

MSC 5-YR RE-EVALUATION
Western Australian Rock Lobster

DRAFT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND SCORING GUIDEPOSTS

27 September 2004

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

Principle 1	A fishery must be conducted in a manner that does not lead to over-fishing or depletion of the exploited populations and, for those populations that are depleted, the fishery must be conducted in a manner that demonstrably leads to their recovery.		
--------------------	--	--	--

1.1 (MSC Criterion 1)	The fishery shall be conducted at catch levels that continually maintain the high productivity of the target population(s) and associated ecological community relative to its potential productivity.		
------------------------------	---	--	--

1.1.1	There should be sufficient information on the target species and stock to allow the effects of the fishery on the stock to be evaluated.		
--------------	---	--	--

1.1.1.1	The identification and reporting of target species is well documented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is only a moderate degree of confidence in proper identification and reporting of the target species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a high degree of confidence in proper identification and reporting of the target species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a very high degree of confidence in proper identification and reporting of the target species.
---------	--	---	--	---

1.1.1.2	The life history of the species (including age at maturity, natural mortality, growth, and fecundity) is understood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are serious gaps in information but the basis of the life history is understood adequately to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The life history of the species is clearly documented and understood well enough to support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All aspects of the life history of the species are clearly documented and understood so as to support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery.
---------	--	--	---	--

1.1.1.3	The geographical range of the target stock is known.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An estimate of the geographical range of the target stock is available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reliable estimate of the geographic range of the target stock is available including seasonal patterns of movement/availability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The complete geographic range of the stock, including seasonal patterns of movement/availability, is reliably estimated.
---------	--	---	--	--

1.1.1.4	Information on reproductive output, and on recruitment and its relationship to parental stock is understood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are enough years of information available on indices of recruitment and parental spawning stock abundance to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimates of fecundity at size, growth rates, sexual maturity at size, and relationship of recruits to spawners are understood well enough to support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is comprehensive and reliable information on the fecundity at size, sex ratio, sexual maturity at size, and factors affecting recruitment, and these are monitored over time to detect trends and shifts and to support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery.
---------	--	---	---	--

1.1.1.5	Information is collected on the abundance/density of the stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Either fishery dependent or fishery independent indices are available on the abundance of the stock biomass for a number of years. Qualitative information exists on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishery dependent and/or fishery independent indices are available on the abundance of the stock for a number of years. Uncertainties in data and indices have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishery independent indices are available on the abundance and density of the stock over sufficient years to assess longer term trends. Indices are consistent and there is clear evidence that they are proportional to the stock size and of
---------	---	---	---	---

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
		the appropriateness of the indices as proportional indicators of stock size and to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> been analysed and accounted for. The indices are understood well enough to support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sufficient precision to support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. Uncertainties have been fully analyzed.
1.1.16	The size structure of catches is measured.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on the size structure of catches are known well enough to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on the size structure of catches in the main fishery are of adequate accuracy and measured for enough years to support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is comprehensive and reliable data on the size structure of all significant catches (including recreational catches) to support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery.
1.1.2		There should be sufficient information on the fishery to allow its effects on the target stock to be evaluated		
1.1.2.1	Fishery related mortality is recorded/ estimated (including landings, discards and incidental mortality).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient information is available to allow accurate estimates to be made of landings broken down as required for a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landings from commercial and recreational fishing are accurately estimated and monitored by area/zone to support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landings from commercial and recreational fishing are accurately estimated and monitored by area/zone to support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. Mortality caused by returning undersized fish to the water is well understood and accounted for.
1.1.2.2	Fishing effort is recorded, estimated, and standardized to effective fishing effort.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nominal effort data are available which can be used to estimate effective fishing effort well enough to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate estimates of effective fishing effort have been made and support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive records are kept of fishing effort, recorded at sub-annual intervals at an appropriate degree of spatial resolution and have been standardized to effective fishing effort and support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery.
1.1.2.3	Fishing methods and gear types are known throughout the fishery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main fishing methods and gear types are known for the fishery well enough to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main fishing methods and gear types are known and information is available on the geographical areas of use and support a high degree of confidence in evaluation of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All fishing methods and gear types employed in the fishery are known. In-situ observations are made of fishing practices. The information and observations support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
			fishery.	fishery.
1.1.2.4	Changes in selectivity are known and accounted for.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some information is available on selectivity and qualitative changes in selectivity, sufficient to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in fishing practices and regulations, and hence selectivity, are well estimated and are sufficient to support a high degree of confidence in evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is comprehensive information on changes in selectivity over time and space, sufficient to support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery.
1.1.2.5	Other fisheries in the area that are not subject to certification are identified and monitored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some information relating to other fisheries in the area that are not subject to certification, sufficient to identify significant impacts on the target species. Where necessary, impacts by these fisheries are accounted for in the stock assessments well enough to support a rudimentary evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any other fisheries impacting on the target species and not subject to certification are identified. Where significant mortalities of the target species from those fisheries occur, they are included in the stock assessments and support a high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All fisheries (and other sources of human-induced mortality) impacting on the target species in the area that are not subject to certification are identified, monitored, and included in the stock assessments and support a very high degree of confidence in the evaluation of the fishery.
1.1.3		Appropriate reference levels have been developed for stock abundance and/or fishing mortality rate.		
1.1.3.1	Limit and/or target reference points that are appropriate to the stock have been identified and applied.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit and/or target points have been chosen and are justified by general agreement among fishery scientists and managers that they are appropriate to achieve long term sustainability for the target stock. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit and target points are justified based on stock biology or exploitation history, and they are measurable given data and assessment limitations. There is no significant scientific opposition about those points outside the management agency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit and target points are justified based on stock biology, uncertainty, variability, data limitations and statistical simulations of these factors. There is no significant scientific opposition about those points outside the management agency. Limit and target points take account of ecological impacts and uncertainties associated with those impacts.
1.1.3.2	Reference points meet acceptable international standards (such as those determined by FAO).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference points recognise appropriate international standards and are being developed to meet these. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference points recognise, and are in line with, acceptable international standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference points meet or exceed international standards.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

