  

## Basic Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Scoping Document Guidelines

# **Introduction**

The purpose of these guidelines is to help the user create a scoping document for a basic FIP to summarize the results of the rapid assessment and recommend strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges. Below is an outline of the suggested content to include.

**Outline of content:**

**Basic fishery information overview:**

This section should contain basic information that describes the fishery – definition of the target stock(s), fishing method/gear used to target that stock, and any fleets or groups of vessels that could be included in a FIP.

**Fishery supply chain analysis:**

This analysis will help to identify who else could be involve in the project. The sources of information could be local and national statistics, global data (e.g. FAO), and market reports. As a review of the chain is develop, a stakeholder mapping should allow to invite other participants (e.g. suppliers, exporters, nongovernmental organizations, etc.).

**Environmental challenges following the three principles of the MSC standard:**

This section should help to identify major sustainability deficiencies in the fishery in the following areas:

* Status of target stocks and harvest strategy
* Ecosystems impacts (impacts on other species, impacts on endangered, threatened and protected species and Impacts on habitats)
* Management (legal framework, fishery objectives and research, monitoring and enforcement)

**Improvement Recommendations:**

This section should describe the actions that need to happen to improve the deficiencies identified.

**Sources of information:**

* Sustainability evaluations
* Market and supply chain analyses
* Manager reports
* Peer-reviewed studies
* International body reports (e.g., FAO reports)

  

## Comprehensive Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Scoping Document

# **Introduction**

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

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

#

# **Outline of template content**

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

1) Definition of the FIP unit of assessment

2) Performance indicators (PIs) summary

3) Recommendations for Improvements by PI

4) Additional impacts

# **Template**

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

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

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

# **2. Performance Indicators Summary**

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

*“As part of an MSC pre-assessment for the [insert name of fishery] fishery in [year], a number of Performance Indicators (PIs) were scored such that the fishery would fail under a full MSC assessment (SG <60),and require conditions for other PIs (SG 60-79). The scores for all PIs are included in Table 1 including the likely time frame for the PI to be addressed”*

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

### Principle 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PI Category** | **Scoring Range** | **Related PIs** |
| 1.1.1 | Stock Status | **Example:** SG<60 | 1.1.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4 |
| 1.1.2 | Stock Rebuilding |  | 1.1.1 |
| 1.2.1 | Harvest Strategy |  | 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.2.1 |
| 1.2.2 | Harvest Control Rules and Tools |  | 1.1.1, 1.2.1 |
| 1.2.3 | Information and monitoring |  | 1.2.1 |
| 1.2.4 | Assessment of Stock Status |  | 1.2.1 |

### Principle 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PI Category** | **Scoring** | **Related PIs** |
| 2.1.1 | Primary spp: Outcome Status |  | 2.1.2, 2.1.3 |
| 2.1.2 | Primary spp: Management Strategy |  | 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.1.3 | Primary spp: Information/Monitoring |  | 2.1.1, 2.1.2 |
| 2.2.1 | Secondary spp: Outcome Status |  | 2.2.2, 2.2.3 |
| 2.2.2 | Secondary spp: Management Strategy |  | 2.2.1, 2.2.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.2.3 | Secondary spp: Information/Monitoring |  | 2.2.1, 2.2.2 |
| 2.3.1 | ETP spp: Outcome Status |  | 2.3.2, 2.3.3 |
| 2.3.2 | ETP spp: Management Strategy |  | 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.3.3 | ETP spp: Information/Monitoring |  | 2.3.1, 2.3.2 |
| 2.4.1 | Habitat: Outcome Status |  | 2.4.2, 2.4.3 |
| 2.4.2 | Habitat: Management Strategy |  | 2.4.1, 2.4.3, 3.2.1 |
| 2.4.3 | Habitat: Information/Monitoring |  | 2.4.1, 2.4.2 |
| 2.5.1 | Ecosystem: Outcome Status |  | 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.4.1 |
| 2.5.2 | Ecosystem: Management Strategy |  | 2.5.1, 2.5.3, 1.2.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2, 3.2.1 |
| 2.5.3 | Ecosystem: Information/Monitoring |  | 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3, 2.4.3 |

