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Acronyms

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FIP | Fishery Improvement Project |
| SRA | Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector |

Glossary

Optional: list terms and definitions used in the report here. Note that any terms defined here shall not contradict terms used in the SRAT.

# Executive summary

Summarize the assessment results here.

# About the SRA

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

The Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector (SRA) was co-developed as a collaborative resource by more than two-dozen organizations. Three main documents inform most of the content and format of the SRA:

* Certification and Ratings Collaboration Framework on Social Responsibility for the Seafood Sector (Opal 2018);
* FIP Rapid Assessment Protocol (OSMI 2018);
* Guidance for Incorporating Socioeconomic Factors into Fishery Improvement Projects (SFP 2018)

Furthermore, the indicators and scoring guideposts used to build the SRA are a collation of all the existing certification and ratings community of practice for

social issues in seafood. Namely, the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool integrates

criteria from: SSRT, FTUSA, Clearview, Seafish RFS, ASC, Naturland, BSCI, FishSource, IFFO RS, GRASP, FOTS, BAP, SFP, IPNLF, and Thai Gap, among others (for a complete list refer to the SRA). The Assessment Tool also integrates all relevant ILO Conventions and international protocols and standards.

This risk assessment is designed to present key information about the fishery’s risks of human rights and social responsibility issues and critical information gaps. The results of the risk assessment are intended to help the fishery identify areas in need of improvement and inform the development of a Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) workplan that includes a social element.

# About the FIP

Provide a written description of the FIP, which should be fully covered in the scope of this risk assessment. The description should include the main targeted species, the location of the fishery and offloading ports, RFMO, vessel flags, vessel and gear types used, the approximate number of vessels and/or fishers, the employers/companies operating in the FIP and the make-up of their workforce(s) (e.g. local, migrant, seasonal, permanent, employed directly or hired through a third party, organization, etc.), the estimated catch quantity (i.e. volume) of the fishery, the average length of time at sea, and any other characteristics that are helpful to understand the social aspects of the FIP. Be sure that all fishers in the scope of the FIP and this risk assessment are described. Carefully note if there are any differences between the scope of the needs or pre-assessment and the risk assessment.

NB: When evaluating a FIP using social principles, the unit of assessment (UoA) may be different from the UoA used in the FIP’s pre-assessment or needs assessment, as it will need to be based on social levels or scales of organization relevant to the fishery or supply chain. Depending on what is being evaluated, the UoA will vary accordingly. See the SRAT for more information.

# Methodology

Assessment Team

This section should describe the individual(s) involved in conducting the assessment, including their names and qualifications.

Data Collection Methodology

The assessment team should strive to use a worker-driven approach to assessing labor conditions—workers/fishers and their representative organizations should be involved in the assessment themselves. This section should outline the data collection approaches used in conducting the assessment, including the unit(s) of assessment, sampling strategy, and specific mechanism employed (interviews, surveys, focus groups, etc) for primary data collection. It should also list any key secondary soures used.

Scoring Methodology

After all available relevant information has been compiled and analyzed, the evaluation team scores the FIP against the Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts (PISGs). Each PI is scored on a graded scale consistent with the MSC scoring method, with levels red, yellow, and green defining key sustainability thresholds. These thresholds correspond to levels of quality and certainty of management practices and their probability of generating sustainability and social responsibility.

This methodology uses the following scoring categories:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Category** | **Risk Level** | **General definition** |
| Red | High Risk | * The FIP does not meet all PISGs at the medium risk level. * The FIP does not meet minimum human rights and social responsibility requirements and/or there is not adequate information available to make that determination. |
| Yellow | Medium Risk | * The FIP meets all PISGs at the medium risk level. * The FIP meets minimum human rights and social responsibility requirements. |
| Green | Low Risk | * The FIP meets all PISGs at the medium AND low risk level. * The FIP is implementing best practices in human rights and social responsibility. |
| Not assessed or N/A | - | The PI is either not applicable to the FIP or was not assessed. |

# Scoring summary

Fill in the scoring category (green, yellow, or red) for each performance indicator (PI) after the assessment is complete. Note “N/A” for the PI if it is not applicable to your fishery and “not assessed” if the PI is applicable but was not assessed.

