

Thai Sustainable Fisheries Roundtable (TSFR)

Multi-species criteria with the revised criteria with proposed FAP actions

Management and Policy (Part 1)

M1 Legislation, policy and plans						
	Assessment Criteria	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	
M1.1	The fishery is covered by modern comprehensive legislation that includes primary legislation (law and acts) and subsidiary legislation (rules and	Pass				
M1.2	The legislation is based on relevant international law, instruments and	Pass				
M1.3	The legislation and/or overarching policies outline the overall broad objectives for the fishery (ecological, social and economic).	Pass				
M1.4	The legislation legally empowers the responsible organisations to manage the fishery, including undertaking monitoring, control and surveillance and implementing management actions.	Pass				
M1.5	The policies and plans publicly commit the fisheries management organisations to sustainable development of the fishery (sustainability).	Pass				
M1.6	The legislation and national policies include arrangements for stakeholder engagement and consultation.	Pass				
M1.7	The fishery has an up-to-date fisheries management plan (or linked to such a plan) that incorporates the main principles of the ecosystem approach to fisheries, covering the ecological, social and economic dimensions of sustainable	Pass				
M1.8	The fishery management plan specifies goals and operational objectives.	Pass				
M1.9	The fishery management plan outlines the roles and responsibilities of the different fishery management and partner organisations.	Pass				

M2 Institutions and stakeholder engagement					
	Assessment Criteria	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
M 2.1	The organisation identified in the initial screening has an effective management framework in place.	Pass			
M 2.2	The management decision-making is based on the best scientific evidence available.	Pass			
M 2.3	There is an organisation charged with the identification, management and conservation of ETPs with jurisdiction over the fishery.	Pass			
M 2.4	There is an organisation responsible for the conservation and protection of fishery habitats.	Pass			
M 2.5	The fishery has some form of governance arrangements in place that can be used to coordinate management between the government organisation and key stakeholders of the fishery.	Pass			
M 2.6	There is a consultation process through which fishery stakeholders are engaged in all aspects of planning and decision-making.	Pass			
M 2.7	The decision-making process is transparent, with processes and results publicly available.	Pass			

M3 Monitoring, control and surveillance					
	Assessment Criteria	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
M 3.1	The MCS organisation identified in the initial screening provides effective compliance and enforcement mechanisms that ensure management measures are complied with.	Pass			
M 3.2	There are adequate sanctions for illegal activities that can be applied when rules and regulations are broken.	Pass			
M 3.3	There is no substantial evidence of widespread non-compliance in the fishery, and no substantial evidence of illegal, unreported and regulated (IUU) fishing.	Pass			
M 3.4	Surveillance is conducted through a regime that includes a range of activities, for example, at-sea and portside inspections, observer programmes and VMS, as appropriate.	Pass			
M 3.5	Stakeholders in the fishery are aware of, and understand, the laws and regulations.	Gap (NEW) : No clear evidence was made available to the assessment team to suggest that awareness rising activities to stakeholder have been conducted.			

2a. Catch						
Part A: Total aggregate catch						
A1: Management objectives and reference points						
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	
A1	The fishery has not developed any objectives or target reference points to ensure that the total multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the multi-species maximum sustainable yield (MMSY) as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors. (0)	Pass				
	The fishery has formally adopted objectives and target reference points to ensure that the total multi-species assemblage multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the MMSY. (8)					
	The fishery has formally adopted objectives and target reference points to ensure that the total multi-species assemblage multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the MMSY. (17)					
A2. Data and information						
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	
A2	The fishery does not monitor any indicators relating to total catch nor collect sufficient data and information to assess the current status of the resources (0)	pass				
	The fishery monitors indicators relating to total catch with a low degree of certainty and frequency and collects some information that could be used to estimate the status of the fishery resources through proxies. (8)					
	The fishery monitors indicators relating to total catch with a high degree of certainty and frequency and also collects sufficient data and information to formally assess the current status of the fishery resources (17)					

