

FisheryProgress Major Changes to Draft Social Policy Feedback Survey

Note: The following document summarizes the questions included in the FisheryProgress Major Changes to Draft Social Policy Feedback Survey. If you are consolidating feedback across your organization, please collect input using the questions below, and then provide your feedback via the survey [here](#).

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback on the proposed major changes to FisheryProgress' draft social policy. In advance of completing the following survey, please review the proposed changes to draft social policy, available [here](#).

Please note that we will not publicly disclose who completed the survey nor attribute feedback to any individual or organization. We're requesting the following contact information to ensure feedback is representative of the broader community and allow us to contact you to clarify feedback if necessary.

1. Name
2. Organization
3. Email
4. Please select the option that best describes your professional role related to your use of FisheryProgress:
 - Industry – end buyer (e.g., retailer, foodservice, hospitality, etc.)
 - Industry – seafood company
 - NGO
 - Academic
 - Funder
 - Consultant
 - Other – please describe: (text box)
5. In what country are you based?
6. Are you a FIP lead (you lead one or more FIPs and report their progress on FisheryProgress)?

Initial Feedback for FIP Leads (Q6=Yes)

Please review the proposed changes to the policy [here](#). Thinking about the set of changes as a whole, please share your overall impressions.

7. If these changes are adopted, to what extent do you support FisheryProgress moving ahead with implementing the social policy?
 - 1=strongly oppose
 - 2=somewhat oppose
 - 3=neutral
 - 4=somewhat support
 - 5=strongly support
8. If these changes are adopted, to what extent are you confident in your FIP's ability to comply with the social policy?
 - 1=not at all confident
 - 2=minimally confident

- 3=somewhat confident
- 4=very confident
- 5=extremely confident

9. Please explain your ratings here.

The following question concerns the clarification about the grievance mechanism requirement. Please review pgs. 16-17 of the document before answering this question.

10. The clarification outlines specific kinds of support FisheryProgress will offer to help FIPs comply with the grievance mechanism requirement. With this support, to what extent are you confident in your FIP's ability to comply with that requirement specifically?

- 1=not at all confident
- 2=minimally confident
- 3=somewhat confident
- 4=very confident
- 5=extremely confident

11. Do you have any other feedback on the grievance mechanism clarification?

Initial Feedback for FIP Leads (Q6=No)

Please review the proposed changes to the policy [here](#). Thinking about the set of changes as a whole, please share your overall impressions.

12. Overall, how do you feel about this proposed set of changes?

- 1=strongly oppose
- 2=somewhat oppose
- 3=neutral
- 4=somewhat support
- 5=strongly support

13. Please explain your ratings here.

Feedback on Proposal #1

The following questions relate to proposal #1 – fisheries observers in the code of conduct. Please review pg. 5 of the document before answering these questions.

14. To what extent do you support the changes to include fisheries observers within the Code of Conduct?

- 1=strongly oppose
- 2=somewhat oppose
- 3=neutral
- 4=somewhat support
- 5=strongly support

15. Do you have any other feedback on the change to include fisheries observers in the Code of Conduct?

Feedback on Proposal #2

The following questions relate to proposal #2 – vessel lists. Please review pgs. 6-9 of the document before answering these questions.

16. To what extent do you support the changes made to the vessel list requirements specifically for large vessels?

- 1=strongly oppose
- 2=somewhat oppose
- 3=neutral
- 4=somewhat support
- 5=strongly support

17. To what extent do you support the changes made to the vessel list requirements specifically for small vessels and non-vessel fisheries?

- 1=strongly oppose
- 2=somewhat oppose
- 3=neutral
- 4=somewhat support
- 5=strongly support

18. Please rate the level to which you agree with the following statements about the vessel list requirements if the proposed changes are adopted: *[Rating matrix, 1=disagree strongly, 2=disagree somewhat, 3=neutral, 4=agree somewhat, 5=agree strongly]*

- The changes make the vessel list requirements more practical for large vessels.
- The changes make the vessel list requirements more practical for small vessels.
- One year is adequate time for FIPs currently listed on the site to provide a vessel list in line with these requirements.

19. Do you have any other feedback on the changes to the vessel list requirements?

Feedback on Proposal #3

The following questions relate to proposal #3 – options for risk assessment. Please review pgs. 10-14 of the document before answering these questions.

20. Option A proposes making the risk assessment, workplan, and reporting voluntary for all FIPs. To what extent do you support this option?

- 1=strongly oppose
- 2=somewhat oppose
- 3=neutral
- 4=somewhat support
- 5=strongly support

21. Option B proposes making the risk assessment, workplan, and reporting required for FIPs in fisheries that have a high risk of human rights violations and voluntary for all other FIPs. To what extent do you support this option?
- 1=strongly oppose
 - 2=somewhat oppose
 - 3=neutral
 - 4=somewhat support
 - 5=strongly support
22. Do you have any concerns or other specific feedback about the high-risk criteria in Option B?
23. Which of the two options would you prefer for FisheryProgress to implement?
- Option A: risk assessment, workplan, and reporting voluntary for all FIPs
 - Option B: risk assessment, workplan, and reporting required for FIPs at high risk of human rights violations and voluntary for all other FIPs
24. Why is that your preferred option?
25. Are you a FIP lead (you lead one or more FIPs and report their progress on FisheryProgress)?

Feedback From FIPs on Proposal #3 (Q25=Yes)

26. Thinking about the FIPs you lead, would any of them be likely to meet any of the criteria for high risk of human rights violations outlined in Option B on pg. 12-13? (If you lead multiple FIPs, please answer collectively on behalf of all FIPs you lead.) *[For each – yes, no, not sure]*
- FIPs with one or more vessels which have been subject to a U.S. Customs & Border Protection Withhold Release Order within the past four years.
 - If there are large vessels using at-sea transshipment in the FIP.
 - Fisheries where workers are not able to come ashore and access grievance procedures at least every 90 days.
 - FIPs with a significant foreign migrant workforce (25% or more of fishers are not citizens of the vessel’s flag state) on vessels flagged to states linked with forced labor in the fishing sector and/or IUU fishing.
 - Where the above characteristics are not known (i.e., where the FIP lead does not have enough information to determine if the fishery is high-risk).

Feedback on Proposal #4

The following questions relate to proposal #4 – allegations procedure changes. Please review pg. 15 of the document before answering these questions.

27. To what extent do you support the changes proposed to the allegations procedure?
- 1=strongly oppose
 - 2=somewhat oppose
 - 3=neutral
 - 4=somewhat support
 - 5=strongly support

28. Do you have any other feedback on the changes to the allegations procedure?

Final Thoughts

29. Do you have other feedback to share?