Performance indicators marked with an \* align with the FisheryProgress Human Rights Code of Conduct.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **PI** | **Performance Indicator** | **Scoring Category** |
| **Principle 1: Protect human rights, dignity and access to resources** | | | |
| 1.1 Human and labor rights | 1.1.1\* | Abuse and harassment |  |
| 1.1.2a\* | Human trafficking and forced labor |  |
| 1.1.2b\* | Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries |  |
| 1.1.3\* | Child labor |  |
| 1.1.4\* | Freedom of association and collective bargaining |  |
| 1.1.5\* | Earnings and benefits |  |
| 1.1.6\* | Adequate rest |  |
| 1.1.7a\* | Access to basic services for worker housing/ live-aboard vessels |  |
| 1.1.7b\* | Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities |  |
| 1.1.8\* | Occupational safety |  |
| 1.1.9\* | Medical response |  |
| 1.2 Access Rights | 1.2.1\* | Customary resource use rights |  |
| 1.2.2 | Corporate responsibility and transparency |  |
| **Principle 2: Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit** | | | |
| 2.1 Equality | 2.1.1\* | Grievance reporting and access to remedy |  |
| 2.1.2 | Stakeholder participation and collaborative management |  |
| 2.2 Equity | 2.2.1 | Equitable opportunity to benefit |  |
| 2.2.2\* | Discrimination |  |
| **Principle 3: Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security** | | | |
| 3.1 Food and nutrition security | 3.1.1a | Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries |  |
| 3.1.1b | Food and nutrition security for small-scale fishing communities |  |
| 3.1.2 | Healthcare |  |
| 3.1.3 | Education |  |
| 3.2 Livelihood security | 3.2.1 | Benefits to and within community |  |
| 3.2.2 | Economic value retention |  |
| 3.2.3 | Long term profitability and future workforce |  |
| 3.2.4 | Economic flexibility and autonomy |  |
| 3.2.5 | Livelihood security |  |
| 3.2.6 | Fuel resource efficiency |  |

# 

1. Human rights, dignity, and access to resources

Principle 1 considers the protection of human and labor rights, fair access to resources, and collective and indigenous rights through two components:

* Component 1.1: Fundamental human rights are respected, labor rights are protected, and decent living and working conditions are provided, particularly for vulnerable and at-risk groups
* Component 1.2: Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights

For all performance indicators under each principle, fill in the PI scoring category (red, yellow, green, n/a, or not assessed), unit(s) of assessment, source(s) (the primary or secondary source used to collect data/information), and the justification (rationale for the scoring category that was assigned). An example has been provided under the abuse and harassment PI (1.1.1).

## Human and labor rights

Optional: Provide any relevant background for this component here, for example information about the social, economic, or legal context in which the FIP is operating.

### Abuse and harassment

**PI scoring category:** Yellow, meets all Medium Risk and some Low Risk Scoring Guideposts

**Unit(s) of Assessment:** A sample of fishers for each fishing company in the FIP

**Sources:** Primary data collection (worker interviews)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.1 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, | Y |
| 1.1.1 S2 | Migrant status is not used as a threat or tool of coercion, | Y |
| 1.1.1 S3 | There is no corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, verbal abuse (significantly different than colloquial banter), gender-based violence, sexual harassment, or any other form of harassment, including excessive or abusive disciplinary action, and fisheries observers (when present) are able to conduct duties free from assault, harassment, interference, or bribery, | Y |
| 1.1.1 S4 | Workers/fishers/farmers’ families or community members are not threatened by employers, buyers, labor brokers, or organized crime, | Y |
| 1.1.1 S5 | There is no forced drug use, or labor and/or product is not compensated for with drugs. | Y |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.1 S6 | There is a written policy publicly disclosed, posted in all languages with special accommodations for illiteracy that prohibits physical abuse, bullying, and sexual harassment, with a disciplinary procedure in place to address cases of harassment, and discipline commensurate to the actions, | Y |
| 1.1.1 S7 | Managers and workers/fishers/farmers are aware of and trained on the harassment policy. | N |
| 1.1.1 S8 | Workers have grievance procedures to report harassment and do not face retaliation for using them. | N |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 1.1.2a Human trafficking and forced labor

