

FISHERYPROGRESS.ORG

FIP Review Guidelines

Revised January 2020

Introduction

FisheryProgress is committed to transparency, consistency, and accuracy in decision making about fishery improvement projects (FIPs) included on the website. We developed these guidelines for use by FIPs and the FisheryProgress reviewers and technical oversight committee to provide clarity around how we determine eligibility for the site and evaluate FIP information and progress. The guidelines include:

- 1. Eligibility for FisheryProgress.** The criteria FisheryProgress uses to determine if FIPs are eligible for the site, based on the Conservation Alliance's [Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects](#).
- 2. Initial review process.** The process and evaluation criteria the reviewer will use in assessing a FIP's initial profile submission to the website.
- 3. Evaluating progress.** The process and evaluation criteria the reviewer will use in assessing six- and 12-month progress reports, three-year audits, FIP changes, and completed or inactive FIPs.
- 4. Quality control and appeals process.** The processes FisheryProgress will implement to ensure reviews are consistent and address objections.

FisheryProgress is in the process of developing a permanent policy for addressing reports of human rights abuses in FIPs and additional criteria for social impacts, which will be released in 2020. In the meantime, it will apply its [interim policy on forced labor, child labor, or human trafficking in FIPs that have FisheryProgress profiles](#) to all FIPs listed on the site.

We expect these guidelines will evolve over time. We will communicate any changes to all users of FisheryProgress via email when they occur.

1. Eligibility for FisheryProgress

Eligibility for FisheryProgress is determined by the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions' [Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects](#). A summary of relevant information from the Conservation Alliance Guidelines is included below. For additional details, please read the Conservation Alliance Guidelines.

Prospective FIPs

FIPs that are currently in stage 0 or 1 may be listed on FisheryProgress as prospective.

Prospective FIPs may be listed for 12 months. The reviewer will remove them if the FIP has not completed stage 2 by the end of 12 months.

The prospective designation is not for FIPs that claim to have completed stage 2 but don't meet the Conservation Alliance's requirements for stage 2 as outlined in the Guidelines.

Active: Basic and Comprehensive FIPs

FIPs must meet the Conservation Alliance Guidelines for basic or comprehensive FIPs to be listed as active FIPs on the site.

Elements for Basic and Comprehensive FIPs	
Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must include active participation by at least one company in the supply chain (this includes fishermen or fishing associations). • Participation means contributing financial or in-kind support to the project and/or working on activities in the workplan.
Public Commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants must commit (e.g., a signed memorandum of understanding, commitment described in participant list) to financially invest in (directly or in-kind) and make improvements to the fishery. • Note "public" in this context only means being willing to have the above described evidence (MOU, etc.) available on FisheryProgress—it does not require further announcement or publications regarding involvement.
Workplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must develop and implement a workplan, with an associated budget and deadlines, designed to address the deficiencies in the fishery necessary to achieve the project's objectives. • The workplan and deadlines must be made publicly available via the FisheryProgress website. Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the workplan and budget templates available on FisheryProgress. • The budget does not need to be made publicly available, but evidence of an appropriate budget for the project must be made available to the reviewer. A confidentiality agreement can be put in place if needed.
Progress Tracking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must publicly report progress on actions and their results with supporting documentation every six months, beginning with the date of initial publication of the FIP on FisheryProgress. • Must update indicator scores and provide supporting evidence every 12 months.

Additional Elements for Basic FIPs	
<p>Needs Assessment (and Scoping Document, if applicable)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must complete a needs assessment based on the MSC standard or the Rapid Assessment Tool to identify environmental challenges. Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the rapid assessment template available on FisheryProgress. <p>The needs assessment must cover at least one indicator in each of the three principle areas of the MSC standard. FisheryProgress recommends basic FIPs include all MSC indicators in their needs assessment if possible and consider conducting an MSC pre-assessment as their needs assessment if they anticipate transitioning to a comprehensive project in the future. If scoring all indicators is not possible, FisheryProgress recommends scoring the subset outlined in Appendix C.</p> <p>The needs assessment should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Include recommended strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard, and/or 2) Provide rationale for why all indicators were not included (e.g., lack of data available, financial resources, management cooperation) <p>If it does not, then the FIP must submit a scoping document to provide this information.</p> <p>The needs assessment or the Rapid Assessment Tool (and scoping document if applicable) must be made publicly available.</p>
<p>Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must define time-bound objectives for addressing a specific set of the fishery’s environmental challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard as evidenced by a color change (i.e., red to yellow, or yellow to green) in at least one indicator. For examples, visit the FisheryProgress glossary.

Additional Elements for Comprehensive FIPs	
<p>MSC Pre-Assessment (and Scoping Document, if applicable)</p> <p><i>Note: a FIP may use a completed Announcement Comment Draft Report (ACDR) in place of a pre-assessment.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be created or reviewed by a party experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer) and evaluate the fishery against all MSC performance indicators. Confirmation of review must be provided (e.g., an email confirmation, contract for work, memo, etc.). Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the Marine Stewardship

	<p>Council Pre-Assessment template available on FisheryProgress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MSC pre-assessment should include recommended strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. If it does not, then the FIP must also complete a scoping document to provide this information. The scoping document must be completed or reviewed by a party experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer). The MSC pre-assessment (and scoping document if applicable) must be made publicly available.
Workplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must be created or reviewed by a party experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer). Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the workplan template available on FisheryProgress.
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must define 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. For examples, visit the FisheryProgress glossary.
Verification of Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every three years, comprehensive FIPs must arrange for an independent in-person audit of activity results and performance against the MSC standard by someone that is both experienced with the MSC standard (e.g., a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer) and independent from the organization implementing the FIP.

Completed FIPs

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

Completed FIPs will be left on the site indefinitely. FisheryProgress does not continue to review FIPs’ progress or data once marked as completed on the site.

Inactive FIPs

Inactive FIPs are those that suspended work before achieving their objectives, due to:

- The FIP making changes such that it now reports under another FIP profile (e.g., the FIP merges with another FIP). In these cases, the inactive profile will note the FIP’s active profile.
- The FIP reporting it is suspending work (e.g., lack of funding or engagement to continue, entered full assessment but was not certified).
- The reviewer designating it as inactive due to one year of failure to report or three years of insufficient progress (note: insufficient progress is defined later in this document).