### Principle 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PI Category** | **Scoring** | **Related PIs** |
| 3.1.1 | Governance and policy: Legal and/or Customary Framework |  | 3.1.2, 3.1.3 |
| 3.1.2 | Governance and policy: Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities |  | 3.1.1, 3.2.2 |
| 3.1.3 | Governance and policy: Long Term Objectives |  | 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 |
| 3.2.1 | Fishery Specific Management System: Fishery-Specific Objectives |  | 1.21.,1.2.2, 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2, 2.5.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.2.5 |
| 3.2.2 | Fishery specific Management System: Decision-Making Processes |  | 3.1.2, 3.2.1 |
| 3.2.3 | Fishery Specific Management System: Compliance & Enforcement |  | 1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3, 2.4.3 |
| 3.2.4 | Fishery Specific Management System: Monitoring and Management Performance Evaluation |  | 3.2.1 |

#

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

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

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

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

**Table 1. Template**

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

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

**Table 2: Example**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.1.1 Stock Status** | **The stock is at a level which maintains high productivity and has a low probability of recruitment overfishing** |
| **Scoring Guidepost** | SG 60 | SG 80 | SG 100 |
| **Scoring Issue Description** |  |
| 1. The stock status relative to recruitment impairment
 | It is likely that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired (PRI). | It is highly likely that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired. The stock is at or fluctuating around its target reference point. | There is a high degree of certainty that the stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired.There is a high degree of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around its target reference point, or has been above its target reference point, over recent years. |
| 1. The stock status in relation to achievement of MSY
 |  | The stock is at or fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY. | There is a high degree of certainty that the stock has been fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY or has been above this level over recent years. |
| **Scoring Range and Rationale** | Stock status is not known quantitatively. The Risk Based Framework (RBF) methodology was used to assess the stock status. The Risk Based Framework (RBF) methodology was therefore used to assess stock status. The RBF estimates risk based on the assumption that the risk to a species depends on two characteristics: (1) the extent of the impact due to the fishing activity, which will be determined by the susceptibility to the fishing activities (Susceptibility) and (2) the productivity of mahi mahi (Productivity), which will determine the rate at which recovery can occur after potential depletion or damage by fishing. Mahi mahi is a very productive species; however, its high susceptibility to fishing activity determines that the risk would likely be estimated as high under any full assessment. |
| **Improvement Recommendations** | The application of the RBF determined that the fishery is likely to pose a high risk on the productivity of the stock. Therefore, an important pre-requisite for scoring 60 and above is to develop reference points. Stock biomass (or stock biomass indicators) and fishing mortality should be estimated through stock assessment and the results compared with target and limit reference points.  |
| **Priority**  | High  |

# **4. Additional Impacts**

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

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

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

  

## Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Workplan Template

## Introduction

Developing a fishery improvement project (FIP) workplan is an important, required step in the FIP process. The purpose of this document is to outline the information that must be included in a FIP workplan.

The FIP workplan should be developed in collaboration with FIP stakeholders[[1]](#footnote-1).This template includes the important components of a workplan and provides the information needed to report progress on FisheryProgress.org.

Upon completion, FIP workplans should be translated from the local language into English or from English into the local language to ensure adequate understanding among all stakeholders.

**Template content**

The template includes the definition of the FIP Unit of Assessment (i.e., the specific species, location(s), gear types covered by the FIP), as well as sections for each Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Principle[[2]](#footnote-2). Each table row contains a simple description of the information needed to be include in each specific MSC Performance Indicator (PI). Additional guidance and examples are also included.

