[Fishery name]

Three-Year Audit Report

Version 1.2, September 2021

## *Purpose*

*The three-year audit report template was developed by FishChoice. The objectives of the three-year audit report are:*

1. *To assess the fishery’s MSC performance indicator scores*
2. *To verify the results of the FIP’s environmental workplan progress as reported on FisheryProgress*
3. *Optional: To provide recommendations to the FIP on environmental workplan actions that should be modified, including recommendations for additional actions/tasks that should be taken or suggested changes to timelines, to help the FIP achieve their stated objectives.*

## *Completing and Submitting the Audit*

*FisheryProgress requires the use of this three-year audit report template and the information must be in submitted in English. FIPs should update the template below with audit results. Note that text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section and should be removed from the final version of this document, and highlighted text should be replaced to reflect the information for your fishery. Save this document as a PDF upon completion and submit to FisheryProgress. Once the audit is complete, FIPs should update all relevant data fields on FisheryProgress based on the audit report, including multi-species/multi-gear excel files.*

## FIP Information

*Fill in the following table. The management authority is the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s) [state target stock(s), if relevant] |  |
| Fishery location |  |
| Gear type(s) |  |
| Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons) |  |
| Vessel type(s) and size(s) |  |
| Number of vessels |  |
| Management authority |  |
| Auditor name(s) |  |
| Auditor Organization/Affiliation |  |
| Date of report completion |  |

## FIP Background (Optional)

## *This section is optional. If the auditor completes this section, use it to provide additional information about the context in which the FIP operates.*

## Stakeholder Consultation & Meetings

*In-person and virtual interviews with stakeholders are meant to inform the auditor with regards to the fishery’s performance and to elicit information regarding the contributions that the FIP’s participants have provided in making progress towards the FIP’s objectives. Stakeholders represent the most critical source of information regarding a fishery independent of the FIP lead and FIP participants. Stakeholders can shed light on the diversity of perspectives on the fishery and can highlight any areas of controversy. The stakeholder consultation process allows an auditor to hear a range of perspectives and make an objective and balanced evaluation of the fishery against the MSC Fisheries Standard and the environmental workplan results.*

*A successful stakeholder consultation process will instill confidence in stakeholders that the assessment of a given fishery was well informed by a balanced, accessible, and equitable process to which they were able to contribute meaningfully. It should not be a forum to debate issues, but to identify the full range of relevant information and issues and bring them to the attention of the auditor. It should also help the auditor identify the improvements that have occurred in the fishery as a direct result of the FIP’s activities and provide a foundation upon which the auditor can provide recommendations for potential adjustments that need to be considered for the FIP to fulfill the environmental objectives that they have set out to achieve. For additional guidance on conducting stakeholder consultation, see Annex GPX of the* [*MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements and Guidance Version 2.0*](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/for-business/program-documents/fisheries-program-documents/msc_fisheries_certification_requirements_and_guidance_v2-0.pdf)*.*

*Fill in the following table and include a high-level summary of the subjects that were discussed. Additional rows may need to be added or modified depending on number of participants and meetings completed. Stakeholders may include:* *official participants in the fishery improvement project, as well as government representatives, industry (fishers, processors, exporters, mid supply chain and end buyers, etc.), environmental and social NGOs, and the scientific community, or those who are impacted by the project or have a role in making changes to address environmental challenges in the fishery.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Affiliation | Date and Subjects Discussed |
| James Smith | Good Seafood, Inc. | 1st January 2021* Logbooks used for data collection
* Voluntary size limit measures
* Gear modifications for bycatch reduction of ETP species
* Mitigation of habitat of ecosystem impacts
 |
| Maria Garcia  | Department of Fisheries | 15th February 2021* Fishery objectives
* Stock assessment and stock status
* Harvest strategy development and stock status evaluation
* Decision-making processes
 |
| Zhang Wei | Seafood Processing Co. | 20th February 2021* Voluntary minimum size purchasing policies
* Data collection efforts to support stock assessment and harvest strategies
* Efforts towards fisher education
 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