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Is the fishery/farm industrial or medium scale with labor recruitment from other countries and/or contracts with employers likely? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.2a S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.2a S2 | The farm/fishery has a policy prohibiting the use of forced, bonded, indentured, prison labor, slavery or trafficked labor, |  |
| 1.1.2a S3 | There are one or more indicators of forced labor in the fishery/ farm (abuse of vulnerability, deception, restriction of movement, isolation, physical and sexual violence, intimidation or threats, retention of identity documents, withholding of wages, debt bondage, abusive living and working conditions, excessive overtime), but the farm/fishery is actively implementing, tracking progress on, and reporting on a remediation plan, |  |
|  | **OR** |  |
|  | There are no indicators of forced labor in the fishery/farm (abuse of vulnerability, deception, restriction of movement, isolation, physical and sexual violence, intimidation or threats, retention of identity documents, withholding of wages, debt bondage, abusive living and working conditions, excessive overtime), but the farm/fishery does not have a robust system in place to monitor, remediate, and report on both its own performance on recruitment and labor practice, and when applicable, the performance and compliance of labor recruiters. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| 1.1.2a S4 | The farm/fishery has a policy prohibiting the use of forced, bonded, indentured, prison labor, slavery or trafficked labor, and managers and workers/fishers/farmers are aware of and trained on the forced labour policy with access to effective grievance procedures for reporting violations of the policy, |  |
| 1.1.2a S5 | There are no indicators of forced labor in the fishery/farm (abuse of vulnerability, deception, restriction of movement, isolation, physical and sexual violence, intimidation or threats, retention of identity documents, withholding of wages, debt bondage, abusive living and working conditions, excessive overtime), and the fishery/farm has a robust operational system in place to monitor, remediate, and report on both its own performance on recruitment and labor practice, and when applicable, the performance and compliance of labor recruiters, |  |
| 1.1.2a S6 | All workers/fishers/farmers, including domestic and foreign migrants, have written contracts in a language they understand, with extra provisions made for illiterate workers, so that their rights and terms of recruitment and employment are clearly understood, |  |
| 1.1.2a S7 | Workers/fishers/farmers do not pay any recruitment fees (document/ visa/passport fees excluded), |  |
| 1.1.2a S8 | Workers/fishers/farmers are paid at least monthly. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 1.1.2b Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If NO, score indicator** |
| Is the fishery/farm industrial or medium scale with labor recruitment from other countries and/or contracts with employers likely? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.2b S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.2b S2 | The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), but most of their income (or share of catch) is kept and a smaller percentage is used to pay back their debts, |  |
| 1.1.2b S3 | The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), and their debt has remained stable or decreased over time proportional to their income (or share of catch), |  |
| 1.1.2b S4 | The fisher/farmer is allowed to witness the product being weighed or graded to calculate their income (or share of catch), |  |
| 1.1.2b S5 | If applicable, interest rates charged to fishers/farmers are transparent and agreed upon in advance with fishers/farmers. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.2b S6 | The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), but a minimal percentage of their income is used to pay back their debts, and their debt has decreased over time proportional to their income (or share of catch), |  |
|  | **OR** |  |
|  | The fisher/farmer is NOT paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Child labor

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.3 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.3 S2 | There is no evidence of hazardous child labor, |  |
| 1.1.3 S3 | Children below the legal age of employment are not employed as waged workers, |  |
| 1.1.3 S4 | Children below the legal age of employment work alongside family members only if this does not interfere with schooling, and on tasks which do not harm their health, safety or morals, and do not work at night, |  |
| 1.1.3 S5 | There is no evidence of hazardous child labor, children below the legal age of employment are not paid as waged workers, nor does the work interfere with their schooling or pose risk to their health and safety, BUT the farm or fishery does not have a child labor policy that ensures the best interests of the child and that the child does not end up in a worse form of employment. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.3 S6 | There is no evidence of hazardous child labor, children below the legal age of employment are not paid as waged workers, nor does the work alongside family members interfere with their schooling or pose risk to their health and safety, and the farm or fishery has a child labor policy that ensures the best interests of the child and that the child does not end up in a worse form of employment. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Freedom of association and collective bargaining

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.4 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.4 S2 | Workers/fishers/farmers are free to form worker organizations, including trade unions, to advocate for and protect their rights, and have the right to decide their own structure, policies, programs, priorities, etc. without employer interference, |  |
| 1.1.4 S3 | There are national laws protecting collective workers’ rights (including cooperatives) which are upheld and respected, or the country restricts trade union rights but the company/fishery/farm has provided a way for workers/fishers/farmers to organize and express grievances, |  |
| 1.1.4 S4 | Human rights defenders are not actively suppressed and there is no recent record of litigation by employers against human rights defenders, |  |
| 1.1.4 S5 | There is no discrimination against workers/fishers/farmers who are members or leaders of organizations, unions or cooperatives, and workers/ fishers/farmers are not dismissed for exercising their right to strike. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.4 S6 | The employer or association has a written policy or by-laws (shared with workers/fishers/farmers in relevant languages and with provisions for illiteracy) that they respect the rights of workers/fishers/farmers to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining, |  |
| 1.1.4 S7 | Workers/fishers/farmers are trained by workers’ organizations on their rights to organize and bargain collectively, |  |
| 1.1.4 S8 | Women participate in unions or cooperatives commensurate with their representation in the workforce. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Earnings and benefits