Language

English is the official language of FisheryProgress. We require profile information and the required documentation for the initial review process (outlined in section 2) be in English.

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

2. Initial Review Process

The reviewer will review all information submitted by FIPs requesting to be listed on FisheryProgress. Whenever feasible, the process will begin with an orientation call between the reviewer and the FIP implementer. The purpose of this initial review is to ensure that evidence submitted supports the FIP’s stated type and stage, and to allow the reviewer to verify that the FIP has completed stage 2 (the point at which it can be displayed as an active FIP on the site). The reviewer also checks that the initial scoring against the site’s indicators is supported by the information from the MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment.

The following outlines what the reviewer will look for in reviewing each piece of information.

Profile Information	
FIP Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accurately reflects the scope of the FIP, being specific as possible about location, species, and gear(s).• The location is specific in identifying the area where the fleet that is included in the FIP fishes, beginning with the country, and if applicable, followed by the region, state, or coast/bay/sea. If the fleet spans across multiple EEZs, the ocean(s) where fishing occurs should be named in place of a country.• The species listed match those scored against Principle 1 of the MSC Standard. If there are more than 3 target species, the species are aggregated into a group (e.g., small pelagics, groundfish).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gear(s) listed match those scored against Principle 2 of the MSC Standard. If the FIP does not cover the whole fishery, name should specify what portion is covered. If multiple FIPs exist within the same unit of assessment, FisheryProgress reserves the right to add a lead organization to the FIP name to distinguish between FIPs.
FIP Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected.
FIP Stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected.
Objective(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIP listed one or more objectives that define the near-term scope of the FIP. Objectives are time-bound (include end date) and measurable (e.g., by X date, the FIP will accomplish Y). Scope of objectives is appropriate for the FIP type (see eligibility information in previous section), and will lead to a color change (i.e., red to yellow, or yellow to green) in at least one indicator.
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short description of FIP providing additional detail on history, context, and scope. Clarify the scope of the fishery included in the FIP by listing: 1) the target stock or stocks; 2) the fishing method/gear; and 3) a method for defining the fleet pursuing that stock that will be part of the FIP and improvements (e.g., license type, permit class, etc.).
FIP Lead(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact info for at least one public FIP contact entered. No more than two leads are listed.
Project Dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start date is when FIP completes stage 2 requirements. If the FIP met those requirements before creating a FIP profile, the start date should be consistent with when it completed stage 2 requirements. Expected end date is based on the workplan. Month/year entered for both.
Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one target species selected that matches those scored against Principle 1 of the MSC Standard.
Gear Type(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one target species selected that matches those scored against Principle 2 of the MSC Standard.
Location(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAO Major Fishing Area completed. Information on EEZ and RFMOs entered if relevant.
Estimated Total FIP Landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled in (in metric tons).
Estimated Total Fishery Landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled in (in metric tons).
Landings Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled in.
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each participant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name, organization, and email entered. <i>Note: participant contact information will be kept private, and only used by FisheryProgress to contact participants if: FisheryProgress can't contact the FIP lead, the FIP misses a report, or the FIP is being moved to inactive, or a one-time contact to</i>

	<p><i>invite supplier participants to list profiles on FishChoice.com.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appropriate category selected. ○ Dropdown menu indicates whether contributing financial or in-kind support and/or working on activities. ○ Box checked for any participants that are listed as FishChoice.com member. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Must include at least one company in the supply chain (this includes fishermen or fishing associations).
Geo Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Filled in.

Required Documentation	
<p><i>Note: It is the FIP's responsibility to obtain permission to utilize any required documentation that was not created or commissioned by a FIP participant itself.</i></p>	
MSC Pre-assessment OR Needs Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>MSC pre-assessment:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is completed by someone experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., is a registered MSC technical consultant or accredited conformity assessment body or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer). 2. Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the Marine Stewardship Council Pre-Assessment template available on FisheryProgress. 2. <u>Needs assessment:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meets the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specifies the scope of the assessment (e.g., species, stock, fishery management area, gear type). ▪ Scores indicators within all three principle areas of the MSC standard (target fish stock status, environmental impact of fishing, and management quality) and provides adequate justification. ▪ Describes strengths and weaknesses, as relevant, for each of the principle areas. ▪ Lists sources for all data (sources may include a Marine Stewardship Council pre-assessment, a completed FishSource profile, a Seafood Watch report, or other source). ▪ Describes methodology used. 2. Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the rapid assessment tool template available on FisheryProgress. 3. The author(s) of a pre-assessment or needs assessment must perform due diligence in determining baseline scores for MSC

	<p>Performance Indicators. If an indicator does not have information to support scoring, the reviewer may request additional detail about why the information is not available.</p>
<p>Scoping Document</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTE: if all elements below are included in the MSC pre-assessment or needs assessment, no need for scoping document. • For <u>basic FIPs</u>, the scoping document summarizes the results of the needs assessment and recommends strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. If the needs assessment doesn’t include all indicators, the scoping document must also include an explanation for what was excluded and why. • For <u>comprehensive FIPs</u>, the scoping document summarizes the results of the MSC pre-assessment and recommends strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. The scoping document was completed or audited by an entity experienced with applying the MSC standard (required for comprehensive FIPs only). • For all scoping documents, assess reasonable alignment between challenges identified in the MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment and strategies recommended in the scoping document. • Scoping documents should also take into account where cumulative impacts will need to be assessed in Principle 2, and indicate where the needs assessment is relying on the MSC Risk-Based Framework.
<p>Workplan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the workplan template available on FisheryProgress. • Workplan includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Actions aligned with FIP objectives</u>. An action is a major activity from the FIP’s workplan that must be completed to address the deficiencies identified in the needs assessment (for basic FIPs) or MSC pre-assessment (for comprehensive FIPs). For examples, visit the FisheryProgress glossary. ○ <u>Specific tasks under each action</u> (optional). Tasks break actions down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished. Using tasks is encouraged in order to provide more clarity on how the FIP intends to complete each action. Tasks allows FIPs to more clearly demonstrate progress, which impacts the reviewer’s