A3. Fishery resource assessment					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
A3	There is no recent or reliable assessment of the status of the fishery resource. (0)	pass			
	The status of the fishery resource is based on indirect evidence from indicators or proxies of stock status. (8)				
	The fishery resource status has been recently assessed using a scientifically defensible methodology. (17)				
A4. Status of fishery resources					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
A4	The status of the fishery resource with respect to the TRP is unknown. (0)	There is no estimation of the fishery resource, only the trend of fishing effort and catch statistics are present.	1) identify the problems obstructing the assessment of the resource. 2) Establish a guideline for assessing current status of the resource.	DoF	3-5 years
	The status of the fishery resource with respect to the TRP is known with a low level of certainty, and is based on proxies. (8)				
	The fishery status with respect to the TRP is known with a high level of certainty. (17)				
A5. Management measures and their compliance					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
A5	There are no management measures in place to control total catch. (0)	Problems with non-compliance.	The problem of non-compliance will be seriously taken into account because it is a key factor of successful management. Given the fact that the rules developed with cooperation, particularly, of the fishers will actually induce a voluntary compliance behavior, management tactics would be based on cooperative decision making. The following tasks need to be considered; (1) evaluate the current fishing measures whether they are practical for the fishers and the willingness of the fishers in following the rules. (2) evaluate whether there are problems potentially impede the implementation and enforcement. (3) Open for all parties, especially the fishers, to get in vole in decision making process/other processes of the management.	DoF	3-5 years
	There are management measures in place to control total catch, but they are poorly complied with. (8)				
	There are management measures in place to control total catch, which are complied with to a high level. (17)				

A6. Management performance						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
A6		The fishery has failed to achieve the objectives it has set in relation to the aggregate catch OR there are no such objectives. (0)	(ongoing process of filling the gap)	In progress, will evaluate the performance later.	DoF	To be Discussed
		The fishery is making progress to meeting the objectives it has set in relation to the aggregate catch. (8)				
		The fishery has achieved the objectives it has set in relation to the aggregate catch. (17)				
Part B: High-risk species/species groups						
B1: Management objectives and references points						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
B1		The fishery has not identified high-risk species/species groups and has not developed any objectives or limit reference points to ensure that these species or groups of species are not being pushed past their PRI. (0)	The identification of high high-risk species/species groups has not formally and systematically organized. More attention has been pressed only on economic species.	For identifying high-risk species/species groups, attention should be on health and vulnerability of the stocks as well as their economic value. The following actions will be taken into account; 1) criteria corresponding risk level should be based on status/health and vulnerability for all species/ at least main species--not only for economic species. 2) evaluate whether the limit reference point is plausible for all species. (Fish stocks with different demographic characters, e.g. vulnerability, and status/health normally respond to fishing pressure and regulation differently. It may be inappropriate to impose the same LRP for all).	DoF	3-5 years
		The fishery has identified high-risk species/species groups with a low degree of certainty and the fishery has informally adopted objectives and limit reference points for only some species or groups of species.(8)				
		The fishery has identified high-risk species/species groups with a high degree of certainty and the fishery has formally adopted objectives and limit reference points for all of these species or groups of species. (17)				

B2. Data and information						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	B2	Monitoring does not include indicators that can be used for evaluating management performance or conducting stock assessments for high-risk species/species groups.(0)	The identification of high-risk species/species groups has neither formally nor well organized, with many species have been left out.	1) revise and consider assessing individually the status of all/as many high-risk stocks as possible. 2) Systematically identify high-risk species (e.g. assign risk level and rank them by level of risk. 3) using the information in 1) & 2) to decide what the indicators should be and how to set them	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	3-5 years
		Monitoring includes some indicators that can be used for evaluating management performance or stock assessments for some high-risk species/species groups.(8)				
		Monitoring includes indicators that can be used for evaluating management performance and conducting stock assessments for all high-risk species/species groups.(17)				
B3. Assessment of high-risk species/species groups						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	B3	There is no or unreliable assessment of the status of high-risk species/species groups.(0)	Despite the identification of high risk species, the stock assessment was selectively done only on those economic species instead of level of risk. The status for these species were assessed based on different aims and needs--the tasks were done by many agencies in many occasions and with different purpose.	Take the same actions as in B2. In addition, specify the species with the highest risk and set as the priority for identifying appropriate catch rate/fishing measures (The impact of doing so need to be assessed). Set up a system for assessment so as to have the same standard for all species/fishing operation.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	1 year (data is available)/3-5 years (more data and information are in need.)
		The status of the high-risk species/species group has been recently assessed based on indirect evidence from indicators or proxies of stock status.(8)				
		The status of high-risk species has been recently assessed using a scientifically defensible methodology.(17)				