1.1.4	There is a well-defined and effective harvest strategy to manage the target stock.		
--------------	---	--	--

1.1.4.1	There is a mechanism in place to contain harvest as required for management of the stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms exist to monitor and (if necessary) reduce harvest. Such mechanisms have not been tested, but nevertheless provide a moderate degree of confidence in the management of the stock. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms are in place to reduce harvest as and when required to maintain, or allow the target stock to return to, productive levels. These provide a high degree of confidence in the management of the stock. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms are in place to reduce harvest as and when required to maintain (or allow the target stock to return to) productive levels They provide a very high degree of confidence in the management of the stock. Measures to demonstrate effectiveness are in place.
---------	---	--	---	---

1.1.4.2	There are clear, tested and agreed decision rules set out for effective management of the stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It can be demonstrated that decision making, though not documented or agreed, is logical and appropriate. Rules have not been tested, but there is a moderate degree of confidence in their effectiveness for management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear decision making rules exist, are fully documented and formally agreed, but have not been fully tested. Decision rules are reconciled with reference points and with data and assessment limitations and there is a high degree of confidence in their effectiveness for management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear, documented, and tested decision rules are fully implemented and have been fully reconciled with reference points and there is a very high degree of confidence in their effectiveness for management. Data and assessment limitations have been periodically evaluated.
---------	--	--	--	---

1.1.4.3	There are appropriate management tools specified to implement decisions for management of the stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management tools exist to implement management decisions. Some evidence exists to show that these tools can be effective and there is a moderate degree of confidence in their effectiveness for management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management tools have been specified to implement management decisions. Evidence exists to show clearly that the tools support a high degree of confidence in their effective use for management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management tools have been specified to implement management decisions. Tools are responsive, relevant and timely. Performance of the tools has been evaluated and evidence exists to show clearly that tools achieve their objectives and support a very high degree of confidence in the effectiveness for management.
---------	--	---	--	---

1.1.4.4	Harvest strategies are precautionary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harvest rates respond appropriately to low stock size Uncertainties about stock status are documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harvest rates are reduced at low stock sizes Decision rules are explicitly precautionary (are more conservative as uncertainty about resource status increases) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The harvest strategy includes formal rules to achieve rapid recovery if stocks approach or fall below limit reference points Harvest rates are an explicit and inverse function of levels of uncertainty about stock size
---------	--------------------------------------	--	--	--

1.1.5	There is a robust assessment of stocks.		
--------------	--	--	--

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
1.1.5.1	Robust assessment methods are used to provide advice on stock status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A robust empirical approach to assessing stock status is adopted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust assessment models are used to assess stock status on an annual basis. Assessment models incorporate and integrate a variety of relevant information and data about the fishery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment models are used and capture all major features appropriate to the biology of the species and the nature of the fishery and the nature of the management questions being asked. The assessment models incorporate and integrate all relevant information and data about the fishery. They use statistically robust methods of fitting to the data, and deal explicitly with both process and measurement error.
1.1.5.2	The assessment takes sufficient account of major uncertainties in data (including evaluation of assumptions) to provide a robust assessment of the stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major uncertainties are identified. Some attempt has been made to evaluate these in the assessment. There is a moderate degree of confidence in the robustness of the assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment takes into account major uncertainties in the data and functional relationships. The most important assumptions have been evaluated, the consequences are known. There is a high degree of confidence in the robustness of the model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment addresses all significant uncertainties in the data and functional relationships and evaluates the assumptions in terms of scope, direction and bias relative to management-related quantities. There is a very high degree of confidence in the robustness of the model.
1.1.5.3	Uncertainties and assumptions are reflected in management advice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major uncertainties are recognised and are reported in management advice, as well as possible implications of those uncertainties on the management advice. There is a moderate degree of confidence in the adequacy of uncertainties addressed in the management advice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major uncertainties and assumptions are addressed in the management advice and through the appropriate decision rules to address those limitations. There is a high degree of confidence in the adequacy of uncertainties addressed in the management advice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All significant uncertainties and assumptions are addressed and reflected in the management advice, including appropriate decision rules. There is a very high degree of confidence in the adequacy of uncertainties addressed in the management advice.
1.1.5.4	The assessment evaluates current stock status relative to reference points.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stock status relative to reference points is assessed empirically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment model evaluates stock status relative to the reference points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment provides a robust measure of the probability of exceeding reference points.
1.1.5.5	The assessment includes a quantitative evaluation of the consequences of current harvest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment forecasts the consequences of current harvest strategies for the stock. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment includes a robust forecast of the consequences of current harvest strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment includes the consequences of current harvest strategies, forecasts future consequences of these and evaluates stock