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Are workers or farmers wage workers? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.5 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.5 S2 | Minimum legal requirements for income and benefits are properly defined in domestic labor law, |  |
| 1.1.5 S3 | Domestic law may not recognize equal remuneration for work of equal value for men and women, however, wages paid to workers/fishers/ farmers do reflect equal remuneration, |  |
| 1.1.5 S4 | Wage levels and benefits meet the minimum legal requirements according to domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel, |  |
| 1.1.5 S5 | Overtime wages are paid in accordance with minimum legal requirements, based on domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel, |  |
| 1.1.5 S6 | Wages paid to workers/fishers/farmers are what was promised at the time of employment, are not withheld as a form of discipline, do not contain illegal deductions, are paid on time or directly to the worker/fisher/farmer, and workers/fishers/farmers do not go longer than one month without being paid, |  |
| 1.1.5 S7 | Employers legally contract employees, |  |
| 1.1.5 S8 | Workers/fishers/farmers are aware of how their earnings or deductions are calculated and their rights to benefits, are allowed to witness procedures used to determine earnings (weighing, grading), and only sign contracts they understand with provisions for different languages or illiteracy, |  |
| 1.1.5 S9 | Workers/fishers/farmers receive wage slips with deductions itemized or written receipts. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.5 S10 | Wages or earnings are higher than minimum legal wages or meet living wage levels (includes being able to provide for family, save, or invest), and benefits are provided beyond legal minimums, |  |
| 1.1.5 S11 | Both domestic law and practices and policies of the fishery/farm uphold the principles of equal remuneration for men and women, |  |
| 1.1.5 S12 | The employer and workers discuss how they can improve wages and productivity in mutually beneficial ways, |  |
| 1.1.5 S13 | There are written contracts between employer and employees in a language employees understand with provisions for illiterate workers. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Adequate Rest

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If NO, score indicator** |
| Are workers or farmers self-employed? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.6 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.6 S2 | There is a mechanism in place for workers/fishers/farmers to record hours worked, |  |
| 1.1.6 S3 | Working hours meet the domestic legal minimum requirements, and overtime hours are paid at a premium as required by law, |  |
| 1.1.6 S4 | Workers have at least 10 hours of rest in a 24 hour period and at least 77 hours in a 7 day period, |  |
| 1.1.6 S5 | Overtime is voluntary. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.6 S6 | There is an independent, third party oversight mechanism for verification of working hours, |  |
| 1.1.6 S7 | Onshore workers do not work more than 48 hours/week even if the law permits more, |  |
| 1.1.6 S8 | Onshore workers do not work more than 6 days/week, |  |
| 1.1.6 S9 | The workplace/farm/fishery has systems in place to anticipate peak production needs and seasonal variation to ensure that excessive overtime is not required, |  |
| 1.1.6 S10 | The workplace/fishery/farm has paid pre- and post-natal maternity/ paternity leave with adequate compensation. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 1.1.7a Access to basic services for worker housing/ live-aboard vessels

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm provide worker housing or require live-aboard vessel time? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.7a S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.7a S2 | Housing and sleeping quarters have adequate fire prevention and air ventilation, meet legal requirements, and meet reasonable levels of safety, decency, hygiene, and comfort, |  |
| 1.1.7a S3 | When present, fisheries observers are provided adequate accommodation appropriate to the size of the monitored entity and equivalent to that of the officers of the monitored entity, |  |
| 1.1.7a S4 | Sanitary facilities (appropriate to vessel size) with adequate privacy are provided, |  |
| 1.1.7a S5 | Potable water is accessible to workers, |  |
| 1.1.7a S6 | Workers/fishers living on site or on board have access to adequate and sanitary food at fair prices. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.7a S7 | There are separate sanitary facilities for men and women, or sanitary facilities can be locked from the inside, |  |
| 1.1.7a S8 | There are separate sleeping quarters for men and women, or if there is one sleeping space, men and women have separate bunks, or share same bunk during different shifts, |  |
| 1.1.7a S9 | Sleeping quarters or sanitation facilities cannot be locked from the outside (restriction of movement is prevented), |  |
| 1.1.7a S10 | Workers’/fishers’ representatives and management meet regularly to discuss vessel or housing improvements, |  |
| 1.1.7a S11 | The workplace/fishery/farm provides childcare. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 1.1.7b Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If NO score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm provide worker housing or require live-aboard vessel time? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.7b S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.7b S2 | There is access to potable water in the community, |  |
| 1.1.7b S3 | There is access to electricity intermittently, |  |
| 1.1.7b S4 | There is access to sewage disposal (i.e., sewage containers), |  |
| 1.1.7b S5 | There is access to waste disposal (i.e., community dump). |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.7b S6 | There is access to potable water in each household, |  |
| 1.1.7b S7 | There is continuous access to electricity, |  |
| 1.1.7b S8 | There is access to sewage treatment (i.e., community treatment systems), |  |
| 1.1.7b S9 | There is access to waste management (i.e., garbage collection and sorting of recycled materials). |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Occupational safety