	<p>ability to determine whether a score may have improved. For examples, visit the FisheryProgress glossary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organizations or people responsible for completing each action/task. ○ A month/year deadline for completing each action. ○ Information about who completed the workplan (e.g., name, title, affiliation). ○ Actions and tasks should provide enough detail and clarity for users to understand the fundamentals of what will be completed, the steps involved, and how the FIP will address the deficiencies identified in the needs assessment or pre-assessment. This detail can be provided through tasks or detailed actions paired with descriptions. For examples, see the actions and tasks entries in the FisheryProgress glossary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Actions/tasks align with FIP objectives. ○ The workplan extends through at least year 2 of the FIP. ○ Timeframes are plausible. ○ There are no major concerns or risks to achieving the workplan given the information provided.
MOU (Optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FIP scope or name. ○ Names and organizations of participants. ○ Specific terms of agreement (funding/in-kind support and/or activities to be conducted by each participant). ○ End date. ○ Confirmation that all parties have signed the MOU.
Proof of Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Starting in March 2021, FIPs, qualified consultants, and CABs must use the FIP budget template available on FisheryProgress. ● Starting in March 2021, the budget must extend to year 2 of the FIP, but only needs to be fully funded for year 1. ● The budget must provide specific detail on how activities and funds will contribute toward achieving stated outcomes. A more detailed budget could list all of the costs associated with each activity, as well as secured funding and needed funding for each activity. ● A budget may anonymize or aggregate the sources of revenue and may include in-kind contributions and monetary contributions. ● The budget must be updated once per year. ● Reviewer looks for red flags indicating budget may be insufficient for completing the workplan. ● NOTE: the budget does not need to be made publicly available. FIPs that keep their budgets private may give FisheryProgress approval to anonymize their budgets for research purposes.

Baseline Indicator Scores (Optional)	<p><u>Single-Species/Single-Gear FIPs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that the baseline indicators align with the first pre-assessment/needs assessment undertaken by the FIP in stage 1. • In cases where the FIP has completed multiple pre-assessments/needs assessments (either from before the FIP launched or after the FIP completed stage 1), the FIP may upload these under “additional documentation” to provide additional data. However, Year 0 will still align with first assessment done in stage 1. • If a FIP is using a needs assessment as its baseline indicator scores, and it does not include baseline scoring and supporting evidence, additional supporting evidence can be uploaded. <p><u>Multi-Species/Multi-Gear/Multi-Jurisdiction FIPs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the FIP includes multiple species/gear/jurisdiction types and the pre-assessment/needs assessment includes separate scores for each species/gear/jurisdiction combination, review the FIP’s Multi-Species/Gear/Jurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet to ensure the lowest score for each indicator is represented in the site’s main table. • Ensure the FIP uploaded the multi-species/gear/jurisdiction indicator score spreadsheet to the site.
Additional Documentation (Optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure additional documents have clear descriptions and are relevant to the FIP.
Independent Audit (Optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure audits have clear descriptions. • For three-year audits, ensure the template is complete.

Indicators	
Baseline Indicator Scores	<p><u>Single-Species/Single-Gear FIPs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that the scores entered for Year 0 are the scores in the first pre-assessment/needs assessment undertaken by the FIP in stage 1. • Ensure the scores are transferred directly. • FIPs that are unfamiliar with the MSC standard may use the following guidance document. <p><u>Multi-Species/Multi-Gear/Multi-Jurisdiction FIPs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the FIP includes multiple species/gear/jurisdiction types and the pre-assessment/needs assessment includes separate scores for each species/gear/jurisdiction combination, review the FIP’s Multi-Species/Gear/Jurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet to ensure the lowest score for each indicator is represented in the site’s main table. • Ensure the FIP uploaded the multi-species/gear/jurisdiction indicator score spreadsheet to the site.

Details	
Engagement Opportunities	<p>Listing engagement opportunities are optional. The guidelines below are for those FIPs that complete this section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Engagement Opportunity</u>: Is clear and concise, and provides enough information to adequately describe the engagement opportunity. • <u>Type of Opportunity (optional)</u>: If selected, type of opportunity is consistent with the engagement opportunity that is described. • <u>Description</u>: Provides additional information and context that helps industry understand more about the engagement opportunity. • <u>How Will the Engagement Opportunity Benefit Businesses? (optional)</u>: If provided, information persuasively conveys the benefit to the potential benefits to seafood businesses to engage in the FIP. The text here should not describe the benefit to the FIP. • <u>Who Needs to Engage in this Opportunity? (optional)</u>: If selected, target audience should be consistent with the information provided elsewhere in the engagement opportunity section. • <u>Why is the Engagement Opportunity Important? (optional)</u>: If provided, information explains why the engagement opportunity is important and how it will advance the FIP. Providing a compelling reason to engage in the FIP will help ensure that businesses participate. • <u>Deadline (optional)</u>: If provided, confirm the deadline is not expired or extends beyond the projected end date of the FIP. • <u>How to Get Involved</u>: Sufficient information should be provided to make this as easy as possible for a company to engage by including a contact name with contact information (even if this is included elsewhere in the FIP profile). It is recommended that additional information such as links to template letters or a FIP agreement be provided in this section as well.
Additional Impacts	<p>Additional impacts are optional. The guidelines below are for those FIPs that complete this section.</p> <p>Confirm the following based on which impact(s) the FIP notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Social Impact</u>: Adequate information is included to describe how the FIP is working to address social issues.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traceability: Adequate information is included to describe how the FIP is working to address traceability. • IUU: Adequate information is included to describe how the FIP is working to address IUU fishing. • Ecosystem Impact: Adequate information is included to describe how the FIP is working to address additional ecosystem impacts beyond those addressed in the MSC standard. • Other: Adequate information is included to describe any affiliations with conservation or social programs or efforts. • Supplier Roundtables: Confirm that roundtables link is accurate if participating. <p>If FIP includes a document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm document is relevant to additional impact described. <p>If FIP includes a website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm website title is accurate. • Confirm the URL link works.
--	--

The reviewer will follow up with the FIP implementer to address any questions regarding the submitted materials, and will review additional materials submitted by the FIP after follow-up is complete if necessary.

The reviewer will aim to complete the review within one month of the date the report is submitted.