B4. Status of high-risk species/species groups.					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
B4	The status of high-risk species/species groups with respect to the LRP is unknown. (0)	High- risk species have not been identified formally and systematically. Status of high-risk species has not been assessed. In addition, the LRP have not been clearly identified and was not strongly imposed.	Take the same actions as in B2. Specify LRP, including the rationale for the specification (need to be more specific and clear whether the RP could possibly applied across the range of species, or specific to particular species).	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	1 year (data is available)/3-5 years (more data and information are in need.)
	The status of the high-risk species/species groups with respect to the LRP is known with a low level of certainty.(8)				
	The fishery status with high-risk species/species groups with respect to the LRP is known with a high level of certainty.(17)				
B5. Management measures, and their compliance					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
B5	There are no management measures in place aimed at preventing high-risk species/species groups falling below the PRI.(0)	1) Management performance for the given measures has never been evaluated. 2) The management measures are too general, not specific to the high-risk species.	1) Evaluate the management performance to see if appropriate and more effective measures are needed. Also, TAE and catch of juveniles may need to be adjusted. (See Detail in part C) 2) Need management measures that specifically focus/target on the high-risk species. Note: The problem might be the fact that there is no management objective dedicated to the high-risk species, as mentioned in B6	DoF	6 months
	There are some management measures in place aimed at preventing specific species or groups of species, falling below the PRI.(8)				
	There are management measures in place which could reasonably be believed to be capable of achieving the objectives relating to high-risk species/species groups.(17)				
B6. Management performance					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
B6	The fishery has failed to achieve the objectives it has set in relation to high-risk species/species groups OR there are no such objectives. (0)	No management objective for protecting the high -risk species.	Using the results from B2, B3, and B4 to validate appropriate objectives and measures for protecting and conserving the high-risk species.	DoF	6 months
	The fishery is making progress to meeting the objectives it has set in relation to high-risk species/species groups. (8)				
	The fishery has achieved all of the objectives it has set in relation to high-risk species/species groups. (17)				

2b. Endangered, threatened and protected species (ETPs)						
T1. Interactions with ETPs are known						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	T1	There are no observations or records pertaining to ETPs interaction with the fishery. (0)	There are regulations for the interactions with ETP. The data on ETPs, which mostly are bycatches, has been routinely collected. However, death of the ETPs caused by fishing net debris/abandoned gears and marine debris has not been monitored routinely and systematically.	1) Make a monitoring routine for collecting the data on abandoned/discard fishing gears and marine debris and the death of ETPs caused by the debris. 2) Initiate a campaign encouraging public awareness of reducing marine debris--if needed (This kind of campaign may have already been run by some organizations).	DoF	3-6 months for setting up, but the monitoring is a long term activity.
		There are ad hoc observations or records of interactions with ETPs. (16)				
		There are reliable and regular records of ETP interactions. (33)				
T2: Interaction effects						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	T2	It is unknown whether the fishery has a significant negative effect on ETPs. (0)	No concrete scientific investigation on the impact of the fisheries on ETPs.	Need a study to confirm there is no negative effect of the fisheries on the ETPs. The data and information from the action in T1. can be used for the study. Note: the results from the study of impacts of fisheries on habitat could plausibly serve this action plan.	DoF	2-3 years
		There is some evidence to show that the fishery has no negative effect on ETPs (16)				
		There substantial evidence to show that fishery has no negative effect on ETPs. (33)				
T3. Management measures and their compliance						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	T3	If the fishery is known to interact with ETP species and: There are no strategies or measures in place to minimise mortality of ETPs. (0)	Problem with non-compliance.	1) investigate/identify the causes of the non-compliance. 2) consult to all parties to solve the problems and develop legitimate regulations.	DoF	To be Discussed
		There are some strategies and measures in place to protect ETP species, and to mitigate the impacts of the fishery on ETP species, but they are not being complied with. (16)				
		There are comprehensive strategies and measures in place to protect ETPs, and mitigate the impacts of the fishery on ETPs, which are being complied with. (33)				

2c. Habitats					
H1. Habitat consideration					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
H1	There is no consideration of potential habitat interactions in the management of the fishery. (0)	The issue of habitat is mostly focused on restoration rather than on impact of the fishing. Consequently, there is very limited information and study to suggest the potential impact of the fishery on the habitat.	1) address the important of healthy habitat; 2) Address the potential of the impact of fishing on habitat well-being; 3) incorporate the issue of the impact of fishery on habitat into fishery management plan.	DoF	3 months
	There some consideration of potential habitat interactions in the management of the fishery. (16)				
	There full consideration of potential habitat interactions in the management of the fishery. (33)				
H2. Impacts of the fishery on critical habitats					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
H2	There is no information on the impacts of the fishery on the critical habitats it encounters. (0)	Limited data and information of the impact of the fisheries on critical habitat.	There is ongoing research project of the impact of the fishery on the critical habitat. Note: Based upon an understanding, "critical habitat" refers to an important habitat, not a habitat with critically unhealthy conditions.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed
	There is limited information collected on the impacts of the fishery on the main critical habitats. (10)				
	There is comprehensive information collected on the impacts of the fishery on main and critical habitats. (20)				
H3. Management measures					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
H3	If the fishery is known to interact with physical habitats AND: There are no measures in place to minimise and mitigate negative impacts. (0)	- Problem with non-compliance.	1) investigate/identify the causes for non-compliance; 2) consult to all parties to solve the problems and develop legitimate regulations. 3) Use the results from the study of H2 to suggest a proper management plan and develop legitimate regulations.	DoF	To be Discussed
	There are some measures in place to minimise and mitigate negative impacts, but they are not complied with. (16)				
	There are comprehensive measures in place to minimise and mitigate negative impacts that are fully complied with. (33)				

