MULTISPECIES FISHERY ASSESSMENT REPORT

Draft Document – Version 2.1 – Issued October 2022

Fishery/Unit of assessment (UoA)	
Date	
Assessor	

Application details and summary of the assessment outcome	
Name:	
Address:	
Country:	**Postal code:**
Telephone:	**Fax:**
Email address:	**Applicant code:**
Assessment details	
Name of assessment body:	
Assessor name:	**Peer reviewer:**
Assessment days:	**Initial/Surveillance/Reapproval:**
Scope details	
Management authority (country/state):	
Main species:	
Fishery location:	
Gear type(s):	

Assessment process

The report shall have a summary of the assessment process based on the topics below, referencing electronic or other documents used:

- Particulars of the recognised groups with interests in the UoA
- Details of consultations leading to the formulation of the Fishery Action Plan (FAP)
- Arrangements for on-going consultations with interest groups
- Details of the decision-making process or processes, including the recognised participants
- Details of any planned education and training for interest groups

Summary of Section 1 results

General clause	Outcome (Pass/Gap)
M1 – Legislation, policy and plans	
M2 – Institutions and stakeholder engagement	
M3 – Monitoring, control and surveillance	

Summary of Section 2 fishery risk ratings

	Very low (0-20)	Low (21-40)	Moderate (41-60)	High (61-80)	Very high (81-100)
Catch – Part A					
Catch – Part B					
ETPs*					
Habitats					
Ecosystems					

*ETP = endangered, threatened and protected species

Characteristics of the fishery

The UoA needs an introductory overview (3-4 pages) to the fishery that provides context to the assessment. This should be completed by the assessor based on a checklist of input from the applicant and must include referencing documents used (electronic or other):

1. **Area of operation of the UoA and jurisdiction under which it falls**
2. **History of the fishery and its past management**
3. **Data availability**
4. **Catch and fleet profiles**
5. **Fishing areas and seasons**
6. **Gears and operation of the fishery**
7. **Supply chain for fishmeal/oil**
8. **Objectives for the fishery (referring to any or all of the following if relevant):**
    a. **Resources**
    b. **Environmental**
    c. **Biodiversity and ecosystem**
    d. **Social**
    e. **Economic**
9. **Current status of the fishery resources, ETPs, habitats and the ecosystem**
10. **Current management arrangements and measures, including details of those individuals or groups granted rights of access to the fishery and particulars of the nature of those rights**
11. **Arrangements and responsibilities for monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) and enforcement**
12. **Arrangements for monitoring and evaluation of management performance, including reporting requirements**

Section 1 – Management/governance framework

This section considers the legislation, policy and planning (M1); management frameworks (M2); and monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms (M3) in place in the fishery. The Fishery Action Plan (FAP) should include improvements which work towards meeting all of the requirements in this section.

M1	**Legislation, policy and plans**		
	M1.1	The fishery is covered by modern comprehensive legislation that includes primary legislation (law and acts) and subsidiary legislation (rules and regulations).	Pass/Gap
	M1.2	The legislation is based on relevant international law, instruments and standards.	Pass/Gap
	M1.3	The legislation and/or overarching policy documents outline the overall policy goals for the fishery (ecological, social and economic)	Pass/Gap
	M1.4	The legislation legally empowers the responsible organisations to manage the fishery, including undertaking monitoring, control and surveillance and implementing management actions.	Pass/Gap
	M1.5	The policies and plans publicly commit the fisheries management organisations to sustainable development of the fishery.	Pass/Gap
	M1.6	The legislation and national policies include arrangements for stakeholder engagement and consultation.	Pass/Gap
	M1.7	The fishery has an up-to-date fisheries management plan (or is 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 development.	Pass/Gap
	M1.8	The fishery management plan specifies goals and operational objectives.	Pass/Gap
	M1.9	The fishery management plan outlines the roles and responsibilities of the different fishery management and partner organisations.	Pass/Gap
M1 outcome:			Passes and Gaps

M2	Institutions and stakeholder engagement		
	M2.1	The organisation identified in the initial screening has an effective management framework in place.	Pass/Gap
	M2.2	The management decision-making is based on the best scientific evidence available.	Pass/Gap
	M2.3	There is an organisation charged with the identification, management and conservation of ETPs with jurisdiction over the fishery.	Pass/Gap
	M2.4	There is an organisation responsible for the conservation and protection of fishery habitats.	Pass/Gap
	M2.5	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/Gap
	M2.6	There is a consultation process through which fishery stakeholders are engaged in all aspects of planning and decision-making.	Pass/Gap
	M2.7	The decision-making process is transparent, with processes and results publicly available.	Pass/Gap
M2 outcome:			Passes and Gaps