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
	strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is moderate confidence in the robustness of the advice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a high degree of confidence in the adequacy of the harvest evaluation. 	<p>trajectories under decision rules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a very high degree of confidence in the adequacy of the harvest evaluation for a robust assessment.
1.1.6		The stock is at or above appropriate reference levels.		
1.1.6.1	The stock is at or above appropriate reference levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments show the stock is likely above the limit reference point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments show the stock is likely above the target reference point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments show the stock is very likely above the target reference point most of the time in recent years.
1.2 (MSC Criterion 2)		Where the exploited populations are depleted, the fishery will be executed such that recovery and rebuilding is allowed to occur to a specified level consistent with the precautionary approach and the ability of the populations to produce long-term potential yields within a specified time frame.		
1.2.1	When the stock is below the target point, there are measures to rebuild the stock specified and implemented for recovery and rebuilding of the stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate rebuilding measures through reduction in exploitation exist and are being implemented. Rebuilding measures other than reduction in exploitation are being considered. Measures are implemented even if they have not been tested. Fishing mortality is further reduced if the stock is below the limit reference point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate rebuilding measures are being implemented to promote recovery within reasonable time frames. Measures have been tested and can be shown to be rebuilding the stock. Target fishing mortality is nearly zero if the stock is below the limit reference point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate rebuilding measures are being implemented to promote recovery as quickly as is possible. Additional measures are being implemented to prevent problems in the future. Total fishing mortality is nearly zero if the stock is below the limit reference point.
1.3 (MSC Criterion 3)		Fishing is conducted in a manner that does not alter the age or genetic structure or sex composition to a degree that impairs reproductive capacity.		
1.3.1.	The size/sex/genetic structure of the stock is monitored to detect significant impairment of reproductive capacity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population size/sex structure is based on some sampling and verification. Some information on stock spatial structure is available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population size/sex structure is based on adequate sampling and verification. The spatial structure of the stock is reasonably well understood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population size/sex structure is well estimated with only insignificant errors. Genetic studies of the stock in relation to spatial structure have been undertaken.
1.3.2	Information from stock assessment indicates any fishery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any fishery-induced trends in recruitment or spawning stock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are likely no downward fishery-induced trends in reproductive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a high degree of confidence that there are no downward fishery-induced trends in

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
induced changes in the size/sex/genetic structure that would have significantly impaired reproductive capacity.	levels have not been shown to be due to changes in the size/sex/genetic composition of the stock.	capacity on local stocks or genetically monitored stocks due to changes in the size/sex/genetic structure.	reproductive capacity on local stocks or genetically identified stocks due to changes in the size/sex/genetic structure.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

Principle 2	Fishing operations should allow for the maintenance of the structure, productivity, function and diversity of the ecosystem (including habitat and associated dependent and ecologically related species) on which the fishery depends		
--------------------	---	--	--

2.1 (MSC Criterion 1)	The fishery is conducted in a way that maintains natural functional relationships among species and should not lead to trophic cascades or ecosystem state changes.		
------------------------------	--	--	--

2.1.1	There is adequate knowledge of the ecosystem relevant to the distribution, life history strategy and fishery for the target species.		
--------------	---	--	--

2.1.1.1.	The nature and distribution of habitats relevant to the fishing operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some information exists in specific areas of the fishery, but this may not be comprehensive or up to date. The distribution of fishing operations is broadly mapped. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature and distribution of all main habitats where the fishery operates have been mapped using an agreed biophysical classification system. The detailed distribution of fishing operations in space and time is monitored and regularly reported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature and the distribution of all habitats relevant to the fishing operations are known in detail, and mapped based on recent information. The nature and distribution of all fishing operations are known in fine-scale detail, and regularly reported.
----------	--	---	---	--