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.8 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.8 S2 | On large vessels, making long trips, vessels carry a crew list and provide a copy to authorized persons ashore at the time of vessel departure [long trips defined as 3 days], |  |
| 1.1.8 S3 | Workers/fishers/farmers/observers have access to communication equipment, or there is a radio on board for vessels over 24 meters, |  |
| 1.1.8 S4 | Adequate personal protective equipment (PPE) (i.e., life jackets) is provided onboard or in the workplace/farm. It is provided at no cost to any employees, |  |
| 1.1.8 S5 | Workers/fishers/farmers and managers are trained in health and safety procedures and on proper use of PPE and safe operation of any equipment they use (unless self-employed), |  |
| 1.1.8 S6 | Vessel/farm/workplace complies with local/national safety and health regulations. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.8 S7 | On small vessels (<24 meters), there is a working radio on board, |  |
| 1.1.8 S8 | Workers/fishers/farmers and managers are trained in health and safety procedures and on proper use of PPE and safe operation of any equipment they use, |  |
| 1.1.8 S9 | Workplace risks and risk areas are identified in relevant languages with provisions for illiteracy, and workplace accidents are recorded, |  |
| 1.1.8 S10 | Workplace/fishery/farm has a written health and safety policy, properly implemented, and workers/fishers/farmers are engaged in reviewing and implementing policy, |  |
| 1.1.8 S11 | Workplace/fishery/farm has a structure or mechanism in place (i.e., occupational health and safety committee), with formal channels of communications established, to discuss and implement protection of workplace health and safety, |  |
| 1.1.8 S12 | There are special protections for young, pregnant, or other vulnerable workers/fishers/farmers. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Medical response

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.1.9 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.1.9 S2 | Adequate medical supplies are available (i.e., there is a first aid kit), |  |
| 1.1.9 S3 | In factories, farms, or large vessels, there is a trained first aid responder, |  |
| 1.1.9 S4 | On large vessels, making long trips, fishers have a valid medical certificate attesting to their fitness to work [long trips defined as 3 days], |  |
| 1.1.9 S5 | Workers are provided with medical care for workplace injuries and are repatriated if necessary at employer’s expense. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.1.9 S6 | Injuries sustained in the course of work are subject to worker’s compensation, lost time pay, and payment of medical expenses, if not by law, then by employer, |  |
| 1.1.9 S7 | Workers/fishers/farmers are trained in emergency response and first aid. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

## Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights

Optional: Provide any relevant background for this component here, for example information about the history of the fishery and the fishers/fisher groups operating in it.

### Customary resource use rights

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm operate within or adjacent to a customary use area? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.2.1 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.2.1 S2 | Customary use rights have been mapped out using a participatory stakeholder process, |  |
| 1.2.1 S3 | The fishery or farm observes the legal and customary rights of local people, |  |
| 1.2.1 S4 | Fishers are not denied or revoked of fishing rights due to discrimination (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, political affiliation) by authorities and/or other communities or entities, |  |
| 1.2.1 S5 | The farm or fishery is not designated in an area legitimately claimed by communities without their documented Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, |  |
| 1.2.1 S6 | The farm or fishery understands its impact on customary access to resources, and does not negatively impact adjacent communities, land, and/or water, or restrict access to vital community resources without community approval. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.2.1 S7 | There is an active process to establish a protocol agreement, or there is a protocol agreement in place, with indigenous communities, or communities with customary use rights, using Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, |  |
| 1.2.1 S8 | Customary resource users are aware of their rights, and are protected under law and can seek recourse within the legal system, |  |
| 1.2.1 S9 | The fishery or farm is actively mitigating any impacts or conflicts on access to resources for customary users, |  |
| 1.2.1 S10 | Communities or people with claims to the resource are strongly involved in management of the resource, and traditional practices and knowledge are incorporated into resource management, |  |
| 1.2.1 S11 | Special attention is paid to ensure women and disadvantaged groups are included in consultation. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Corporate responsibility and transparency