2d. Ecosystems						
E1. Ecosystem consideration						
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	
E1	The impact of the fishery on the broader ecosystem within which the fishery occurs is not considered in management. (0)	The impact of the fishery on the ecosystem has centered limitedly to the ideas of maintaining and restoring ecosystem balance and biodiversity. Other aspects of ecology, which are crucial to ecosystem-based fisheries management, such as interactions, ecosystem processes, and ecosystem service, have gained less attention.	The DoF has committed to implement ecosystem-based fisheries management. Many steps of the management are currently in progress. Also, there is ongoing research on the impact of the fishery on the ecosystem. Accordingly, more ecosystem information and aspects will be incorporated into the management.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	3-5 years	
	The impact of the fishery on the broader ecosystem within which the fishery occurs is considered in a superficial way in management. (12)					
	The impact of the fishery on the broader ecosystem within which the fishery occurs is considered fully in management. (25)					
E2. Impacts on the ecosystem						
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	
E2	There is no or inadequate information on the impacts of the fishery on the ecosystem. (0)	There is no clear evidence of applying ecological concepts to deal with impact of the fisheries on ecosystem. Rather, the idea of ecology has been addressed as an expectation of healthy ecosystems resulted from the management aiming at conserving, reserving, and preventing the extinction of aquatic resources as well as sustaining fisheries resources.	1) Identify key ecological species. 2) Investigate the impact of the fishery on the species in 1)	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	3-5 years	
	There is limited information on impact on the ecosystem, especially with respect to key ecological species. (12)					
	The impact on the ecosystem is well known, especially with respect to key ecological species. (25)					
E3. Management measures and strategies						
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	
E3	There are no measures in place for the management and conservation of ecosystem structure and function. (0)	The focus and concern of the management are mostly on ecosystem structure, not on function/or other aspects.	The studies on the impact of ecosystem, which are in progress, expectedly will provide more understanding about the ecosystem. Subsequently, the management strategies and tactics could be potentially developed to serve the management and conservation of ecosystem structure and function.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed	
	There are some plans/strategies and measures in place for the management and conservation of ecosystem structure and function. (12)					
	There is a comprehensive set of plans/strategies and measures in place for the management and conservation of ecosystem structure and function. (25)					

E4. Impacts on key ecological elements					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
E4	If the impact on any key ecological species is unacceptable AND: No additional precaution is included in recommendations relating to the total permissible fishery removals and no target management measures are in place. (0)	There is no protective fishing measure to deal with the key ecological species impacted by the fishery.	1) Identify key ecological species; 2) Investigate the impact on the identified spp.; 3) Use the information from 1) and 2) to develop appropriate protective fishing measures, regarding to permitted removals.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed
	Some additional precaution is included in recommendations relating to the total permissible fishery removals and some target management measures are in place. (12)				
	Comprehensive additional precaution is included in recommendations relating to the total permissible fishery removals and target management measures are in place. (25)				
Part C: to Section 2a: Catch					
C1: Management objectives and references points (MMSY)					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
C1	The fishery has not developed any objectives or target reference points for the reduction component to ensure that this multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the TRP (e.g. multi-species maximum sustainable yield (e.g. MMSYc) as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors). (0)	No objectives/TRPs for reduction component ensuring sustainability and production for the TRP of the multi-species assemblage.	To ensure sustainability of the multi-species assemblage, information on status/well-being of individual stock/mixed stock is needed. However, the first step is to clearly define the reduction components. Secondly, the current status of the reduction components and MMSY will be assessed. Considerably, status of individual sp. may need to be assessed (see the note below). Given the information from the first and second steps, objectives/TRP could be developed regarding to the sustainability.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	3-5 years
	The fishery has informally adopted objectives and target reference points to ensure that the component's multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the TRP (e.g. MMSYc). (7)				
	The fishery has formally adopted objectives and target reference points to ensure that the component's multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the MMSY. (14)				