2.1.1.2	Information on non-target species affected by the fishery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main non-target species in the fishery have been identified, and trends in abundance have been assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information is available on the main non-target species affected by the fishery, including their distribution, abundance and population status, drawn from comparative studies of fished and unfished areas. Research projects are underway to develop improved knowledge of habitats, major species assemblages and their natural dynamics in the region where the fishery operates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed information is available on all non-target species affected by the fishery, including their distribution, abundance, ecology, and conservation status, based on empirical comparative studies of fished and unfished areas. The dominant natural large-scale factors responsible for structuring the marine ecosystems and their composition are known, and the dominant ecological effects of the major ocean currents on primary and secondary production, have been established. The nature, spatial and temporal extent of major natural variation in the ecosystem is understood. Major research programs are underway to further evaluate the nature and values of species, assemblages and habitats where the fishery operates.
---------	---	--	--	--

2.1.1.3	Information on the trophic relationships of the target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key prey, predators and competitors with the target species are known. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basic structure of the regional foodwebs has been determined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative information is available on the position and importance of the target species within the food
---------	--	--	---	--

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
	species within the food web	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research is being designed to study foodwebs in the region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information is available on the position and general importance of the target species in the environment at key life stages, based on comparisons between fished and unfished areas. Research projects are underway to develop improved knowledge of trophic relationships in the region where the fishery operates 	web at key life stages, derived from manipulative studies comparing fished and unfished areas.
2.1.1.4	Information on the potential for the ecosystem to recover from fishery related impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key elements of the functioning of the ecosystem, including natural forcing factors, relevant to the fishery have been identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main elements of the functioning of the ecosystem, natural variability and major drivers have been broadly documented and are understood. research projects, including modelling and field measurements, are underway to improve estimates of impacts and the recovery potential for dependent species that may be potentially affected by the fishery, either through removal of target species, bycatch or habitat impacts models and estimates of resilience and recovery potential take account of important aspects of ecosystem dynamics, environmental uncertainty and other factors external to the fishery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed information is available on the resilience of the benthic ecosystem, and the potential for affected elements to recover from fishery related impacts, derived from manipulative experiments comparing fished and unfished areas.
2.1.2		There is adequate knowledge about the risks to the ecosystems, habitats and species that are posed by the fishery.		
2.1.2.1	Information on the nature and extent of the by-catch and incidental mortality of non-target species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main by-catch species in the fishery have been identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The catch of the main bycatch species are monitored, and key species have been assessed to determine population status. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bycatch is monitored in detail at the vessel level, including species, size, age, and sex composition where appropriate, and population status of the bycatch species is regularly assessed

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific assessment, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders Data on bycatch are routinely synthesised and assessed by fishery managers, with summaries for public release 	through fishery-independent sampling programs.
2.1.2.2	Information on the trophic dependency of the non-target species on the target species within the food web	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key prey, predators and competitors with the target species are known in the main areas of the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential impacts of removal of the target species at key life stages has been assessed, based on comparisons between fished and unfished areas. Risks have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific assessment, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders Risks have been evaluated, where appropriate, by information derived from comparison of fished with unfished areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential impact of removal of the target species has been determined using quantitative information on the target species at key life stages, derived from manipulative studies comparing fished and unfished areas.
2.1.2.3	There is adequate knowledge of the impacts on the habitat of fishing gear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main impacts of gear use on the habitat have been identified including extent and location of use. Effects of habitat perturbations have been estimated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of gear use on the habitat have been identified, including extent, location and frequency of use. Physical disturbance to benthic habitats is minimal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The physical impacts on the habitat due to use of gear have been quantified, including details of any irreversible changes. Fishing gear is not used in sensitive habitats types (such as hard corals, some seagrass types).
2.1.3		There is adequate knowledge about the risks to the ecosystems, habitats and species that are posed by bait, bait bands or lost gear.		
2.1.3.1	Use of bait and loss of bait bands and fishing gear during	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of bait and loss of gear across the fishery can be documented from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type, quantity and location of all forms of bait used and gear lost during 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is detailed knowledge of the type, quantity and location of bait used in the fishery.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

fishing operations.	fishery and sales data.	<p>fishing operations is monitored and reported regularly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number and type of bait bands and other bait packaging material lost at sea is monitored, verified and regularly reported. Risks have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific assessment, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gear types lost during fishing operations are documented at the vessel level on a day by day basis bait bands and bait packaging lost at sea are monitored and independently verified through a fishery-wide waste-management audit conducted at vessel level.
---------------------	-------------------------	---	---

2.1.4	Strategies have been developed within the fisheries management system to address and restrain any significant negative impacts of the fishery on the ecosystem.
--------------	--

2.1.4.1	Levels of acceptable impact are established.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is sufficient information to determine acceptable impacts for the main non-target species and habitats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of acceptable impacts (e.g. biological reference points) for key aspects of the ecosystem within main fishing areas have been estimated and assessed. Levels of acceptable impacts have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific process, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of acceptable impact for key populations (specified indicator non-target species) and habitats across the full extent of the fishery have been estimated and are subject to frequent assessment.
---------	--	---	--	---