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm constitute a single taxable enterprise or business? |  |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 1.2.2 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 1.2.2 S2 | The fishery/farm can demonstrate compliance with all tax laws, |  |
| 1.2.2 S3 | There is no evidence that owners, managers, fishers or farmers pay bribes to public servants to gain access to resources or to avoid compliance with local regulations, |  |
| 1.2.2 S4 | The fishery/farm has a human rights policy in place (appropriate to their size and circumstances to meet their responsibility to respect human rights), and can demonstrate evidentiary compliance with their policy. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 1.2.2 S5 | Farm or fishery publicly discloses their social, economic, and environmental performance, |  |
| 1.2.2 S6 | Farm or fishery is engaged in multi-stakeholder, worker-centered initiatives aiming to improve social performance across the industry, |  |
| 1.2.2 S7 | Financial accounts are regularly reviewed by independent third-party auditors, |  |
| 1.2.2 S8 | Farm or fishery has published social responsibility and environmental policies, |  |
| 1.2.2 S9 | The human rights policy is communicated and training is provided, in a language or medium understandable to all workers and observers on the fishing vessel and other relevant persons who assume the responsibility or duties for the operation of the fishing vessel or its workers. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

1. Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit

Principle 2 considers the equal and equitable opportunity to benefit through two components:

* Component 2.1: Recognition, voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status
* Component 2.2: Equitable opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain

## Recognition, voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status

Optional: Provide any relevant background for this component here, for example information on the different stakeholder groups operating in the fishery.

### Grievance reporting and access to remedy

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 2.1.1 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 2.1.1 S2 | Workers/fishers/farmers that pertain to a business have knowledge of and access to effective, fair, and confidential grievance mechanisms, or if workers/fisher/farmers are part of a cooperative, association, or customary group, they have knowledge and access to effective and fair grievance mechanisms (according to established protocols and by-laws of transparency, democracy, and equal representation) appropriate for and commensurate with size and scale of fishery/farm, |  |
| 2.1.1 S3 | There is no retaliation or prejudice against workers/fishers/farmers who submit grievances, including gender-based prejudice or retaliation. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 2.1.1 S4 | Grievance mechanisms are both procedurally and substantively effective at remediation of conflicts and complaints in a time-bound manner with no reoccurring grievances, and these remediation processes (corrective action plans) are publicly disclosed, |  |
| 2.1.1 S5 | The grievance procedure includes special consideration for vulnerable populations (e.g., migrant workers, women, ethnic minorities), |  |
| 2.1.1 S6 | Workers/fishers/farmers have access to third party independent organizations or local/customary governance body that can address grievances and ensure effective representation. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Stakeholder participation and collaborative management

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 2.1.2 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 2.1.2 S2 | There is a mechanism for stakeholder participation or in the fishery/ farm management unit (i.e., worker committees, worker-management communication channels, advisory/technical councils, co-management bodies, consultation processes, etc.), |  |
| 2.1.2 S3 | All affected and relevant stakeholders are represented and no stakeholder groups are excluded based on status, class, gender, ethnicity, etc., |  |
| 2.1.2 S4 | Stakeholder input is considered and integrated into decision-making. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 2.1.2 S5 | Decisions are publicly communicated, promoted, and transparent, |  |
| 2.1.2 S6 | Decision-making processes have special consideration provided for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups (i.e., migrant workers, women, ethnic minorities), so that decisions are made by affected stakeholders on equal terms, |  |
| 2.1.2 S7 | All affected and relevant stakeholders are free to engage in all aspects of fishery/aquaculture governance including decision-making, monitoring, enforcement, and conflict resolution, |  |
| 2.1.2 S8 | Participation and collaborative management between local stakeholders and government (or between workers and management in the case of industrial fisheries) is fostered and reinforced by civil society organizations working to protect the interests of relevant stakeholders. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

## Equitable opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain

Optional: Provide any relevant background for this component here, for example information on minority groups.

### Equitable opportunity to benefit

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm employ women or other marginalized groups (i.e., migrants, ethnic, or religious minorities)? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 2.2.1 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 2.2.1 S2 | There is equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/ farm regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, class, migrant status, political affiliation, etc., |  |
|  | OR |  |
|  | There is not equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/ farm, but a strategy or policy to address inequity is in place. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 2.2.1 S3 | There is evidence of equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/farm, and marginalized groups are in leadership positions or positions of power, |  |
| 2.2.1 S4 | Gender transformative policies and research programs are in place when women participate in the farm or fishery (i.e., routine data collection of gender disaggregated data). |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### Discrimination

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 2.2.1 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 2.2.2 S2 | Workers/fishers/farmers receive equal pay for work of equal value, |  |
| 2.2.2 S3 | There is no discrimination in recruitment promotion, access to training, access to permits, remuneration, allocation of work, termination of employment, retirement, ability to join unions or cooperatives, or other activities, |  |
| 2.2.2 S4 | There is no discrimination in access to benefits e.g., health care, savings accounts, insurance, etc., |  |
| 2.2.2 S5 | There is no compulsory pregnancy testing for female workers/ fishers/farmers. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 2.2.2 S6 | There is a comprehensive and proactive anti-discrimination policy for the fishery or farm. The policy is implemented through procedures and practices, posted in all languages and visible to all workers, |  |
| 2.2.2 S4 | Managers and workers/fishers/farmers are aware of and trained on the anti-discrimination policy. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

1. Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security

Principle 3 focuses on the overall wellbeing of the fishers and communities linked with the fishery through two components:

* Component 3.1: Food and nutrition security
* Component 3.2: Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation

## Food and nutrition security

Optional: Provide any relevant background for this component here, for example information on overall socio-economic context in which the fishery operates.

