

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

This suite of *ethical* attributes assesses fisheries based on a range of ethical concerns, and integrates sustainability on many levels, including ecological and social. The ethical evaluation field in RAPFISH was developed by a team of ethicists, social and natural scientists and has since been revised. Scoring scale is from zero (worst) to 10 (best), with 4/10 representing a bare pass and 7/10 a good score. Scoring guidelines are given with each ethical attribute description. Users can give an upper and lower 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. Adjacency</b>	Assesses geographical proximity of fishers to the resource. If fishers have to travel a greater geographical distance to reach fishing grounds, implies they will have less affinity with the resource.	Best to score by distance travelled to fishing grounds or time to reach home port. As a proxy, score local fishers (Rapfish score 10-9); district / regional / provincial fishers (8-6); national fishers (5-3); international fishers (2-0)
<b>2. Iconicity</b>	Assesses if resource has cultural or symbolic value to community beyond food or monetary value.	Cultural icon (10-9); regional icon (8-6); place affinity recognized (5-3); no place affinity or attachment (2-0)
<b>3. Alternative Livelihoods</b>	Assesses alternative livelihoods to the fishery as sources of support within the community.	Alternative livelihoods in other sectors as well as fisheries locally (Rapfish score 10-9); in other fisheries locally (8-6); only with outmigration (5-3); very limited livelihood options (2-0)
<b>3. Equity of Access</b>	Assesses whether access to the fishery is equitable and regulated. Barriers to access to resources and entry to fishery may include prohibitive cost of licenses and competition from foreign vessels via access agreements. Limited entry of regulated access (i.e., dedicated access) and customary and traditional access are considered better for sustainability than open access.	Equitable, regulated access (Rapfish score 10-9); local and mostly equitable access with low barriers to entry (8-6); some foreign competition, but mostly local access, with high barriers to entry (5-3); much foreign competition, with limited historical and traditional access (2-1); open access with no regulation (0).
<b>4. Just Governance</b>	Assesses the inclusion of fishers and local community (where appropriate) in management and governance. Score along gradient of equitable sharing of power within collaborative governance arrangements, weighted by ecosystem impacts of governance decisions.	Co-governance, positive impacts (Rapfish score 10-9); co-governance, some negative impacts (8-6); co-management, some negative impacts (5-3); no co-governance or co-management, negative impacts (2-0)
<b>5. Illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing</b>	Assesses illegal, unregulated and unreported fish catches (poaching, trans-shipments, non-compliance with gear, quota, species, size, place and other regulations) and the effectiveness of measures to combat IUU fishing. (See	No IUU fishing (Rapfish score 10-9); some IUU fishing with measures to combat (8-6); more IUU fishing with fewer measures to combat (5-3); significant IUU fishing with almost no

	FAO 2001, Agnew et al. 2009 and Österblom 2014).	measures to combat (2-0)
<b>6. Harmful Impacts</b>	Assesses harmful impacts from discards, waste and/or by-catch of non-target fish, mammals, reptiles, birds, benthic invertebrates, etc.) and consequent ecological damage and loss of information caused by fishery	No discards, waste, and by-catch (Rapfish score 10-9); some (8-6); a lot (5-3); a great deal (2-0)
<b>7. Mitigation of Harm</b>	Assesses efforts to mitigate harmful impacts of gear on fish habitat and/or efforts to mitigate fisheries-induced changes to ecosystem structure and functioning of predators, prey or competing organisms of fishery target, weighted by mitigation effectiveness (through, e.g., restoration, avoidance, and closures) on ecosystem attributes	Much mitigation, effective (Rapfish score 10-9); some mitigation, effective (8-6); some mitigation, not so effective (5-3); limited mitigation, limited effectiveness (2-0)
<b>8. Consumer / Buyer Choice</b>	Assesses ability of consumers and retail buyers to make informed choices in purchasing decisions through access to eco-labels and consumer awareness campaigns, weighted by influence of choice on the market and sustainability of the resource, e.g., through eco-labels, niche markets, provenance information, sustainable sources of fish, fishery improvement plans, traceability within supply chain, and overfishing status.	Score (and its uncertainty limits) as a categorical function: Awareness/eco-label present, choices influential (Rapfish score 10-9); awareness/eco-label present, some influence (8-6); some awareness, marginal influence (5-3); no awareness or influence (2-0)
<b>9. Traceability</b>	Assesses existence and validity of traceability documentation along the entire supply and value chain, e.g., FishPopTrace in EU and ThisFish™ (Ecotrust Canada)	Existence of science-based traceability documentation (10-9); traceability, with good supporting documentation (8-6); traceability, but validity questionable (5-3); no traceability (2-0)