**Guidance on how to use the workplan template**

The workplan template aims to help stakeholders develop a clear plan for implementing the fishery improvements that need to be made and ensures that information needed for reporting on FisheryProgress.org is included in the workplan. Each PI that has a scoring category of <60 (i.e., red) or 60-79 (i.e., yellow) must have at least one action directly linked to it, that would, when completed, result in an increased score (i.e., meeting the requirements of the next scoring guidepost for that PI).

The critical elements that need to be included in the FIP workplan are:

1. **Actions:** Defined as a major activity in the FIP’s workplan that must be completed to address specific deficiencies identified in the needs assessment (for basic FIPs) or MSC pre-assessment (for comprehensive FIPs). For comprehensive FIPs, actions should clearly link to the PIs of the MSC Fisheries Standard. For FIPs reporting their progress on [FisheryProgress.org](http://www.fisheryprogress.org), both basic and comprehensive FIPs need to report progress against the MSC Principles.
2. **Completion dates:** To ensure accountability, an expected completion date should be included for each action.
3. **Priority:** High, medium or low priority taking into account scoring in the needs assessment or MSC pre-assessment and sequencing of actions (output of one action needed to begin another action).
4. **Estimated Cost:** Costs for each action.
5. **Responsible parties:** Organizations/individuals responsible for completing the actions as agreed upon by FIP stakeholders.
6. **MSC PIs:** All PIs that will be addressed by the action.
7. **Tasks:** This section breaks the actions identified above down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished. Tasks provide more clarity on how the FIP intends to complete each action. This allows participants to better track progress over time and communicate about progress being made in the FIP.

# **FIP Workplan Content**

## Acronyms

## Definition of the FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA)

## Principle 1: Sustainability of Fish Stocks

## Principle 2: Minimizing Environmental Impacts

* Principle 3: Management Effectiveness
* Additional impacts

## Glossary

#### Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FIP | Fishery Improvement Project |
| MSC | Marine Stewardship Council |
| PI | Performance Indicator |
| UoA | Unit of Assessment |

####

#### Definition of the FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA)[[3]](#footnote-3)

The FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA) includes the target stock(s), fishing method or gear, and fleets, vessels, individual fishing operators and other eligible fishers pursuing that stock. The FIP consultant or FIP leads should complete Table 1 to define the UoA.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1. FIP Unit of Assessment based on MSC definition** |
| Target species (common and scientific names) | **Example:** Mahi mahi (*Coryphaena hippurus)*  |
| Stock(s) | **Example:** Eastern Pacific |
| Fishing method or gear type | **Example:** Surface longline |
| Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock | **Example:** Artisanal Peruvian fleet |

## Table 1 below is a blank template to copy and paste as needed. Table 2 below is an example of a completed template.

## Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

**Table 1: Template**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Number and Name** (One sentence description) |   |
| **Action Goal** (One sentence that describe the result of the action) |   |
| **Action Description** (Brief summary of the steps involved in the action and importance of the action in achieving the FIP objectives) |   |
| **Expected Completion Date** |   |
| **Priority** (Based on the implementers criteria: e.g., lowest scoring issues are high priority or actions that are necessary to complete before beginning other actions are high priority) |   |
| **Estimated Cost**(An estimate of the budget needed to complete the action) |   |
| **Responsible Parties** (List of participants) |   |
| **MSC PI(s) Addressed by the Action** |   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Tasks/ Milestones** | **Responsible (lead)** | **Responsible (supporting role)** | **Starting date** | **Actual completion date** | **Evidence of completion / results** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |

