

**Rapfish ECONOMICS EVALUATION FIELD: ATTRIBUTES (Version 3.1)**

This revised Rapfish evaluation field scores *economic* factors (attributes) that will foster or inhibit biological sustainability of the resource. Scoring scale is zero (worst) to 10 (best), with 4/10 representing a bare pass and 7/10 a good score. Scoring guidelines are listed for each economics attribute description. Attempt to score generic processes, not specifics. Give a range for each score to express uncertainty. (Please note that Rapfish undergoes continual improvement, and the most recent version of this scoring table will be found at [www.rapfish.org](http://www.rapfish.org).)

ATTRIBUTE	DESCRIPTION	SCORING GUIDELINES
<b>1. Fishers' discount rate (<i>d</i>) in relation to fish productivity</b>	Assesses sustainability based on the ratio of fishers' discount rate (taken as national discount rate from <a href="http://www.economist.org">www.economist.org</a> ) to fish population reproductive rate (from <a href="http://www.fishbase.org">www.fishbase.org</a> ). [ <i>go to life history data tool for species</i> ] Economic analysis (Clark et al. 1973) shows that fish should be wiped out when the discount rate is more than twice the reproductive rate of the fish population.	Discount rate, $d < 20\%$ of fish reproductive rate, $r$ (Rapfish score 10-9); $d/r = 20-39\%$ (8-6); $d/r = 40-59\%$ (5-4); $d/r = 60-79\%$ (3-2); $d/r > 80\%$ (1-0)
<b>2. "Bad" Subsidies</b>	Higher government subsidies are bad for sustainability. Assesses subsidy level as percentage of gross turnover of fishery or revenue flowing through the fishery. Include hidden subsidies (such as guaranteed off-season income for fishers, vessel building or fuel subsidies). National figures are available from Sumaila et al. (2010): these values may be used as a default if there is no specific information on the fishery.	Subsidy $< 10\%$ of turnover (Rapfish score 10-9); subsidy = 10-19% turnover (8-6); subsidy = 20-29% turnover (5-4); subsidy = 30 - 99% turnover (3-2) subsidy $\geq 100\%$ of turnover (1-0)
<b>3. Rate of change in profitability</b>	Assesses changes in profitability in either direction in last 5-10 years; large changes are bad for sustainability. Any trend up or down signals concerns for sustainability. (Non-linear utility).	Change in profitability in last 5-10 years $< 5\%$ (increase or decrease) (Rapfish score 10-9); change 5-19% (8-7); change 20-49% (6-5); change 50-99% (4-3); change $\geq 100\%$ (2-0)
<b>4. Opportunity for Alternative Livelihoods</b>	Assesses other sources of income through alternative livelihoods.	Many other sources of livelihood (Rapfish score 10-9); a lot (8-6); some (5-3); very few (2-0)
<b>5. Marketing system</b>	Assesses the impact of the marketing system. Open system	Fully open market auction system (Rapfish score 10-9); partially

	better for sustainability, for example, open auction system. Closed system, such as monopoly buyer, not good for sustainability	open market auction system (8-6); semi-closed market system (5-3); monopoly, government buyer, or fixed price system (2-0)
<b>6. Equity of economic benefits</b>	Assesses equity of monetary and other material benefits. Benefits accrue to owners of fishing vessels, gears and licences, skippers and crew providing labour and skills, and shore-side processing and marketing, and villagers receiving common property fish. Includes spatial location of benefits in that equitable local benefits are more likely to foster sustainability.	Equitable distribution of economic benefits (Rapfish score 10-9); partially equitable distribution of economic benefits (8-6); inequitable distribution of economic benefits (5-3); grossly inequitable distribution of economic benefits (2-0)
<b>7. Commoditization</b>	Treating fishery products as a global commodity is inimical to sustainability. On the other hand, labelling products with ecolabels (such as from the Marine Stewardship Council), provenance or niche creates market pressures that could foster sustainability.	Fishery products are marketed with a specific, local provenance and/or niche (Rapfish score 10-9); fishery products are to a large extent marketed with a local provenance and/or niche (8-6); fishery products are to a minor extent marketed with a local provenance and/or niche (5-3); fishery products are commoditized and marketed as generic global products with no local provenance or niche (2-0)
<b>8. Export Markets</b>	Assesses the extent of the export market of the fishery product. It is harder to control the resource if there is a global market demand, so a higher export demand likely leads to reduced sustainability.	Local, specialized market (10-9); provincial/regional market (8-6); national market (5-3); global market (2-0)