## *Summarize the progress the FIP has made in the past three years. Optional: provide any recommendations for the FIP (e.g., regarding modifications to FIP actions, or potential gaps in the FIP’s workplan necessary to achieve the FIP’s objectives).*

## Summary of MSC Performance Indicator Scores

*Fill in the “previous score” scoring category (<60, 60-79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) according to the most recent set of scores available on FisheryProgress (see the Improvement Progress tab of the FIP’s profile* — *the most recent scores will be on the right-most column).*

*Fill in the “current score” scoring category (<60, 60-79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) by referring to the* [MSC Fisheries Standard *v2.01*](https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/for-business/program-documents/fisheries-program-documents/msc-fisheries-standard-v2-01.pdf?sfvrsn=8ecb3272_19)*.* ***Provide a rationale that explicitly addresses each of the performance indicator’s scoring issues (and references when applicable) only if the current score given is different than the previous score****.*

*Fisheries that contain combinations of multiple target species, gear types, and/or governing jurisdictions (UoAs) should complete the* [*Multi-species/Gear/Jurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet*](https://fisheryprogress.org/sites/default/files/Multissptool_Jan_2020.xlsx) *and use the table below to provide the lowest score for each performance indicator. If a rationale is provided, the auditor may choose to address only the scoring issues for the lowest scoring UoA for that performance indicator.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principle | Component | Performance Indicator | Previous Score [Year] | Current Score [Year] | Rationale or Key Points  |
| 1 | Outcome | 1.1.1 | Stock status | 60-79 | >80 | According to the most recent stock assessment conducted in 2017 (Hernandez 2018, attached), the estimated spawning stock biomass is above the target reference point of 50,000 metric tons. Estimates of spawning stock biomass from the past five years have shown a stable trend. Scoring Issues:1.1.1a: It is highly likely that the stock is above the point at which recruitment would be impaired (PRI) 1.1.1b: The stock is now fluctuating at a level consistent with MSY. |
| 1.1.2 | Stock rebuilding | >80 | >80 |  |
| Management | 1.2.1 | Harvest Strategy |  |  |  |
| 1.2.2 | Harvest control rules and tools |  |  |  |
| 1.2.3 | Information and monitoring |  |  |  |
| 1.2.4 | Assessment of stock status |  |  |  |
| 2 | Primary species | 2.1.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 2.1.2 | Management strategy |  |  |  |
| 2.1.3 | Information |  |  |  |
| Secondary species | 2.2.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 2.2.2 | Management strategy |  |  |  |
| 2.2.3 | Information |  |  |  |
| ETP species | 2.3.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 2.3.2 | Management strategy |  |  |  |
| 2.3.3 | Information |  |  |  |
| Habitats | 2.4.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 2.4.2 | Management strategy |  |  |  |
| 2.4.3 | Information |  |  |  |
| Ecosystem | 2.5.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 2.5.2 | Management strategy |  |  |  |
| 2.5.3 | Information |  |  |  |
| 3 | Governance and Policy | 3.1.1 | Legal and customary framework |  |  |  |
| 3.1.2 | Consultation, roles and responsibilities |  |  |  |
| 3.1.3 | Long term objectives |  |  |  |
| Fishery specific management system | 3.2.1 | Fishery specific objectives |  |  |  |
| 3.2.2 | Decision making processes |  |  |  |
| 3.2.3 | Compliance and enforcement |  |  |  |
| 3.2.4 | Management performance evaluation |  |  |  |

*For FIPs using MSC’s Modified Assessment Tree, fill in the additional PIs below as needed. (Salmon: 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3; Bivalve: 1.1.3, 1.2.5, 1.2.6, 2.6.1, 2.6.2, and 2.6.3.).* ***Delete this table if it is not applicable****.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Principle** | **Component** | **Performance Indicator** | **Previous Score** | **Current Score** | **Rationale or Key Points** |
| 1 | Outcome | 1.1.3 | Genetics Outcome |  |  |  |
| Management | 1.2.5 | Genetics Management |  |  |  |
| 1.2.6 | Genetics Information |  |  |  |
| Enhancement | 1.3.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 1.3.2 | Management |  |  |  |
| 1.3.3 | Information |  |  |  |
| 2 | Translocations | 2.6.1 | Outcome |  |  |  |
| 2.6.2 | Management |  |  |  |
| 2.6.3 | Information |  |  |  |

