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

This revised Rapfish evaluation field scores *social* factors (attributes) that foster or inhibit biological sustainability of the resource. 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 for each social attribute description. When scoring, consider demonstrated resilience to change. (Resilience is defined as capacity for recovery from a perturbation. Users may give a range for each score to express uncertainty. LEK = Local environmental knowledge of fishers and their communities (includes here traditional environmental knowledge of indigenous peoples). (Please note that Rapfish undergoes continual improvement, and the most recent version of this scoring table will be found at www.rapfish.org.)

| ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION | SCORING GUIDELINES |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Strength of social network** | *Social resilience factor.* Assesses the strength of social peer-group support, including kin, for fishers' actions and decisions. Measures social resilience within the community due to shared risks and experiences. This may be demonstrated by the presence of fishery associations and cooperatives, including local groups of fishers or processors, local multi-stakeholder boards, and organized co-management mechanisms and bodies. | Score as a linear function: Score 5 if fishery association present; <5 to represent degree of lack of social resilience; and >5 to represent degree of social resilience in associations |
| **2. Leadership** | *Social cohesiveness factor.* Assesses presence and effectiveness of community leaders. | Score as a linear function: Score 5 if community leader present; <5 to represent the degree of lack of leadership; and >5 to represent the effectiveness of the leadership |
| **3. Extent of Local Environmental Knowledge (LEK)** | *Knowledge of resource factor.* Assesses knowledge contribution to sustainable fishing practices, ownership, management decisions, and governance. Expresses the positive effects of LEK, including traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) of indigenous peoples, on sustainability. Considers the age profile of the community, where large proportion of older fishers should aid sustainability. Two aspects of LEK influence can be considered: (a) the number of generations (G=1 corresponds to 30 years) that local individuals, families, or communities have conducted this fishery, where more generations = better sustainability; and (b) median age of fishers in the fishery, where older fishers bring wisdom and perspective, so older median age = better sustainability. The influence of | Score as a linear function: Score 0 (lowest sustainability) to 10 (highest sustainability), with 4/10 representing a bare pass and 7/10 a good score.<br><br>*Alternative scoring for TEK* using the G-index: G=0, score 0; G=0.5, 1, G=1, 2; G=2, 4 ("pass" score); G=3, 6; G=3.5, 7 ("good" score); G=4, 8; G >=5, 10. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | LEK may be found in three aspects of the fishery: (a) fishing practices and ownership of licenses or Total Allowable Catch (TAC); (b) management decisions; and (c) governance. Scoring may employ as a proxy for intergenerational learning a new cultural indicator, the G-index, which is the number of generations the resource has been fished by individuals, families, or communities living adjacent to resource (adjacent means within a day of the home port); high values should help sustainability. | |
| **4. Fishers-to-owners ratio** | *Socio-economic factor.* Assesses spatial and demographic equity in benefits distribution, where benefits include cultural and social benefits, not just monetary. Benefit Distribution: estimate the ratio of fishers to recipients, beneficiaries, owners, patrons, buyers or processors: a lower ratio (e.g., a small number of fishers to many recipients of benefits or owners) acts for sustainability. Local owners are more likely to foster sustainability, while corporate remote owners, the converse. Also include type of debt to other sectors, which ranges from reciprocal or market-regulated at the sustainable end of the spectrum, to unregulated (loan sharking) at the unsustainable end. Weight the debt type and extent equally with benefit (i.e., more sustainable debts = greater owners) in assigning a score to fisher/owner ratio. Score ratio for one vessel; for multiple vessel owners, sum fishers over all vessels for one owner. | Score as a categorical function: fisher-to-owner ratio >10 = poor (Rapfish score 0); ratio 10 (1); ratio 9 (2-3); ratio 8 (3-4) (i.e., "pass" score); ratio 7 (5); ratio 6 (6); ratio 5 (7) (i.e., "good" score); ratio 4 (8); ratio 3 (9); ratio ≤ 2 (10). |
| **5. Adverse change in fishing benefits** | *Change of State factor.* Change of state often signals concerns for sustainability, such as greater instability in fishing benefits. Assess using same underlying metrics as in #4. | Rate of change ≥40% per year, score 0; change 39-20% per year, score 1-2; change 19-15% per year, score 3; change 14 to 10% per year, score 4 (i.e., "pass"); change 9-5% per year, score 5 or 6; change <5 % per year; score 7 to 10 (i.e., "good" scores). |