M3	Monitoring, control and surveillance		
	M3.1	The MCS organisation identified in the initial screening provides effective compliance and enforcement mechanisms that ensure management measures are complied with.	Pass/Gap
	M3.2	There are adequate sanctions for illegal activities that can be applied when rules and regulations are broken.	Pass/Gap
	M3.3	There is no substantial evidence of widespread non-compliance in the fishery, and no substantial evidence of illegal, unreported and regulated (IUU) fishing.	Pass/Gap
	M3.4	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/Gap
	M3.5	Stakeholders in the fishery are aware of, and understand, the laws and regulations.	Pass/Gap
M3 outcome:			Passes and Gaps

Section 2 – Fishery risk ratings: Catch, ETPs, habitats and ecosystem

Section 2a: Catch

The first of the four Fishery Risk Ratings relates to the species caught in the fishery and is named 'catch'. This represents the risk posed by the fishery to the populations of the stocks it exploits, including discards, and particularly the risk of overfishing. Mitigation measures involve understanding the effects of the fishery on the fished species, determining appropriate levels of catch, restricting the total fishing effort, and others. The most effective way to reduce the risk posed by the fishery is to reduce total effort and/or fishing mortality, and this is reflected in the potential mitigation scores.

The catch of the multi-species fishery is divided into three parts:

Part A: Total aggregate catch – based on a target reference point (TRP) e.g. multi-species maximum sustainable yield (MMSY).

Part B: High-risk species/species groups – based on a limit reference point (LRP) e.g. Point of recruitment impairment (PRI). Note: These species or groups of species do not include ETPs that are assessed separately below.

Part C: The reduction component of the catch – based ensuring that the catch of this component is restored to or maintained at a safe biological level and indices of juvenile catches. This component is often called 'low value/trash fish' and is the source of the material used to manufacture fish meal/oil.

Part A: Total aggregate catch

Part A: Total Mitigation Value	
Part A: Catch Risk Value (100 minus mitigation value)	
Part A: Catch Risk Rating	

A1: Management objectives and references points	
	Mitigation Score
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 TRP (e.g. multi-species maximum sustainable yield (MMSY) as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors).	0
The fishery has informally adopted objectives and target reference points to ensure that the total multi-species assemblage is maintained or restored to levels capable of producing the TRP.	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 TRP.	17

A2. Data and information	
	Mitigation Score
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
The fishery monitors indicators relating to total catch with a low degree of precision and regularity 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 precision and frequency and collects sufficient data and information to formally assess the current status of the fishery resources.	17

A3. Fishery resource assessment	
	Mitigation Score
There is no recent or reliable assessment of the status of the fishery resource.	0
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 sound methodology.	17

A4: Status of the fishery resource	
	Mitigation Score
The current status of the fishery resource with respect to a target reference point is unknown.	0
The current status of the fishery resource with respect to a target reference point is known with a low level of certainty and is based on proxies.	8
The current fishery status with respect to a target reference point is known with a high level of certainty.	17

A5. Management measures and their effectiveness	
	Mitigation Score
There are no management measures in place to control total catch.	0
There are management measures in place to control total catch, but they are not effective.	8
There are management measures in place to control total catch, which are effective.	17

A6. Management performance	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery has failed to achieve the objectives it has set in relation to the aggregate catch OR there are no such objectives.	0
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

Click on the spreadsheet icon below and save a copy on your computer with your file name. Fill in the data and scores for the species/species groups of interest. The spreadsheet will automatically calculate the PSA score based on the productivity/susceptibility scores.

Part B Total Mitigation Value	
Part B: Catch Risk Value (100 minus mitigation value)	
Part B: Catch Risk Rating	

B1: Management objectives and references points	
	Mitigation Score
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 fishery has identified some high-risk species/species groups and the fishery has informally adopted objectives and limit reference points for these species or groups of species.	8
The fishery has identified most of the high-risk species/species groups and the fishery has formally adopted objectives and limit reference points for all these species or groups of species.	17

B2. Data and information	
	Mitigation Score
Monitoring does not include indicators that can be used for evaluating management performance or conducting stock assessments for high-risk species/species groups.	0
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	
	Mitigation Score
There is no or unreliable assessment of the status of high-risk species/species groups.	0
The status of high-risk species/species groups 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 sound methodology.	17

B4. Status of high-risk species/species groups.	
	Mitigation Score
The status of high-risk species/species groups with respect to the limit reference point is unknown.	0
The status of the high-risk species/species groups with respect to the limit reference point is known with a low level of certainty.	8
The fishery status with high-risk species/species groups with respect to the limit reference point is known with a high level of certainty.	17

B5. Management measures, and their effectiveness	
	Mitigation Score
There are no management measures in place aimed at preventing high-risk species/species groups falling below the PRI.	0
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 that are capable of achieving the objectives relating to high-risk species/species groups.	17

B6. Management performance	
	Mitigation Score
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
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 the objectives it has set in relation to high-risk species/species groups.	17

Part C: Reduction component of the catch

Part C of the catch criteria, looks at the component of the UoA fishery that supplies raw material that is reduced to fish meal/oil.