## Environmental Workplan Results

*Fill in the following table by reviewing the latest FIP’s environmental workplan (see the FIP’s Documents section on the Details tab on the FIP’s FisheryProgress profile) and summarizing the results that have been achieved over the past three years (or since the last audit report was completed) by the FIP. A result is defined as:*

* *A regulatory policy change or regulatory action to improve the fishery (e.g., a new bycatch provision), or fishing practice change (e.g., a change in fishing gear developed voluntarily and implemented by the FIP) to improve the fishery*
* *A publicly verifiable positive change in the water (e.g., an increase in biomass of target stock, an increase in population of impacted protected species, a decrease in habitat or ecosystem impacted)*
* *An activity that led to an MSC performance indicator score change in the fishery*

*It is advised that auditors determine results through stakeholder consultation, however the FIP’s Action Progress tab on FisheryProgress may also be a useful resource. For results to be valid, FIP participants must have directly worked on or contributed to the improvement through one or more actions/tasks in the FIP’s environmental workplan. For each result:*

1. *Summarize the result in a short sentence*
2. *Identify the most closely related action(s), as they are listed on the FIP’s Action Progress tab on the* [*FisheryProgress*](http://www.fisheryprogress.org/) *profile*
3. *Identify the most closely related MSC performance indicator(s) impacted by the result*
4. *Provide an explanation of steps that the FIP participants took, or the how the FIP’s work played a role in supporting and achieving the result*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Result | Related Action on FisheryProgress  | Related MSC Performance Indicator | Explanation |
| Fishery-dependent data collected to inform fishery stock assessment | Develop onboard data collection program | 1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3, 2.4.3, 2.5.3 | In December 2018, FIP participant (Good Seafood, Inc.) launched a voluntary data collection program to gather information on catch, effort, size, maturity/reproductive state, sex ratios, discards, and species composition. The electronic logbook program covers the entire fleet of 35 dropline vessels. Data are aggregated into a single database and shared with the Department of Fisheries, which analyze the data to inform an annual stock assessment. |
| Stock assessment evaluates the status of the stock annually | Develop onboard data collection programSupport Department of Fisheries in stock assessment | 1.2.4, 1.1.1 | Data collected by FIP participant (Good Seafood, Inc.) directly supports the length-based SPR assessment conducted by the Department of Fisheries. FIP participant, Jorge Hernandez of Ocean Savers, is part of a technical advisory group that meets biannually to review whether the existing stock assessment method is appropriate for the target stocks and determine whether additional information should be collected to ensure that the assessment of the stock can be updated appropriately.During the last workshop (December 2018), the technical advisory group determined that the assessment method properly evaluates major sources of uncertainty and provides limit and target reference points that can feed into harvest control rules.On an annual basis (last occurred in June 2017), the stock assessment is peer-reviewed by qualified scientists to confirm the appropriateness of assumptions, the validity of data used, and to consider the main uncertainties in the biology of the species. |
| Stock status assessments show that the stock is above MSY | Develop onboard data collection programSupport Department of Fisheries in stock assessment | 1.1.1 | During the last stock assessment technical advisory group meeting (June 2017), of which FIP participant Jorge Hernandez of Ocean Savers is an active member, the working group concluded that the status of target stock had improved from above the limit reference point to above the target reference point. There is a high degree of certainty that the stock is above the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) and that the stock is fluctuating above the maximum sustainable yield (MSY). |
| Fishery-specific objectives have been established | Support the development of a fishery management plan | 3.2.1 | In June 2017, multiple FIP participants (Good Seafood, Inc., Seafood Processing Co, Ocean Savers) petitioned to formally include fishery objectives into the fishery management plan. Over the next year, a working group developed objectives. In August 2018, a management plan was published that includes well-defined objectives, strategies, and activities which are consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC principles 1 and 2. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Supporting References

*Provide a list of references that are referred to within this document.*