This timing may vary depending on the volume of FIPs on the site and the amount of follow-up needed to secure additional information from the FIP implementer. Once this process is complete, the reviewer will make the FIP public on FisheryProgress.

3. Evaluating FIP Progress

Six-Month Report Review

Every six months from the date the profile is posted on FisheryProgress, FIPs must report on action progress. An established FIP (i.e., those that create a profile after implementation has already started) may request a one-time adjustment of up to three months to its six-month report date to better align with the FIP’s work cycle with valid explanation for the adjustment.

For the six-month report review, the reviewer will:

1. Confirm the FIP met its six-month reporting deadline by providing a comprehensive update on progress for all actions and complete a detailed review.
2. Confirm the FIP submitted evidence for completed actions and tasks. The reviewer may also request evidence for progress reported on tasks and actions that are not yet complete. We encourage evidence to be submitted in English. If it is not, the evidence is subject to secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site. Guidance on evidence is below.

- **Evidence** must meet the following criteria to be acceptable:
 - Be documented in writing.
 - Have a date.
 - Have a source (e.g., person, organization).
 - Have a contact person who can verify it.
 - Should be publicly available. If not publicly available, it must be able to be made public on FisheryProgress with appropriate anonymizing.
 - **Evidence for action and task progress** will vary depending on the action/task. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence for action or task progress:
 - Signed agreements with consultants, government, or others demonstrating progress on specific activities such as research.
 - Meeting agendas, notes, and/or participant lists.
 - Letters sent to governments, suppliers, or others.
 - Media articles, blog posts, and/or statements posted on a website.
 - White papers, summary reports, rapid assessments, formal stock assessments, or data analyses.
 - Data collection protocols, log books and catch documentation, or raw data.
 - Official government laws, regulations, or policies.
3. The reviewer will complete a detailed review, and publish the updates to the website when complete.
 4. FIPs that want to report progress impacting their progress rating or indicator scores may request an additional progress review outside of the 6- or 12-month timeframe. These reviews will not change the FIPs' 6- and 12-month review deadlines. FisheryProgress will evaluate other requests for profile changes/progress updates on a case-by-case basis.

A report will be considered missed if not completed within one month of the deadline. To be considered complete, a FIP must submit its report and address any issues flagged by the reviewer. If a report is not completed within one month of the deadline, the FIP's missed report deadline will be highlighted in red on the FIP overview page.

If the FIP completes a missed report after one month, the passed deadline distinction will be removed but the report will still be considered missed. Two consecutive missed reports (including a report that was missed then submitted later) will render the FIP inactive.

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

Annual Review

Every 12 months from the date the profile is posted on FisheryProgress, FIPs must report on action progress AND provide an update on all of the FIP's indicator scores. The reviewer will:

1. Re-familiarize with the FIP by reviewing the FIP's profile and MSC pre-assessment/needs assessment, scoping document (if available), and workplan.
2. Confirm that the workplan and FIP budget has been updated and extends for the following two years.
3. Confirm the FIP participant contact information has been updated.
4. Confirm that the FIP met its 12-month reporting deadline by providing:
 - A detailed update on progress for all actions and tasks;
 - Evidence for completed actions and tasks (note that the reviewer may also request evidence for progress reported on tasks and actions that are not yet complete) or any reported results; and
 - A description of/evidence for indicator score changes.
5. Assess the progress details and evidence to confirm that they are accurate, of acceptable quality, and do not raise red flags that would cause site users to doubt the veracity of the FIP's progress reports. We encourage evidence to be submitted in English. If it is not, the evidence is subject to secondary review and may take longer to publish on the site.

Guidance on evidence is below.

- **Evidence** must meet the following criteria to be acceptable:
 - Be documented in writing.
 - Have a date.
 - Have a source (e.g., person, organization).
 - Have a contact person who can verify it.
 - Should be publicly available. If not publicly available, it must be able to be made public on FisheryProgress with appropriate anonymizing.
- **Evidence for action and task progress** will vary depending on the action/task. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence for action and task progress:
 - Signed agreements with consultants, government, or others demonstrating progress on specific activities such as research.
 - Meeting agendas, notes, and/or participant lists.
 - Letters sent to governments, suppliers, or others.
 - Media articles, blog posts, and/or statements posted on a website.
 - White papers, summary reports, rapid assessments, formal stock assessments, or data analyses.
 - Data collection protocols, log books and catch documentation, or raw data.
 - Official government laws, regulations, or policies.
- **Evidence for score change.** Changes in indicator scores are shown in two ways on FisheryProgress: 1) A color change (red to yellow or yellow to green) indicates a FIP has progressed to the next scoring range for that indicator; and 2) A plus sign indicates a FIP has made positive progress within a scoring range but not yet reached the next scoring range.

Score changes may be driven by action progress (see above) or by demonstrated improvements in policy, management, or fishing practices or improvements on the water. Evidence will vary depending on the improvement reported. The following are examples of different kinds of evidence for improvements a FIP may report:

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

FisheryProgress reserves the right to ask for additional evidence for any FIP claiming a score change. Pre-assessments, BMTs, workplans, or reports can be used as evidence as long as they are authored by qualified consultants and accompanied by legitimate rationale that draws upon language from the MSC Standard scoring guideposts. Reviewers may exercise discretion in absence of concrete evidence.

- **Age of evidence.** FisheryProgress will review data/evidence that support score changes on a case-by-case basis to make a determination on how and where it should influence score changes. However, as new evidence becomes available, the date of publication (as opposed to the original date of data/information) should be used to determine which year (y0, y1, etc.) the MSC scores are changed or adjusted.
6. Focus on areas where specific progress is reported. Where no progress is reported, the reviewer will only spot-check to confirm there are no setbacks in progress (e.g., data collection program with fishermen ended).
 7. Consult with Technical Oversight Committee in tough situations (see Proactive Quality Control section below).
 8. Address any missing or unclear information by following up with FIP implementer as needed, who can also request a conversation with the reviewer when submitting documentation. Any inquiries and replies by the reviewer and FIP implementer should occur within a reasonable timeframe (five business days when possible).
 9. Update the FIP stage based on progress reported.
 10. Aim to complete the annual review within one month of the date the report is submitted. This timing may vary depending on the volume of FIPs on the site, amount of follow-up needed to secure additional information from the FIP implementer, and whether or not the FIP reports progress earlier than the 12-month deadline.