### 3.1.1a Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm operate adjacent to or offshore of a marine/coastal resource-dependent community(ies) (within the country’s EEZ) and is industrial to medium-scale? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.1.1a S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.1.1a S2 | The fishery/farm is operating offshore a marine resource-dependent community or fishing for the same resource (or fish stock) as the local community (either directly as target catch, or indirectly as bycatch), but active measures are being taken to address these impacts, |  |
|  | OR |  |
|  | The majority of the catch landed by the fishery/farm is not retained for local consumption, or the country or community in question is food/nutrition insecure (i.e., based on % undernourished or FIES, respectively), but active measures are being taken to address these impacts. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.1.1a S3 | The fishery/farm is not operating offshore a marine resource-dependent community or fishing for the same resource (or fish stock) as the local community (either directly as target catch, or indirectly as bycatch), |  |
|  | OR |  |
|  | The majority of the catch landed by the fishery/farm is retained for local consumption, and the country or community in question is not food/ nutrition insecure (i.e., based on % undernourished or FIES, respectively). |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.1.1b Food and nutrition security for small-scale fishing communities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine/coastal resource-dependent community(ies)? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.1.1a S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.1.1b S2 | The country is food/nutrition secure (i.e., based on % undernourished), or a participatory local food and nutrition security assessment has found low to moderate risk of food/nutrition insecurity, |  |
| 3.1.1b S3 | International or export trade agreements which affect the fishery/ farm have not resulted in food/nutrition insecurity for the workers/fishers/ farmers, their families, or community members, |  |
|  | OR |  |
|  | A participatory local food and nutrition security assessment (i.e., FIES or MDDI-W) has found food/nutrition insecurity impacts due to the fishery/ farm (i.e., lack of access to marine resources for subsistence purposes) but active measures are being taken to address these impacts. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.1.1b S4 | There is no food/nutrition insecurity among workers/fishers/farmers and their families, nor among community members adjacent to a fishery/farm (i.e., based on FIES or MDDI-W), |  |
|  | OR |  |
|  | Where food/nutrition insecurity has been found among seafooddependent communities (i.e., based on FIES or MDDI-W), local data shows improving food/nutrition security factors (i.e., increasing access to marine resources for subsistence purposes), |  |
| 3.1.1b S5 | There are programs in place to ensure international or export trade agreements which affect the fishery/farm do not result in food/nutrition insecurity for the workers/fishers/farmers, their families, or community members. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.1.2 Healthcare

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine/coastal resource-dependent community(ies)? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.1.2 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.1.2 S2 | The community’s (adjacent to fishery/farm) healthcare needs have been assessed, |  |
| 3.1.2 S3 | The community’s (adjacent to fishery/farm) healthcare needs are not of concern. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.1.2 S4 | The community’s (adjacent to fishery/farm) healthcare needs have been assessed and there are resources being invested to address any needs uncovered, |  |
| 3.1.2 S5 | Women have adequate access to reproductive healthcare including family planning, pre- and post-natal, and maternal care, |  |
| 3.1.2 S6 | Local data shows improving healthcare. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.1.3 Education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine/coastal resource-dependent community(ies)? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.1.3 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.1.3 S2 | The community’s (adjacent to fishery/farm) education needs have been assessed, |  |
| 3.1.3 S3 | The community (adjacent to fishery/farm) has adequate literacy (literacy rate among youth aged 15-24 is 90% or more), and schooling rates (less than 10% of primary school-age children are out of school) (see SFP 2016), |  |
| 3.1.3 S4 | Girls and boys do not have different rates of educational attainment. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.1.3 S5 | The community’s educational needs have been assessed and there are resources being invested to address any needs uncovered, |  |
| 3.1.3 S6 | There is universal access to education through a secondary school level, via remote learning where relevant, or access to a technical school, or university. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

## Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation

Optional: Provide any relevant background for this component here, for example information on the role the fishery plays in the local economy, profitability trends in the species or region, or broader local economic trends.