Mitigating measures include ensuring that the catch of the component is sustainable when the total UoA is fished to a defined TRP, and minimizing the catch of juvenile fish of higher-value species.

Part C: Total Mitigation Value	
Part C: Catch Risk Value (100 minus mitigation value)	
Part C: Catch Risk Rating	

C1: Management objectives (catch of the reduction component)	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery has not developed any objectives for the total catch (see Part A) or for the reduction component of the catch to ensure that the reduction component of the catch is maintained at levels capable of producing less than the TRP (e.g. multi-species maximum sustainable yield (MMSY) of the reduction component as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors).	0
The fishery has developed objectives for the total catch (see part A) but NOT for the reduction component of the catch that indirectly results levels capable of producing less than the TRP (e.g. MMSY) of the reduction component as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors).	6
The fishery has developed objectives for the total catch (see part A) AND for the reduction component of the catch that indirectly results levels capable of producing less than the TRP (e.g. MMSY) of the reduction component as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors).	11

C2: Management objectives (juvenile catch)	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery has not developed any objectives relating to the catch of juvenile higher-value fish in the reduction component to ensure that the catch is having a minimal impact on total fish resource of the UoA.	0
The fishery has informally adopted objectives for the catch of juvenile higher-value fish in the reduction component to ensure that the catch is having a minimal impact on total fish resource of the UoA.	6
The fishery has formally adopted objectives for the catch of juvenile higher-value fish in the reduction component to ensure that the catch of juveniles is having a minimal impact on total fish resource of the UoA.	11

C3. Data and information (reduction component catch)	
	Mitigation Score
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.	0
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.	6
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.	11

C4. Data and information (juvenile catch)	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery does not monitor any data on the catch of juvenile higher-value fish in the rection component.	0
The fishery monitors indicators relating to the catch of juvenile higher-value fish with a low degree of certainty and frequency.	6
The fishery regularly monitors the catch of juvenile higher-value fish with a degree of certainty.	11

C5. Assessment and status of the resource (reduction component)	
	Mitigation Score
There is no recent or reliable assessment of the status of the fish resources in the reduction component of the catch.	0
The status of the fishery resource in the reduction component is based on indirect evidence from indicators or proxies of stock status.	6
The fishery resource status has been recently assessed using a scientifically sound methodology.	11

C6. Assessment and status of the resource (juvenile catch)	
	Mitigation Score
There has been no consideration of the possible impact of the catch of juvenile higher-value fish on the status of the fishery resource of the total UoA.	0
There has been consideration of the possible impact of the catch juvenile higher-value fish, but no assessment has been made.	6
The impact of the catch of juvenile higher-value fish on the fishery resources in the UoA is known with a fair degree of accuracy.	11

C7. Management measures and their effectiveness	
	Mitigation Score
There are no management measures in place to control the catch of the reduction component nor the amount of juvenile higher-value fish taken.	0
There are management measures in place to control the catch of the reduction component and the amount of juvenile higher-value fish taken but are not effective.	6
There are management measures in place to control the catch of the reduction component and the amount of juvenile higher-value fish taken, which are effective.	11

C8. Management performance (reduction component)	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery has failed to achieve the objectives it has set in relation to the reduction component OR there are no such objectives.	0
The fishery is making progress to meeting the objectives it has set in relation to the reduction component of the catch.	6
The fishery has achieved the objectives it has set in relation to the reduction component of the catch.	11

C9. Management performance (juvenile catch)	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery has failed to achieve the objectives it has set in relation to juvenile catch OR there are no such objectives.	0
The fishery is making progress to meeting the objectives it has set in relation to the juvenile catch.	6
The fishery has achieved the objectives it has set in relation to the juvenile catch	11

Section 2b: Endangered, threatened and protected species groups

The second of the four Fishery Risk Ratings relates to the impacts of the fishery on ETP species.

ETPs, as defined by MarinTrust are Endangered, Threatened and Protected (ETP) species, are defined for the purposes of the MarinTrust assessment as those which either:

- are categorised by the IUCN as Endangered or Critically Endangered; or
- appear in the CITES appendices.

Species listed in national (state/province/local) legislation as being depleted, or at increased risk of extinction and usually subject to conservation measures, are also considered as ETPs.

Mitigation measures include monitoring and understanding the effects of the fishery on ETP species, minimising interactions, and mitigating other potential impacts.