A report will be considered missed if not completed within one month of the report date. To be considered complete, a FIP must submit its report and address any issues flagged by the reviewer. Two consecutive missed reports (including a report that was missed then submitted later) will render the FIP inactive.

If a FIP misses an annual report, all annual report requirements outlined above (including updating indicator scores) must be met in the following reporting cycle. The FIP's next annual report date will be adjusted to 12 months from the completed report date.

Three-Year Audit Review (for comprehensive FIPs only)

Every three years, comprehensive FIPs are required to have an independent in-person audit of action results and performance against the MSC standard (in-person may mean the location of the fishery, the location of FIP stakeholders, or where workplan actions take place).

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

FIPs must use the [three-year audit template](#).

The reviewer will:

- **Confirm the date of the FIP's last audit.** Audits must be completed at least every three years after the publication of the FIP profile on FisheryProgress. If an audit is completed before the three-year publication date, the next audit will be due three years following the date of the most recently completed audit.
- **Send a reminder at the two-year mark.** The reviewer will reach out around the FIP's two-year mark to remind the implementer of FisheryProgress's [three-year audit guidelines](#), [the three-year audit template](#), and auditor criteria (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has [other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer](#)), and answer any questions.
- **Check auditor qualifications.** The reviewer will confirm the audit report includes information on the auditor's qualifications, and consequently confirm that the auditor has the required experience with the MSC Standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has [other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer](#)).
- **Review the audit.** The reviewer will confirm the FIP used the three-year audit template, and that the template is completed correctly. The reviewer will not review the audit for accuracy or credibility.

- **Confirm the audit is submitted properly.** The reviewer will confirm the audit is posted on FisheryProgress under the “Independent Audit” field in the details tab, along with a short description of the audit.

If the reviewer finds the audit to be incomplete or incorrectly filled out, and/or it is not submitted within one month of the deadline, FisheryProgress will render the FIP inactive.

Additional guidance is available in the [three-year audit guidelines](#).

FIP Ratings

All FIPs on FisheryProgress are assigned a rating, based on evidence they provide to FisheryProgress through their 6-month and annual reports. Ratings are determined using the methodology available [here](#).

Ratings are determined by Sustainable Fisheries Partnership, and reviewed by FisheryProgress.

Impact of FIP Changes on the FIP Review Process

Early reporting. FIPs may submit their six- or 12-month progress reports early if they choose. FIPs that want to report progress impacting their progress rating or indicator scores may request an additional progress review outside of the 6- or 12-month timeframe. These reviews will not change the FIPs’ 6- and 12-month review deadlines.

FisheryProgress will evaluate other requests for profile changes/progress updates on a case-by-case basis.

FIP changes. Changes may occur over the life of a FIP. The following outlines how the reviewer will respond to minor and significant scope changes (the FIP will submit changes to actions, tasks, and deadlines in the workplan during its six- and 12-month progress reports).

- For minor changes (e.g., change in FIP lead, new participants added), the reviewer will ensure the change is made on the website. Reporting deadlines will remain the same.
- For significant scope changes, the reviewer will work with the FIP to ensure it uploads updated materials, complete an annual review, and reset the annual review date. If the change is due to increased ambition or scope (e.g., transition from basic to comprehensive), the FIP’s new information will be published as soon as it’s reviewed. For other changes (e.g., reduction in FIP objectives, majority of participants leave), the reviewer may remove the FIP from the website for a maximum of six months. The FIP’s annual reporting cycle will be adjusted to align with the date it is republished to the site.

For examples of potential changes and how they will be handled, please see [Appendix B](#).

Reactivating an inactive FIP. A FIP that is inactive may reactive its profile by uploading updated materials and completing an annual review. The FIP’s annual reporting cycle will be adjusted to align with the date it is republished to the site, though the FIP will maintain the original profile’s start date.

- **Impact on the three-year audit cycle.** Comprehensive FIPs that are reactivating an inactive profile will maintain the profile’s original three-year audit cycle report date unless it is due within 12 months of reactivating, in which case the three-year cycle report date will be adjusted to 12 months from the new publish date.

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

Completed and Inactive FIPs

Completed FIPs. When a FIP reports that it is complete and provides independent verification for the final claim it’s making about the performance level it has achieved, the reviewer will move it to the Completed section of the website. Examples of claims and appropriate verification include:

Claim	Independent Verification
Certified	Certification report
In MSC full assessment	Publicly announced and not on exited list, with at least one of the FIP participants listed as a client group
Meets a level of performance equivalent to an unconditional pass of the MSC Standard (i.e., a comprehensive FIP that does not pursue certification)	Independent, in-person audit that affirms all indicators are green (and meets FisheryProgress’ audit guidelines) posted publicly on FisheryProgress
Rated	Assessment report
Met specific objective such as bycatch reduction	Independent evidence – government report, peer-reviewed paper, etc.

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

If a FIP is marked complete due to entering full assessment but then withdraws, the FIP will have the option to either move the FIP profile to Inactive or reactivate the FIP according to the significant scope changes guidance outlined in the [FIP changes](#) section above.

Completed FIPs will be left on the site indefinitely. FisheryProgress does not continue to review FIPs’ progress or data once marked as completed on the site.

Inactive FIPs. The reviewer will move a FIP to the Inactive section of the site if:

1. The FIP self-reports that it is ending without achieving its objectives.
2. The FIP misses two sequential six-month reporting deadlines. (A FIP must fully update its progress to move back to Active.) A report will be considered missed if not completed within one month of the report date.
3. The reviewer finds the three-year audit to be incomplete and/or it is not submitted within one month of the deadline.

4. The FIP reports no changes in fishing practice or management or change on the water in three years. (A FIP must provide evidence of at least one change in fishing practice or management or change on the water to move back to Active.)
5. The FIP makes changes such that it now reports under another FIP profile (e.g., the FIP merges with another FIP). In these cases, the inactive profile will note the FIP's active profile.

Inactive FIPs remain on the site indefinitely, but as a limited profile that includes a subset of the FIP's information.