### 3.2.1 Benefits to and within community

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine/coastal resource-dependent community(ies)? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.2.1 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.2.1 S2 | People from within the community hold at least some resource access rights or permits, |  |
| 3.2.1 S3 | Consideration is paid to hiring a local workforce (in the case of industrial vessels, some labor positions are occupied by local workforce). |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.1.3 S4 | The majority of the harvesting workforce is comprised of local residents, |  |
| 3.1.3 S5 | People from within the community hold the majority of resource access rights or permits, |  |
| 3.1.3 S6 | Majority of livelihoods and economic benefits from fishery/farm are distributed and retained locally, |  |
| 3.1.3 S7 | High employment rates of women in local jobs created by fishery/ farm. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.2.2 Economic value retention

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If NO, score indicator** |
| Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.2.2 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.2.2 S2 | The ratio of gross value added to turnover is between 47-57%. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.2.2 S3 | The ratio of gross value added to turnover is above 57%, |  |
| 3.2.2 S4 | Formalized training is provided to fishers/farmers in how to add value to their product. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.2.3 Long-term profitability and future workforce

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If NO, score indicator** |
| Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.2.3 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.2.3 S2 | Long-term average operating profit margin is between 11%-18%, |  |
| 3.2.3 S3 | The average age of workers/fishers/farmers is close to the average age in the country, and new workers/fishers/farmers are joining the workforce. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.2.3 S4 | Long-term average operating profit margin is above 18%, |  |
| 3.2.3 S5 | New workers/fishers/farmers including women are being recruited into the workforce, |  |
| 3.2.3 S6 | Women are increasingly taking leadership roles in the supply chain and fishing/farming communities. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.2.4 Economic flexibility and autonomy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Do fishers/farmers or their organization (i.e., cooperative, association, etc.) sell their own product? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.2.4 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.2.4 S2 | If applicable, interest rates charged to fishers/farmers are transparent and agreed upon in advance with fishers/farmers, |  |
| 3.2.4 S3 | There is more than one local fish buyer, and harvesters are free to sell to whomever they wish without retribution, |  |
| 3.2.4 S4 | There is no price collusion among local buyers, |  |
| 3.2.4 S5 | Fishers/farmers know the quality expected of the product, how the price is calculated, and when they will be paid via verbal contract with buyers. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.2.4 S6 | If applicable, fishers/farmers can access loans from at least two types of lenders at interest rates not exceeding government rates or lender’s borrowing rate, |  |
| 3.2.4 S7 | Fishers/farmers are organized into groups to better negotiate with buyers and may be price setters, |  |
| 3.2.4 S8 | Fishers/farmers know the quality expected of the product, how the price is calculated, and when they will be paid via written contract with buyers (in a language understood or with provisions for illiteracy), |  |
| 3.2.4 S9 | When applicable, buyers support fishers/farmers through sharing costs of certification and training, |  |
| 3.2.4 S10 | Fishers/farmers have access to competitive credit markets or are recipients of investment opportunities. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.2.5 Livelihood security

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Is the fishery/farm contributing to local livelihood security? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.2.5 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.2.5 S2 | Fishers/farmers/workers work under a license(s) or are recognized as part of the legal work force, |  |
| 3.2.5 S3 | Fishers/farmers/workers have harvesting access (formally or informally) to more than one species/species group, |  |
| 3.2.5 S4 | Fishers/farmers/workers have access to fishing/farming gear needed to fulfill livelihood responsibilities (ice, engines, boats, gear, fuel, bait etc.), |  |
| 3.2.5 S5 | Fishers/farmers/workers, or someone in their household, have alternative livelihoods outside of the fishery or farm. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.2.5 S6 | Male and female fishers/farmers/workers have formal (legal) access to a portfolio of species/species groups and gear types, |  |
| 3.2.5 S7 | Male and female fishers/farmers/workers have ownership over the fishing/farming gear needed to fulfill livelihood responsibilities (ice, engines, boats, gear, fuel, bait etc.), |  |
| 3.2.5 S8 | Male and female fishers/farmers/workers have access to professional development training or capacity building either inside the fishery/farm, or outside (in alternative livelihoods). |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |

### 3.2.6 Fuel resource efficiency

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicability** | **If YES, score indicator** |
| Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only? | Y/N |

**PI scoring category:**

**Unit(s) of Assessment:**

**Sources:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SG#** | **Scoring Guidepost** | **Met?** |
| **Medium Risk** | | |
| 3.2.6 S1 | There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, |  |
| 3.2.6 S2 | Ratio of true vessel fuel costs (including subsidy)/fish sales is between 13%-18%. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Low Risk** | | |
| 3.2.6 S3 | Ratio of true vessel fuel costs (including subsidy)/fish sales is under 13%. |  |
| **Justification:** | | |
|  | | |
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