan
- Draft training materials
- Planning documents, such as a mapping out of the workforce or stakeholder landscape

Guidance on Evidence for HRSR Policy Requirement 1.4: Assess the Availability and Effectiveness of Grievance Mechanisms for Fishers in the FIP

FIPs must assess both the existence and effectiveness of systems through which fishers can raise and resolve grievances. The following guidance outlines examples of acceptable evidence across a range of FIP contexts, including both formal and informal settings.

1. **Evidence of Grievance Mechanism Documentation:** FIPs must submit documentation demonstrating when grievance processes exist and how they are structured. Evidence will vary depending on the context—whether the mechanism is formal and written or informal, verbal, and/or community-based.
 - a. **Formal Grievance Mechanisms.** This is applicable in settings with clear employment relationships (e.g., industrial vessels, employers with human resources systems):
 - i. Grievance procedures or policies (in employee handbooks, human resources policies, or codes of conduct)
 - ii. Company-level grievance mechanism documents (in any participating employer’s documentation)
 - iii. Agreements with third-party grievance platforms (e.g., hotlines, SMS reporting systems)
 - b. **Cooperatives or Fishing Association.** Where fishers are part of a cooperative, association, or local governance group:
 - i. Documents outlining conflict resolution or grievance procedures
 - ii. Written policies or codes of conduct adopted by the group
 - iii. Signed declarations by leaders outlining grievance pathways
 - iv. Records of cooperative grievance committee activities (if applicable)
 - c. **Unionized Fishers.** Where fishers are covered by a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) or union representation, FIPs must provide evidence that the CBA is active and define the bargaining unit (i.e., which fishers in the FIP the CBA covers):
 - i. A copy of the CBA, including the grievance clause
 - ii. Signed statements by workers and/or employers
 - iii. Union membership lists or dues records
 - iv. Employer policies that reflect the terms of the CBA
 - v. Worker surveys or interview results
 - d. **Informal or Verbal Mechanisms (common in small-scale/artisanal contexts).** Where no written documentation exists, FIPs may submit:
 - i. A written description or map of the “grievance channel” (who fishers go to, how issues are resolved)
 - ii. Community-developed grievance process summaries or social network maps
 - iii. Outputs from participatory workshops (e.g., facilitation notes, sketches, photos)
 - iv. Signed statements or testimonies from fishers or community leaders describing grievance pathways
2. **Evidence of Grievance Mechanism Availability and Effectiveness:** In addition to documentation, FIPs must assess whether fishers actually use mechanisms and whether the mechanisms function effectively. This includes identifying who has access to them, how issues are resolved, and whether fishers feel the system works. Acceptable evidence to accompany the FIP’s grievance mechanism summary assessment form may include but is not limited to:
 - a. Logs or reports showing number and types of grievances received and how they were addressed (where available)
 - b. Meeting minutes or documented resolutions of past grievance cases
 - c. Testimonials or direct quotes from fishers on whether they feel their concerns are heard and resolved. These can be written summaries of findings, even if qualitative (e.g., “In a group discussion with 10 fishers, 8 said they prefer to raise issues with their cooperative leader, and 6 said their issues were usually resolved verbally within two days.”)

- d. Documentation of the role of community leaders, elders, or co-op representatives in resolving conflicts
- e. Results from fisher or worker surveys about their awareness, use, and satisfaction with grievance processes
- f. Notes or reports from third-party interviews or assessments on the accessibility and effectiveness of the mechanism
- g. Indications of ongoing improvements (e.g., mechanisms adapted to better serve fishers, translated materials, enhanced Wi-Fi access, etc.)

Examples of Evidence for MSC PI score increase: FIP's action progress or its demonstrated improvements in policy, management, or fishing practices or improvements on the water may drive score changes. Evidence will vary depending on the improvement that the FIP reports. Evidence supporting score changes must meet the MSC standard's scoring guidepost language for the PI score that the FIP is reporting a change to. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence for improvements a FIP may report:

- **Policy change:** management plan, ministerial decree, or media coverage documenting policy change
- **Change in fishery status:** government or third-party reports showing improvement in the fishery (e.g., stock assessment)
- **Changes in fishing practices (e.g., gear changes):** government or consultant report or summary report from the FIP, which for fishing practice changes, the evidence must clearly state what proportion of the fishery has implemented the changes
- **Research (e.g., research done or data collection made more accurate):** peer-reviewed study, consultant or government report, or grant report that confirms data being collected

FIPs can use pre-assessments, workplans, or reports as evidence as long as they are authored by a party experienced in the MSC Standard and accompanied by appropriate rationale that draws upon language from the MSC Standard scoring guideposts. Reviewers may exercise discretion in absence of concrete evidence.