Unpublished FIPs. A FIP may not request its profile be unpublished (i.e., removed from the site). A FIP profile may only be unpublished if needed for the review process as outlined in these guidelines. If a FIP would like to stop reporting on the site, it may either provide evidence it is completed (as outlined above) or move to inactive.

4. Quality Control and Appeals Process

Proactive Quality Control

FisheryProgress is committed to consistent, accurate reviews of FIP progress, results, and impact. Our Technical Oversight Committee serves as an expert advisor providing a second opinion to the reviewer in situations where evaluating progress is difficult due to technical issues that require additional capacity, issues of interpretation relative to MSC criteria that present complex scope considerations, or use of complex portions of the standard (e.g. non-DAT fisheries).

In second opinion situations, the reviewer will send his or her specific question(s) to two expert advisor members of the Technical Oversight Committee. These advisors will provide separate and independent answers/interpretations to the reviewer within a few days (as soon as practicable), or if the advisor cannot, the advisor will decline and the reviewer will ask another member of the committee instead. In cases where the issues/questions are too complex for this process, the reviewer will schedule a short conference call with the committee members with at least a week for them to review the issue(s) first.

In addition, the Technical Oversight Committee conducts random spot checks of initial and 12-month progress reviews to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Conflict Resolution and Appeals Process

The conflict resolution and appeals process is set for the effective and timely resolution of challenges and appeals relating to FIP profiles published on the FisheryProgress website, or to the decisions taken by FisheryProgress reviewers.

Scope. Appeals may be submitted on the following grounds:

- A decision made by the reviewer, limited to:
 - Initial review outcomes (including FIP type and stage assignments)
 - Six-month and annual progress review outcomes
 - Site status and inactive and complete designations
 - Whether a consultant meets the site's [comprehensive FIP consultant criteria](#)

- Evidence of inaccurate data posted on the site, limited to:
 - Evidence that a FIP didn't complete an action or outcome
 - Evidence that a score change is incorrect
 - Evidence that a listed participant is not participating in the FIP

Objections of an inaccurate progress rating is not grounds for appeal. Progress ratings are assigned by Sustainable Fisheries Partnership, based on the evidence FIPs list on FisheryProgress. Concerns about progress ratings should be directed to fipevaluation@sustainablefish.org. FishChoice staff will help to address concerns about ratings according to the conflict resolution process outlined below and by reviewing new evidence if needed.

Questions or challenges pertaining to issues outside the scope of this appeals process may provide feedback via the site's [contact page](#).

Conflict resolution. FisheryProgress has a preference for resolution of conflicts informally if possible, using the following processes:

- a. **For FIPs (implementers or participants):** If a FIP implementer or participant has concerns about the outcome of a reviewer's decision or data on the site (either published or unpublished and under review), the FIP will first contact the reviewer directly to discuss these concerns, address questions, or correct inaccuracies in the reporting.
- b. **For external stakeholders:** If a stakeholder unaffiliated with the FIP (e.g., the organization or individual is not a participant in the FIP) has concerns about the outcome of a reviewer's decision or data on the site, he/she can submit a comment through the comment feature on a FIP's profile. A FIP reviewer will follow up to discuss the concerns and the FIP will be contacted to provide additional information, if considered necessary by the reviewer.

Appeals process. If the concerns cannot be solved informally through conflict resolution, a FIP implementer or participant or external stakeholder can enter into a formal appeal process.

Requirements. Appeals must be submitted using the appeal template (available to download [here](#)) and supported by credible evidence. Any appeals submitted on issues outside of the noted scope or without credible evidence will be declined. Any appeals submitted without first engaging in the informal conflict resolution process (described above) will be declined.

Process. The appeals process is as follows:

- **Appeal filed.** A FIP implementer or participant must file an appeal within 30 calendar days of a FIP reviewer's decision (according to the appeals grounds noted above). External stakeholders may file an appeal at any point. An appellant must complete the appeals template and submit it to FisheryProgress (contact@fisheryprogress.org). If the appellant is an outside stakeholder, the FIP will be informed of the appellant and the basis for the appeal unless there is a valid reason to keep that information confidential from the FIP.
- **Initial review.** A member of the FisheryProgress Technical Oversight Committee will review the appeal to confirm if it fits within scope and meets the requirements within three business days. If needed, a member of the Technical Oversight Committee may schedule a call to discuss the

appeal or clarify questions with the appellant (and the FIP implementer or participant, if the appellant is an external stakeholder), and a call with the FisheryProgress review team to gather additional information and answer any outstanding questions. A majority of the TOC reviews the appeal and makes a recommendation to the Advisory Committee within 60 calendar days.

- **Final decision.** The Advisory Committee reviews the Technical Oversight Committee's recommendation. If the Advisory Committee disagrees with the Technical Oversight Committee's recommendation, a joint call will be held between the Advisory Committee and the Technical Oversight Committee to discuss the disagreement. At the end of the call, the Advisory Committee makes the final decision about how to proceed by majority rules. A final decision must be reached within 30 calendar days of the Technical Oversight Committee submitting its recommendation to the Advisory Committee.
- **Decision communicated.** Within one week of the decision, a member of the Technical Oversight Committee or Advisory Committee communicates the final decision back to the appellant (as well as the FIP implementer or participant, if appeal was filed by an external stakeholder). The communication will not be public, though the FIP may do its own communication about its status. FisheryProgress will maintain records of all appeals.

Timing for implementing changes. The decision will outline timing for implementing any changes, if needed. If the FIP does not meet the deadline, the reviewers will move it to inactive.

Conflict of interest. Any member of the Technical Oversight Committee or Advisory Committee with a conflict of interest (i.e., not independent from the FIP or the appellant) will abstain from any discussions/decisions about the appeal.

Appendix A: Comprehensive FIP Consultant Criteria

FisheryProgress requires that comprehensive FIPs' pre-assessment and related scoping document (if applicable) and in-person audits (required every three years) are conducted by a party experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited conformity assessment body](#) or has other demonstrated qualifications approved by the reviewer).

The following clarifies the third category – those with other demonstrated qualifications. It establishes criteria that FisheryProgress will use to determine if a consultant has the demonstrated qualifications necessary to complete an MSC pre-assessment and related scoping document (if applicable) or conduct a comprehensive FIP's in-person audit of activity results and performance against the MSC standard.