### **Table 2: Example**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Number and Name**  | 1.1.2 Define the stock unit(s) |
| **Action Goal**  | Understand the stock distribution and mahi mahi population structure |
| **Action Description**  | To define the mahi mahi biological unit and determine the status of the stock, the Working Group for the Assessment of Mahi mahi needs to consider conducting genetic analysis and tagging studies. Genetic markers can be used to identify distinct fish populations. Tagging studies have proven to be very useful to understand the migratory patterns of tuna species and could also be useful to understand migratory patterns of mahi mahi. Implementing research tagging projects would provide an understanding of the stock distribution. |
| **Expected Completion date** | March 2018 |
| **Priority**  |  Medium |
| **Estimated Cost** | $50,000 USD |
| **Responsible Parties**  | IMARPE, Universities, SRP, IATTC |
| **MSC PI(s) Addressed by the Action** | 1.2.3 Information and Monitoring |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Tasks/ Milestones** | **Responsible (lead)** | **Responsible (supporting role)** | **Starting date** | **Actual completion date** | **Evidence of completion / results** |
| 1.1.2 Define the stock unit(s) | Design and implement tagging research projects | IMARPE, Universities | SRP, IATTC, Relevant NGOs | December 2016 | March 2017 | Tagging study |
| Design and implement genetic research project | IMARPE, Universities | SRP, IATTC, Relevant NGOs | December 2016 | In progress |   |

**[Copy and paste table for additional actions needed under Principle 1 as appropriate]**

##

## Principle 2: Minimizing environmental impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Number and Name** |   |
| **Action Goal** |   |
| **Action Description** |   |
| **Expected Completion Date** |   |
| **Priority** |   |
| **Estimated Cost** |   |
| **Responsible Parties** |   |
| **MSC PI(s) Addressed by the Action** |   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Tasks/ Milestones** | **Responsible (lead)** | **Responsible (supporting role)** | **Starting date** | **Actual completion date** | **Evidence of completion / results** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |

**[Copy and paste table for additional actions needed under Principle 2 as appropriate]**

## Principle 3: Effective management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Number and Name** |   |
| **Action Goal**  |   |
| **Action Description**  |   |
| **Expected Completion Date** |   |
| **Priority**  |   |
| **Estimated Cost** |   |
| **Responsible Parties** |   |
| **MSC PI(s) Addressed by the Action** | . |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Tasks/ Milestones** | **Responsible (lead)** | **Responsible (supporting role)** | **Starting date** | **Actual completion date** | **Evidence of completion / results** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |

**[Copy and paste table for additional actions needed under Principle 3 as appropriate]**

## Additional Impacts

Some FIPs include objectives that go beyond the MSC PIs. Please provide additional detail below on additional impacts that FIP stakeholders are working to address.

### Example: Social impacts

Describe the problem, goals and actions that will be implemented to address social impacts within the fishery.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Addition Impact Title** | **Additional Impact Description** |
| **Status Summary** |  |
| **Improvement Recommendation** |  |

### Example: Traceability improvements

 Describe the problems, goals and actions that will be implemented to ensure FIP traceability.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Addition Impact Title**  | **Additional Impact Description** |
| **Status Summary** |  |
| **Improvement Recommendation** |  |

## Glossary

**Pre-assessment**: A pre-assessment is a preliminary evaluation of a fishery against all MSC performance indicators to provide a picture of the fishery’s baseline environmental performance and challenges. A pre-assessment allows a fishery to identify any areas that need to be improved to reach an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. A pre-assessment must be completed by someone experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](http://www.msc.org/get-certified/fisheries/technical-assistance/consultants/consultants) or [accredited auditing body](http://www.accreditation-services.com/archives/standards/msc)).

**Basic FIP**: A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing a specific set of the fishery’s environmental challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. Basic FIPs complete a needs assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery.

**Comprehensive FIP**: A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing all of the fishery’s environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. Comprehensive FIPs engage a party experienced with applying the MSC standard to complete an MSC pre-assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery and must have independent, in-person audits of progress against the MSC standard every three years.

**Performance indicator**: A performance indicator evaluates the success of a particular activity when compare against desired goals. In the case of FIPs that follow the MSC Standard, it measures the impact of the action in place against desired conditions or results.

1. This is led by FIP participants (e.g. of FIP participants: companies in the fishery supply chain, government representatives, fishery managers, and/or nongovernmental organizations). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Per the Conservation Alliance FIP Guidelines, both basic and comprehensive FIPs must address the three MSC Principles. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA) defines the full scope of what was assessed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)