2.1.4.2	Management objectives and strategies are set in terms of impact identification and avoidance/reduction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited management systems exist in terms of impact identification and avoidance/reduction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management objectives and strategies are designed to detect and reduce impacts, although some may not have been fully tested. Key impacts of the fishery that are unavoidable through gear or deployment modifications are mitigated on a precautionary basis through the use of closed areas . These objectives and strategies are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management objectives and strategies to detect and reduce impacts have been developed, tested and are deployed across the fishery. These objectives and strategies are designed to adequately protect ecosystems, habitats and populations of both target and non-target species across the full range of the fishery, and are based on the use of closed areas to provide adequately precautionary levels of protection.
---------	---	---	---	--

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
			<p>designed to adequately protect key aspects of the ecosystem within the main fishing areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategies are determined in conjunction with an appropriate range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	
2.1.5		Assessments of impacts associated with the fishery, including the importance and risk of each impact, show no unacceptable impacts on the ecosystem structure and/or function, on habitats or on the populations of associated and dependent species.		
2.1.5.1	Effects of the fishery on the ecosystem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main impacts of the fishery on the ecosystem are known from existing information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a comprehensive assessment of the effects of the fishery on the ecosystem based on existing risks information. The assessment indicates that there are no areas of high risk of fishery impacts, determined using a precautionary approach to any gaps in existing knowledge. Risks have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific process, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders Research is underway to study impacts related to, and refine the assessment of, any medium-level risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects of the fishery on the ecosystem have been quantified by appropriate comparative and manipulative studies using fished and unfished areas, and found to be within acceptable limits.
2.1.5.2	The impacts on ecosystem structure and function through removal of the target and non-target species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies indicate that the removal of target stocks and non-target species has not had apparent impacts on ecological systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consequences of current levels of removal of the target and non-target species, determined using comparisons of fished with unfished areas, indicates that impacts are within acceptable limits in the main 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecological consequences of current levels of removal of target and non-target species has been quantified and documented to be within acceptable, pre-determined, limits in all areas where the fishery operates, based on empirical evidence derived from the comparison of fished with unfished areas.

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
			fishery areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of acceptable impacts have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific process, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	
2.1.5.3	Fishery impacts on habitat structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of the fishery on habitat structure within major fishing areas have been studied, and impacts appear to be minimal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of the fishery on habitat structure within major fishing areas are monitored and remain within prescribed limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on habitat structure are monitored across the full range of the fishery and are within prescribed limits established through comparison of fished and unfished areas.
2.1.5.4	The impact of bait and loss of bait bands and fishing gear during fishing operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of bait and loss of gear has been assessed in a range of studies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecological impacts of bait used, and bait bands and gear lost during fishing operations on selected indicators are monitored and maintained within prescribed limits. The fishery has an agreed code of practice to minimise loss of gear, at sea wastes and discards. Monitoring and reporting of gear loss, fishing wastes and discards at sea is verified by independent audit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecological impacts of all forms of bait used and bait bands and gear lost during fishing operations on selected indicators are monitored and maintained within prescribed limits across the full range of the fishery. There is a comprehensive gear reconciliation program, which is designed to track and validate the life-cycle fate of all fishing gear used in the fishery. The fishery has an agreed code of practice to minimise loss of gear, at sea wastes and discards, which is annually independently audited for effectiveness against performance indicators.
2.1.5.5	The effects of the fishery on associated biological diversity and productivity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of the fishery on biological diversity and productivity have been estimated, based on empirical studies or knowledge from other systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of the fishery on biological diversity and productivity have been studied and are within prescribed limits for the main habitats, based on the comparison of fished with unfished areas. Levels of acceptable impacts have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific process, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects of the fishery on biological diversity and productivity have been quantified and are within acceptable limits based on empirical data derived from the comparative manipulation of fished and unfished areas.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

2.2 (MSC Criterion 2)	The fishery is conducted in a manner that does not threaten biological diversity (at the genetic, species or population levels) and avoids or minimises mortality of, or injuries to endangered, threatened or protected species.		
------------------------------	--	--	--

2.2.1	Fishing is conducted in a manner that does not have unacceptable impacts on protected, endangered, threatened or icon species.		
--------------	---	--	--

2.2.1.1	Information on the presence and populations of protected, endangered, threatened or icon species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a program in place to identify protected, threatened, endangered or icon species that may be affected by the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected, threatened, endangered or icon species likely to directly interact with the fishery have been identified, and their likely space and time interactions have been assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is knowledge of all populations of protected, endangered, threatened or icon species that directly or indirectly interact with the fishery, including an assessment of spatial and temporal interactions. The identity, function and distribution of critical habitats for these species have been identified.
---------	---	--	---	---

2.2.1.2	The interactions of the fishery with protected, endangered, threatened or icon species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main interactions directly related to the fishery are known. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative estimates have been made of the effects of interactions for the main species that directly interact with the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliable quantitative estimates have been made of the interactions of all species and populations of protected, endangered, threatened or icon that interact directly with the fishery, and qualitative information is available on indirect impacts.
---------	---	--	--	---