1. General Eligibility Criteria

- a. University degree in fisheries, marine conservation biology, natural resources, environmental management, or relevant field (e.g., economics, mathematics, statistics).

OR

- b. At least 3 years management or research experience in a marine conservation biology, fisheries, natural resources, or environmental management position.

2. Fishery Experience

The applicant must qualify in at least one of the following areas of fishery expertise:

- a. **Fish stock assessment:** at least 3 years of experience as a leader in the production of peer-reviewed stock assessments.
- b. **Fish stock biology/ecology:** at least 3 years of experience working in fisheries biology and population dynamics.
- c. **Fishing impacts on aquatic ecosystems:** at least 3 years of experience in research into, policy analysis for, or management of fisheries impacts on aquatic ecosystems.
- d. **Fishery management and operations:** at least 3 years of experience as a practicing fishery manager and/or fishery policy analyst.

3. Understanding of the FIP Process

- a. Has contributed to at least two FIP workplans that meet the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions' Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects since 2015.

4. Understanding of MSC Fisheries Standard

- a. Have undertaken a minimum of 2 MSC fishery assessments or surveillance site visits as a team member in the past 10 years (evidence: announcement documentation and/or assessment report) and successfully completed the [online assessor training modules](#) for the latest version of the fisheries standard (evidence: certificate of completion).

OR

- b. Is currently listed on the MSC's Register as a technical consultant or associate technical consultant (<https://www.msc.org/get-certified/fisheries/technical-assistance/consultants/consultants>).

5. Communication, Stakeholder Facilitation, and Project Management Skills (optional)

- a. Experience applying various interviewing and facilitation techniques.
- b. Experience engaging with stakeholders in fisheries management, science, or fisheries policy development on a range of fisheries and resource sustainability issues.
- c. Record of consultancy work, project development, and management.

Appendix B: Examples of FIP Changes and Process for Handling

This appendix outlines some examples of changes in FIPs and how they will be handled by FisheryProgress. This is not exhaustive – it is intended to serve as examples and maintain historical data for the FisheryProgress reviewers.

- If a FIP wants to extend its end date, it must provide the reviewer with an updated end date; associated action plan; and an explanation of the extension that is sufficiently detailed to understand the challenge the FIP has faced in achieving its objectives by the previous end date, and how the updated workplan will increase the FIP's chances of success.

The detailed explanation will be kept internal to FisheryProgress reviewers, and the reviewer will note the original end date and a summary of the reason for the change on the FIP's profile.

If the explanation is not sufficiently detailed, the reviewer will request the FIP resubmit it within two weeks. FIPs who do not provide additional details within the two weeks will be moved to inactive.

- If an inactive FIP is merged into a new FIP, the FIP has two options. The FIP may:
 - Reactive the old profile, meeting the criteria for reactivating an inactive profile outlined earlier.
 - Create a new FIP profile, and maintain the old profile which will remain in the inactive section indefinitely.
- If a portion of the scope of the FIP enters MSC full assessment and the rest of the FIP wants to remain active on FisheryProgress, the following changes will be made:
 - A new FIP profile will be created to represent the portion of the FIP that continues to be active (adjustments will be made to the title, geographic scope, landings, species, participants). The actions and updates may be transferred over to the new profile.
 - The existing profile will be adjusted to reflect the completed scope of the FIP (including the title, geographic scope, landings, species, participants), and the profile will be move to the completed section of FisheryProgress. Actions will remain as-is.
 - The original scope of the FIP will be described at the top of both FIP descriptions, with links to the completed or new profiles.
- If a FIP was marked complete due to entering full assessment but then withdraws:
 - The reviewer will contact the FIP lead and offer two options: move the FIP profile to Inactive, or reactivate the FIP. The FIP will have two weeks to respond.
 - If the FIP decides to reactivate, it will move to unpublished status for up to three months (unless an extension is granted by the reviewers for up to six months) while it provides updated materials and workplan, and completes an annual review.
 - If the FIP does not respond within two weeks, it will move to Inactive. If it wants to reactivate in the future, it may reactivate following the process outlined [here](#).

Appendix C: Needs Assessment Recommended Indicators

If a basic FIP is unable to score all of the MSC indicators in its needs assessment, FisheryProgress recommends scoring the following subset. Rationale is included for why each performance indicator is recommended, based on the Marine Stewardship Council’s Risk-Based Framework methodologies – more information is available in Annex 1 of the [MSC’s Capacity Building Toolkit](#).

Principle 1 – Sustainable Fish Stocks

Rationale for recommendation: The following PIs are recommended because understanding the areas of risk can help a FIP understand where to focus resources. Even in data-limited fisheries, the target stock status and the impact of the fishery on other species and habitats can be achieved using the [MSC’s Risk Based Framework](#).

Performance Indicator	Rationale
1.1.1 – stock status	<p>This PI looks at status of the entire stock that the FIP is targeting.</p> <p>FIPs should understand the status of the stock that the FIP is targeting.</p> <p><i>Note: Where stock assessments or reference points are lacking, a risk-based approach can be followed using the MSC’s Risk Based Framework.</i></p>
1.2.1 – harvest strategy	<p>This PI looks at whether there is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place to ensure sustainable management of the stock.</p> <p>FIPs should understand the key components of the harvest strategy and if it is working. This is fundamental to the sustainable management of a fishery.</p>
1.2.3 – information & monitoring	<p>This PI looks at whether relevant information is collected, and monitoring is conducted.</p> <p>FIPs should understand where they need to collect more data and ensure monitoring programs are in place.</p> <p>Scoring this PI will help FIPs understand what information needs to be collected and how best to prioritize data collection resources.</p> <p>Information is a crucial component of an effective fisheries management system as it underpins the understanding of stock status, the scale of fishery impacts or the effectiveness of management measures. Effective management is often compromised by a failure to collect adequate information in a robust, independent and timely fashion.</p>

Principle 2 – Minimizing Environmental Impact

Rationale for recommendation: The following PIs are recommended because understanding the areas of risk with respect to the fishery’s impact on other species and habitats can help a FIP understand where to focus resources, especially with respect to information collection and monitoring. Even in data-limited fisheries, the risk the fishery poses to other species and habitats can be determined using the [MSC’s Risk Based Framework](#).