C2: Management objectives and references points (juvenile catch)						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	C2	The fishery has not developed any objectives or target reference points for the catch of juvenile commercial fish in the reduction component to ensure that the catch of juveniles is having a minimal impact on the commercial species. (0)	Uncertainty in the target due to shifting the baseline	Update the TRP of juvenile commercial fish from the catch. See the details in C3.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed
		The fishery has informally adopted objectives and target reference points for the catch of juvenile commercial fish in the reduction component to ensure that the catch of juveniles is having a minimal impact on the commercial species.(7)				
		The fishery has formally adopted objectives and target reference points for the catch of juvenile commercial fish in reduction component to ensure that the catch of juveniles is having a minimal impact on the commercial species. (14)				
C3. Data and information						
		Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
	C3	The fishery does not monitor any indicators relating to catch of the reduction component nor collect sufficient data and information to assess the current status of the reduction component, nor any data on the catch and impacts of juvenile commercial fish. (0)	No reliable system of monitoring and data collection. Consequently, there are no assessments for either current status of the reduction component or the catch as well as the impact of the juvenile.	1) Need to specify scope/criteria and reference points for the mix species. also, see the note in FAP comments in C1. 2) Subsequently, set up monitoring and data collection symmetrically. 3) when the system is all set, the assessments could be done as needed. **Note: The ongoing research would potentially provide scientific information, which is up to date that can be useful in setting up the monitoring indicator for the catch of the reduction component and the impact of juvenile commercial	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed
		The fishery monitors indicators relating to the catch of the reduction component with a low degree of certainty and frequency and collects some information that could be used to estimate the status of the reduction component through proxies and the catch and impact of juvenile commercial fish. (7)				
		The fishery monitors indicators relating to total catch with a high degree of certainty and frequency and also collects sufficient data and information to formally assess the current status of the reduction component and the catch and impact of juvenile commercial fish. (14)				

C4. Fishery resource assessment					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
C4	There is no recent or reliable assessment of the status of the fishery resource of the reduction component and no estimates of juvenile commercial fish. (0)	No formal assessment of reduction component on the status, catch and impact on the juveniles, and MMSY.	see the note in FAP of C1 and FAP of C3	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed
	The status of the fishery resource in the reduction component is based on indirect evidence from indicators or proxies of stock status and there is limited assessment on the catch and impact of juvenile commercial fish. (7)				
	The fishery resource status has been recently assessed using a scientifically defensible methodology and the catch of juvenile commercial fish is known with a fair degree of accuracy (14)				
C5. Status of fishery resource					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
C5	The status of the fishery resource with respect to the TRP is unknown and the impact of the juvenile catch is unknown. (0)	The information about the status of the resources, including the juvenile are known with low level of uncertainty.	see note and FAPs of C1 and C3	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	To be Discussed
	The status of the fishery resource with respect to the TRP is known with a low level of certainty, and is based on proxies. The impact of the juvenile catch is known with a low degree of certainty. (7)				
	The fishery status with respect to the TRP and the impact of the juvenile catch is known with a high level of certainty. (14)				
C6. Management measures and their compliance					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
C6	There are no management measures in place to control the catch of the reduction component nor the amount of juvenile commercial fish taken. (0)	Management measures are not effective	The ineffective measures particularly concern on the amount of catch rather than groups of individual need to be protected. Therefore, protective measures for the reduction component and the juveniles need to be taken into account. First, the current measures need to be evaluated so as to suggest the causes of the ineffectiveness. Subsequently, an effort to impose more protective measures will be considered, such as closing area and season.	DoF and TSFR (Through ARDA Research Project)	5 years
	There are management measures in place to control the catch of the reduction component and the amount of juvenile commercial fish taken, but are not effective. (7)				
	There are management measures in place to control the catch of the reduction component and the amount of juvenile commercial fish taken, which are very effective. (14)				

C7. Management performance					
	Assessment Criteria and score level	GAP (from assessment)	FAP action	Responsible Unit	Timeline
C7	The fishery has failed to achieve the objectives it has set in relation to the reduction component OR there are no such objectives. (0)		on going process. Will be updated.	DoF	3 years
	The fishery is making progress to meeting the objectives it has set in relation to the reduction component. (7)				
	The fishery has achieved the objectives it has set in relation to the reduction component. (14)				