2.2.1.3	The level of interaction with protected, endangered, threatened or icon species that constitutes an unacceptable risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interactions are within any defined acceptable limits set by national or international legislative requirements Interactions appear to create no ecological threats to populations of the species concerned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For any protected, endangered, threatened or icon species, critical interactions are robustly estimated Acceptable limits are set to prevent any important impacts that may affect the spatial distribution, reproductive success, population structure, or conservation status of these species. Levels of acceptable impacts have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific process, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The direct and indirect effects of fishing on any protected, endangered, threatened or icon species are determined and set within acceptable limits to prevent any important impact at any time across the fishery.
---------	--	---	--	---

2.2.1.4	The impacts of the fishery on protected, endangered,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies in the fishery have examined fishery impacts on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular assessment of the impacts on each protected, endangered, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on all protected, endangered, threatened or icon species are regularly assessed, quantified,
---------	--	---	--	--

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
	threatened or icon species.	populations of protected, endangered, threatened or icon species, and mitigation strategies are being developed where appropriate	threatened or icon species demonstrates that impacts are generally maintained within the prescribed acceptable limits.	documented and publicly reported to be within the prescribed acceptable limits in all areas where the fishery operates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are assessed using empirical evidence derived from the comparison of fished with unfished areas or through other equally robust benchmark systems and/or precautionary models.
2.2.2		Strategies have been developed within the fisheries management system to address and restrain impacts of the fishery on protected, endangered, threatened or icon species to within acceptable minimum levels.		
2.2.2.1	Management objectives and strategies are set in terms of impact identification and avoidance/reduction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific interactions have been identified, although there are limited management systems in place to reduce impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management objectives and strategies are set to detect and reduce impacts, although some, such as the use of closed areas, may not have been fully tested and shown to be effective. These objectives and strategies are designed to adequately protect key aspects of the populations of the protected, endangered, threatened or icon species within the main fishing areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management objectives and strategies to detect and reduce impacts have been developed, tested and are fully deployed across the fishery. These objectives and strategies are designed to adequately protect populations across the full range of the fishery Strategies are based on the use of closed areas to provide precautionary levels of protection, or on equivalently robust empirical knowledge of the fishery interactions.
2.2.2.2	Mitigation of the impacts of the fishery on protected, endangered, threatened or icon species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies across the fishery are examining the fishery impacts on populations of the listed, protected and icon species, and mitigation strategies are being developed where appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conservation status of each protected, endangered, threatened or icon species has been assessed. Assessments demonstrate that impacts are generally within prescribed acceptable limits. The fishery impacts and effectiveness of mitigation strategies are regularly reviewed. Research projects, including modelling and field measurements where appropriate, are underway to improve estimates of impacts and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of the fishery are mitigated using closed areas, or equivalently robust precautionary systems of spatial management. The conservation status and fishery impacts on each protected, endangered, threatened or icon species is regularly assessed. Assessments demonstrate that impacts are always maintained within prescribed acceptable limits. The effectiveness of mitigation strategies in restraining the impacts of the fishery is regularly reviewed through independent external expert review.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recovery potential Models of mitigation and estimates of resilience and recovery potential take account of important aspects of ecosystem dynamics, environmental uncertainty and other factors external to the fishery 	
--	--	--	--

2.3 (MSC Criterion 3)	Where exploited populations (of non-target species) are depleted, the fishery will be executed such that recovery and rebuilding is allowed to occur to a specified level within specified time frames, consistent with the precautionary approach and considering the ability of the population to produce long-term potential yields.		
------------------------------	--	--	--

2.3.1	There are management measures in place that allow for the rebuilding of affected (non-target) populations.		
--------------	---	--	--

2.3.1.1	Management measures to modify fishery practices in light of the identification of unacceptable ecological impacts of the fishery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mechanism exists for the modification of fishing practices in light of the identification of unacceptable impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated effective management measures are in place and have been used to successfully modify fishery practices in light of the identification of unacceptable ecological impacts. The management system has procedures in place that have been tested and found effective for detecting and responding to an unacceptable ecological impact. Strategies for rebuilding have been determined through a robust peer reviewed scientific process, involving the relevant range of ecological expertise and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are demonstrated effective procedures in place in the management system to provide for a highly timely and fully effective modification of fishery practices in light of the identification of unacceptable ecological impacts.
---------	---	--	---	---

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

Principle 3	Fishing operations should allow for the maintenance of the structure, productivity, function and diversity of the ecosystem (including habitat and associated dependent and ecologically related species) on which the fishery depends		
--------------------	---	--	--

3.1	The management system has a clearly defined scope, capable of achieving MSC Principles and Criteria and includes short and long-term objectives, including ecosystem objectives, consistent with a well managed fishery		
------------	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