Performance Indicator	Rationale
2.1.1 – primary species outcome	<p>This PI looks at the status of other species caught as part of the FIP and the impact of the fishery on these other species.</p> <p>This PI is only relevant for species that are managed according to reference points.</p> <p>FIPs should understand the status of the other species that are caught as part of the FIP. FIPs should understand the impact of the fishery on these species and ensure that management measures are in place to ensure the fishery does not hinder the recovery or rebuilding of a stock.</p> <p><i>Note: For many FIPs, scoring primary species may not be necessary as primary species are those managed to reference points, which require good levels of information and data, and so it may be that basic FIPs that are data limited won’t even have primary species therefore this PI wouldn’t need to be scored. The MSC’s Risk Based Framework can be followed in limited situations.</i></p>
2.1.3 – primary species information	<p>This PI looks at the availability and quality of information with respect to understanding the impact of the fishery on primary species and whether that information is adequate enough to support management measures or strategies.</p> <p>FIPs should ensure there is adequate information to determine the impact of the fishery and understand if management measures are effective.</p> <p>Scoring this PI will help FIPs understand what information needs to be collected and how best to prioritize data collection resources.</p> <p>Information is a crucial component of an effective fisheries management system as it underpins the understanding of stock status, the scale of fishery impacts or the effectiveness of management measures. Effective management is often compromised by a failure to collect adequate information in a robust, independent and timely fashion.</p>
2.2.1 – secondary species outcome	<p>This PI looks at the status of other species caught as part of the FIP and the impact of the fishery on these other species.</p>

	<p>This PI is relevant for all other species caught as part of a FIP that are not managed according to reference points and are not ETP species.</p> <p>FIPs should understand the status of the other species that are caught as part of the FIP. FIPs should understand the impact of the fishery on these species and ensure that management measures are in place to ensure the fishery does not hinder the recovery or rebuilding of a stock.</p> <p><i>Note: Where data is limited, a risk-based approach can be followed using the MSC's Risk Based Framework.</i></p>
<p>2.2.3 – secondary species information</p>	<p>This PI looks at the availability and quality of information with respect to understanding the impact of the fishery on secondary species and whether that information is adequate enough to support management measures or strategies.</p> <p>FIPs should ensure there is adequate information to determine the impact of the fishery and understand if management measures are effective.</p> <p>Scoring this PI will help FIPs understand what information needs to be collected and how best to prioritize data collection resources.</p> <p>Information is a crucial component of an effective fisheries management system as it underpins the understanding of stock status, the scale of fishery impacts or the effectiveness of management measures. Effective management is often compromised by a failure to collect adequate information in a robust, independent and timely fashion.</p>
<p>2.3.1 – ETP species outcome</p>	<p>This PI looks at the impact of the fishery on ETP species – either in the context of nationally/internationally set limits or, where these are not available, in the context of direct and indirect effects of the fishery on the ETP species.</p> <p>FIPs should understand the direct and indirect impacts of the fishery on ETP species and know whether either within national/international limits, or are not hindering the recovery of ETP species.</p> <p><i>Note: Where data is limited, a risk-based approach can be followed using the MSC's Risk Based Framework.</i></p>
<p>2.3.3 – ETP species information</p>	<p>This PI looks at the adequacy of information, both to determine the risk posed to ETP species by the fishery and to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy to manage impacts on ETP species.</p>

	<p>FIPs should ensure there is adequate information to determine the impact of the fishery and understand if management measures are effective.</p> <p>Scoring this PI will help FIPs understand what information needs to be collected and how best to prioritize data collection resources.</p> <p>Information is a crucial component of an effective fisheries management system as it underpins the understanding of stock status, the scale of fishery impacts or the effectiveness of management measures. Effective management is often compromised by a failure to collect adequate information in a robust, independent and timely fashion.</p>
<p>2.4.1 – habitats outcome</p>	<p>This PI looks at the impact of the fishery on the structure and function of the habitats that are encountered.</p> <p>The FIP should understand its impact on habitats and whether or not the habitats they encounter are vulnerable.</p> <p><i>Note: Where data is limited, a risk-based approach can be followed using the MSC’s Risk Based Framework.</i></p>
<p>2.4.3 – habitats information</p>	<p>This PI looks at the adequacy of the information available both to determine the impact of the fishery on habitats/or the risk posed to habitats from the fishery and to evaluate the effectiveness of management measures/strategies to manage those impacts.</p> <p>FIPs should ensure there is adequate information to determine the impact of the fishery and understand if management measures are effective.</p> <p>Scoring this PI will help FIPs understand what information needs to be collected and how best to prioritize data collection resources.</p> <p>Information is a crucial component of an effective fisheries management system as it underpins the understanding of stock status, the scale of fishery impacts or the effectiveness of management measures. Effective management is often compromised by a failure to collect adequate information in a robust, independent and timely fashion.</p>

Principle 3 – Effective Fisheries Management

Rationale for recommendation: Fishery-specific management PIs in Principle 3 capture the FIP's underlying commitment and approach to sustainable fisheries management and the involvement of key stakeholders in that approach.

Performance Indicator	Rationale
3.2.1 – fishery-specific objectives	<p>This PI looks at whether there are fishery management objectives. It identifies a fisheries commitment to sustainable fisheries management.</p> <p>Objectives are important statements of what an individual and/or organization intends to achieve and against which progress can be measured. Fishery-specific objectives (or operational objectives) provide direction for management measures or regulations</p>
3.2.2 – decision-making processes	<p>This PI looks at the process by which fishery management decisions are informed and made, and against what criteria. It is therefore critical to the success of fisheries management in meeting its stated objectives. It is the process of decision-making, rather than the outcomes of decisions that is the focus of this PI.</p> <p>The importance of effective decision-making in the fisheries context is highlighted in the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing.</p>
3.2.3 – compliance and enforcement	<p>This PI looks at whether the Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) mechanisms are adequate to ensure the management and conservation measures in a fishery are enforced and complied with, and that illegal, unreported or unregulated (IUU) fishing is avoided or minimized. MCS systems are considered one of the key principles of effective fisheries management. The scoring for this PI considers the effectiveness of the overall system, the appropriateness of any sanctions for non-compliance and the overall record of compliance and cooperation within the fishery.</p>