Total ETP Mitigation Value	
ETP Risk Value (100 minus mitigation value)	
ETP Risk Rating	

T1. ETPs are known	
	Mitigation Score
There is no list of ETPs and fishers are unaware of the existence of ETPs.	0
Some ETPs have been listed and fishers are familiar with these.	12
A full list of ETPs has been formally adopted and fishers are familiar with all these ETPs.	25

T2. Interactions with ETPs are known	
	Mitigation Score
There are no observations or records pertaining to ETPs interaction with the fishery.	0
There are ad hoc observations or records of interactions with ETPs.	12
There are reliable and regular records of ETP interactions.	25

T3: Interaction effects	
	Mitigation Score
It is unknown whether the fishery has a significant negative effect on ETPs.	0
There is some evidence to show that the fishery has no negative effect on ETPs	12
There is substantial evidence to show that fishery has no negative effect on ETPs.	25

T4. Management measures and their effectiveness	
	Mitigation Score
The fishery is known to interact with ETPs AND:	
There are no strategies or measures in place to minimise mortality of ETPs.	0
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 effective.	12
There are comprehensive strategies and measures in place to protect ETP species, and mitigate the impacts of the fishery on ETPs, which are effective.	25

Section 2c: Habitats

The third of the four Fishery Risk Ratings relates to the impacts of the fishery on critical habitats.

A critical habitat is one that is essential to maintaining the integrity of an ecosystem, species or assemblages of species. For a species, it is the habitat that is important for the spawning and survival of juvenile fish, which if degraded, results in a decline the abundance of fish (in a tropical system these are usually mangroves, seagrasses and coral reefs).

Mitigation measures include monitoring and understanding the effects of the fishery on critical habitats, protecting critical habitats, and mitigating other potential impacts.

Total Habitats Mitigation Value	
Habitats Risk Value (100 minus mitigation value)	
Habitats Risk Rating	

H1. Habitat consideration	
	Mitigation Score
There is no consideration of potential critical habitat interactions in the management of the fishery.	0
There is some consideration of potential critical habitat interactions in the management of the fishery.	16
There is full consideration of potential critical habitat interactions in the management of the fishery.	33

H2. Information on the impact on critical habitats	
	Mitigation Score
There is no information on the impacts of the fishery on the critical habitats it encounters.	0
There is limited information collected on the impacts of the fishery on the main critical habitats.	16
There is comprehensive information collected on the impacts of the fishery on main and critical habitats.	33

H3. Management measures	
	Mitigation Score
If the fishery is known to interact with critical habitats AND:	
There are no measures in place to minimise and mitigate negative impacts.	0
There are some measures in place to minimise and mitigate negative impacts, but they are not effective.	16
There are comprehensive measures in place to minimise and mitigate negative impacts that are effective.	33

Section 2d: Ecosystems

The last of the four Fishery Risk Ratings relates to the impacts of the fishery on ecosystems. Mitigation measures include monitoring and understanding the effects of the fishery on ecosystems, protecting ecologically important species, and mitigating other potential impacts.

E1. Ecosystem consideration	
	Mitigation Score
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 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 structure and function	
	Mitigation Score
There is no information available on the ecosystem structure/biodiversity and function.	0
There is only ad-hoc information about the impact of the fishery on the ecosystem, especially with respect to structure/biodiversity and function.	12
The impact on the ecosystem is well known, especially with respect to structure/biodiversity and function.	25

E3. Impacts on key ecological species/keystone species	
	Mitigation Score
There is no data or information on key ecological species in the ecosystem.	0
There is limited data and information that indicates that there is either no key ecological species in the ecosystem or that the impact on the fishery on these is known with a low degree of certainty.	12
There is adequate data and information that indicates that there is either no key ecological species in the ecosystem or that that the impact on the fishery on these is known with a high degree of certainty.	25

E4. Management measures and strategies	
	Mitigation Score
There are no measures in place for the management and conservation of ecosystem structure and function.	0
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

Socio-economic criteria

In addition to the areas examined above, applicants to full MarinTrust approval must commit to ensuring that vessels operating in the fishery adhere to internationally recognised guidance on human rights. They must also commit to ensuring there is no use of enforced or unpaid labour in the fleet(s) operating upon the resource.

Improver Programme notes

In the current version of the MarinTrust RS fishery assessment, the social component is limited to a commitment from applicants. The extent to which this commitment is 'tested' is limited. However, applicants to the Improver Programme should be aware that this section will be under continuing development over the coming years, and additional social requirements are likely to be added before the end of any FIP process.

The overall goal of fisheries management is to maximise socio-economic benefits while minimising impacts on the fishery resources and the integrity, structure and functioning of the ecosystem. Because of this, a set of economic criteria is also being considered so that the costs (impacts on the fishery resources and ecosystem) can be balanced with socio-economic benefits.