<u>3.1.1</u>	The management system incorporates and applies an adaptive and precautionary exploited stock strategy [Relates to MSC Criteria 3.2, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system recognizes the need for sustainability indicators. There are basic attempts to control effort. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has sustainability indicators, including catch rates, and sets objectives related to these data. There are measures to control effort. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system includes scientific assessment of stocks and sets precautionary long-term stock management objectives. The harvest strategy includes effective effort and/or output controls. Harvest strategies maintain stocks at productive levels (specified by appropriate target and limit reference points), and provide for the recovery of depleted stocks to specified levels within specified time frames. Harvest strategies are evaluated using robust assessment methods that consider the use of a range of management tools. Stock assessments and harvest strategy evaluations are undertaken in an open process and the methods and results made available in published reports. Stock assessments and harvest strategy evaluations are periodically externally reviewed.
--------------	---	---	---	--

<u>3.1.2</u>	The management system incorporates and applies an effective strategy to manage the ecological impacts of fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on non-target species are irregularly collected, but no formal assessment has been conducted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system considers ecological impacts from fishing, but has no formal strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has a strategy that takes into account all significant ecological impacts of the fishery, including non-target species and habitats.
--------------	--	--	--	--

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
	[Relates to MSC Criteria 3.2, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A preliminary review of the impacts on habitats from fishing gear has been conducted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on non-target species are irregularly collected and assessed. Impacts on habitats from fishing gear have been assessed. 	
3.1.3	The management system incorporates and applies an effective strategy to manage the socioeconomic impacts of the fishery, and the fishery is free from significant subsidies, which promote over fishing or ecosystem degradation. [Relates to MSC Criteria 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fishery management system seeks to understand social and economic consequences of decision-making but there are no formal arrangements. There are no significant direct subsidies to the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The long-term interests of people dependent on fishing for food and livelihood are formally considered under the management system. There are no significant direct subsidies to the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system considers the long-term interests of people dependent on fishing for food and livelihood, in a manner consistent with ecological sustainability. All aspects of fishery are free from significant direct subsidies that promote over fishing or ecosystem degradation.
<u>3.1.4</u>		There is a well-defined strategy for research related to the objectives of the fishery		
3.1.4.1	The management system has a plan for research needed to support the harvest strategy [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some limited research to support management is undertaken. Some of the research results are considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a research plan to support the management system. Resources are available for critical studies in support of management. Most research results are considered. 	<u>100 Scoring Guidepost</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a research plan, designed jointly by scientists and managers, to support the management system. Resources are available to support research for the needs of management. The research results are made public and they are considered under the management system.
3.1.4.2	The management system has a plan for research needed to support the understanding of the ecological impacts of fishing [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some limited research to support ecosystem management is undertaken. Some of the research results are considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a research plan to support the ecosystem. Resources are available for critical studies in support of ecosystem management. Most research results are considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a research plan, designed jointly by scientists and managers, to support the ecosystem and to address significant environmental impacts of fishing. <p>The effectiveness of the research plan has been assessed,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources are available to support research for the needs of ecosystem management.

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research results are made public and they are considered under the management system
3.2	The management system recognizes applicable legislative and institutional responsibilities and coordinates implementation on a regular, integral, explicit basis.			
3.2.1	The fishery is managed and conducted in a manner that respects international conventions and agreements and not under any controversial unilateral exemption to an international agreement [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.1]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system appears to operate within applicable international law, although no detailed examination of this has been made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system does not employ or in any manner seek to operate within any exemption to otherwise applicable international law. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All measures taken within the management system are in compliance with relevant international treaty obligations. The management system does not undertake unilateral exemption from any treaty obligation pertaining to the fishery.
3.2.2	The fishery is managed and conducted in a manner that complies with domestic law [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.16]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system appears from preliminary observations to operate within applicable domestic law and no noted violations have been identified that would jeopardize the management of fisheries resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system is known to be in compliance with all substantive and procedural aspects of applicable domestic law. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system is consistently in compliance with all substantive and procedural aspects of applicable domestic law. No officer or agent of the management system, including its component entities, has at any time been found to be in contempt of any domestic court of jurisdiction on any matter related to performance of official duties on behalf of the management system
3.3	Stakeholders are directly involved in management of the fishery, disputes can be settled within the system and the managers have useful advice on which to base decisions.			
3.3.1	The management system involves all categories of stakeholders appropriately on a regular, integral, explicit basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system makes decisions after consulting some stakeholder groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system makes decisions after consulting all significant stakeholder groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system makes transparent decisions that fully account and serve all stakeholder groups. Stakeholders are involved in the decision

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
	[Relates to MSC Criterion 3.2]			making process.
3.3.2	The management system provides for timely and fair resolution of disagreements [Relates to MSC Criteria 3.2, 3.5]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms for informal dispute resolution exist, and are used by some stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has mechanisms for both formal and informal resolution of disputes at all levels of, and for most issues arising within the system. Stakeholders generally accept the resolutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has established objective mechanisms for resolution of disputes at all levels of, and for all issues arising within the system. The management system's dispute resolution procedures show evidence of being open to and used by a variety of participants and stakeholders. The resolution results are public.
3.3.3	The management system presents managers with clear, relevant information, which is considered in decision-making [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system's decision makers are provided with information under the management system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The decision makers show evidence of considering the information provided to them under the management system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system regularly presents decision makers with analyzed alternatives for action. The management system shows evidence of a pattern of behavior by decision makers that reveals that they have found the information provided to them to be useful.
3.4	The management system applies information through implementation of measures and strategies (by rule or by voluntary action of fishery) that demonstrably control the degree of exploitation of the resource in the light of the natural variation in ecosystems			
3.4.1	The management system restricts gear and practices to avoid by-catch, minimize mortality of by-catch, and reduce discards [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.12, 3.17]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By-catch reduction has been considered by the management system and a preliminary plan is in place. The fishers assist and cooperate with authorities in the collection of catch, discard and other information on the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By-catch reduction methods are part of the management system. The fishers assist and cooperate with authorities in the collection of catch, discard and other information on the fishery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are specific measures in place to eliminate by-catch and discards in the management system and results are measured against a series of goals. The fishers assist and cooperate with authorities in the collection of catch, discard and other information on the fishery.
3.4.2	The management system	The management system requires efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system is 	The management system requires efforts to identify and

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
	minimizes adverse impacts on the habitat [Relates to MSC Criteria 3.10, 3.13]	to identify and document fishery impacts on all habitats.	<p>gathering knowledge of sensitive habitats in the area of the fishery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As information concerning potential impacts on sensitive habitats is identified, there are mechanisms in place to assess whether the impacts are significant. 	document fishery impacts on all habitats.
<u>3.4.3</u>	3.4.3 The management system does not allow use of destructive fishing practices [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.14]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system discourages the use explosives or toxic chemicals to kill or stun aquatic species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The operational practices in the fishery attempt to minimize habitat impacts except those impacts that are physically unavoidable consequences of authorized uses of fishing gear. There is evidence that the fishery does not use explosives or toxic chemicals to kill or stun aquatic species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system prohibits fishery or operational practices that damage or destroy natural geologic, biologic, or chemical features or characteristics of the aquatic area in which the fishery occurs, except those impacts that are physically unavoidable consequences of authorized uses of fishing gear. There is a monitoring system in place to determine if such impacts occur. There are penalties for the use of destructive fishing practices.
<u>3.4.4</u>	The management system provides for rebuilding and recovery [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.10]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are regular discussions on the state of the stocks, which would consider if they were over exploited and in need of rebuilding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments are made of the population, and or stocks, to determine if they are falling below acceptable levels, so that plans for rebuilding could be developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where population or stocks impacted by the fishery have declined below acceptable levels, the management system is structured so that plans for rebuilding would be developed.
<u>3.4.5</u>	Incorporates no-take zones where appropriate [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.10]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has the capacity for establishing no-take zones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has considered the introduction of no-take zones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has established no-take zones, where appropriate. The purpose and effectiveness of these no-take zones is described and assessed.

SCORING CRITERIA		SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
3.4.6	The management system minimizes operational waste [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.15]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fishery encourages minimization of operational wastes. There is evidence of its effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are monitoring and enforcement programs for operational waste from the fishery, which have been shown to be minimal.
3.5		The management system provides for enforcement and compliance [Relates to MSC Criteria 3.11, 3.16]		
3.5.1	The management system enforces compliance in the fishery and has knowledge of the level of illegal fishing on the target species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has a compliance and enforcement system and there is general compliance with the system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has established a compliance and enforcement system and has demonstrated a consistent ability to enforce applicable rules. The level of illegal fishing is estimated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has established a comprehensive compliance and enforcement system. It contains procedures for effective compliance; monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement, which ensure that management system controls are not violated and appropriate corrective actions, are taken. The effectiveness of the procedures is measured. The level of illegal fishing is known.
3.6		The performance of the management system is regularly and candidly evaluated and adapted as needed to improve		
3.6.1	The management system provides for internal assessment and review [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has an internal system for occasional evaluation of management performance in the case of special circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has an internal system for evaluation of management performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has an internal, continuing, system for evaluation of management performance.
3.6.2	"The management system provides for external assessment and review [Relates to MSC Criterion 3.2, 3.3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has a system for occasional external evaluation of management performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system has a system for a regular external evaluation of management performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management system provides for an independent, expert review of management performance.

SCORING CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDEPOST 60	SCORING GUIDEPOST 80	SCORING GUIDEPOST 100
<u>3.6.3</u>	The management system identifies research needs and directs appropriate funding and other resources to these problems [Relates to MSC Criteria 3.3, 3.7]	Resources for research are adequate to address at least some of the gaps in knowledge that are identified by the management system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources for research are adequate to address critical gaps in knowledge that are identified by the management system. • There is a strategic plan for monitoring and research linked to the management plan. • Resources for monitoring and research are adequate to address most gaps in knowledge that are identified under the management system.