

## RAPFISH Evaluation Fields for

# Rapid Appraisal of Compliance with Article 7 of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, covering Fisheries Management

Revised Nov 2004, March 2007<sup>1</sup>, August 2011

### Evaluation Field 1: Management Objectives

#### *SCORES INTENTIONS OF MANAGEMENT*

Attributes		Reference Points		Code Clauses	
		BAD	GOOD	Main	Other
1	Are formal reference points for the fish stock in this fishery identified using best science available? No (0); partially (5); completely (10).	0	10	7.2.1	7.1.1
2	Is present fleet capacity calculated and are there plans to reduce it? No (0); calculated (3.5); target capacity defined (7); planned measures to reduce capacity (10). NOTE: fishing capacity may be measured simply, as in numbers of vessels, or in a complex fashion, for example as true catching power. Within each grade, bonus points may be given for more accurate complex measures.	0	10	7.2.2	7.1.8
3	Are small scale fishers considered in plan? No (0); considered but not consulted (2.5); consulted informally (5); institutional structures for ongoing consultation (7.5); plus extra points if small-scale fisher's opinions are often included in plans. (max 10).	0	10	7.2.2	7.1.2
4	Impacts of fishery on biodiversity allowed for in plan? No (0); some impacts assessed (3.5); most impacts assessed and mitigated (7); full impacts mitigated in management plan (10).	0	10	7.2.2	7.2.3
5	Does the management plan aim to restore depleted stocks in this fishery? No (0); slowly (5); rapidly (10).	0	10	7.2.2	7.1.1
6	Are human impacts (pollution, waste) on the fishery habitat identified? No (0); partially identified (3.5); identified and plan includes measures to mitigate (7); complete mitigation in plan (10).	0	10	7.2.2	7.2.1
7	Is fishing gear mandated by the management plan to avoid by-catch of non-target species, environmental and habitat damage? No (0); in part (5); totally (10).	0	10	7.2.2	7.4.2
8	Are ecosystem linkages with this fishery made explicit in the management plan? No (0); identified (3.5); made fully explicit (7); & adverse ecosystem impacts minimised (10).	0	10	7.2.3	7.3.1
9	Are environmental influences on this fishery made explicit in the management plan? No (0); identified (3.5); made fully explicit (7); & adverse impacts minimised (10).	0	10	7.2.3	7.2.1

*Intermediate scoring is encouraged where small differences among the fisheries evaluated can be justified.*

<sup>1</sup> Revised scores all span zero to ten, in order to encourage intermediate scoring. Original ranges scaled accordingly.

## Evaluation Field 2: Framework (Data & Procedures)

### SCORES WAYS INTENTIONS ARE IMPLEMENTED

Attributes		Reference Points		Clauses Code	
		BAD	GOOD	main	other
1	Are total & complete removals from this stock over the whole stock area and over whole life cycle accounted for in assessment? No (0); somewhat (3.5); mostly with a few omissions (7); almost completely (10).	0	10	7.3.1	7.4.2
2	Are management measures compatible with those of other jurisdictions concerned with this stock? No (0); in part (5); almost completely (10). (Score 10 if not applicable to this fishery, but eliminate attribute if not applicable to any other fisheries in analysis).	0	10	7.3.2	7.1.3
3	Does the management plan have clearly stated long-term objectives? No (0); in part (5); absolutely clear (10).	0	10	7.3.3	7.1.1
4	Are all the stakeholders in this fishery resource identified and considered? No, only government interests (0); score two for each group represented: large-scale industry, small-scale fishers, recreational fishers, local communities, conservation and public watchdog groups (Max = 10). (Score 2 for any one group that genuinely does not apply; Score 1 for any group only partially considered).	0	10	7.1.2	7.1.6
5	Are data, management processes and decision-making open and transparent, including any international aspects? No, closed except to management (0); informed only when necessary (2.5); regularly consulted (5); participation in decisions (7.5); full co-management in decision-making (10).	0	10	7.1.9	7.1.6
6	Are timely, complete and reliable statistics collected and verified? No (0); collected partially (2); collected almost completely (4); timely - add 1 if available in less than 1 year, add 2 if 6 months (6); add 2 if there are attempts at verification (8); add additional 1 to 2 if almost totally satisfactory verification (10).	0	10	7.4.4	7.1.4
7	Are social, economic and institutional factors related to sustainability evaluated with data? No (0); score one or two points for each, plus up to additional 2 points for interdisciplinary analysis (10)	0	10	7.4.5	7.4.2

*Intermediate scoring is encouraged where small differences among the fisheries evaluated can be justified.*

### Evaluation Field 3: Precautionary Approach

#### SCORES PRECAUTIONARY INTENTIONS AND ACTIONS

Attributes		Reference Points		Code Clauses	
		BAD	GOOD	main	Other
1	Is precaution explicitly enshrined in legislation, or is precaution implicitly applied to management of the fisheries? No (0); implicit in some regulations or actions of the country (1-4); explicit in legislation, and partially applied in management (5-8); almost fully applied in regulations (9-10).	0	10	7.5.1	
2	Is uncertainty, including lack of appropriate information, quantified and used to reduce fishing that might otherwise occur? No (0); in part (3.5); a great deal (7); add 1-3 points for degree of quantification of uncertainty (10).	0	10	7.5.1	7.4.3
3	Are stock-specific target reference points estimated and employed? No (0); simple targets estimated (3.5); estimated and employed (7); almost totally satisfactory (10). Quality of targets is included in the evaluation: full statistical stock analysis gains bonus points while simple MSY or 'Gulland formula' calculations get less credit.	0	10	7.5.3	7.2.1
4	Are stock-specific limit reference points estimated and employed? No (0); estimated (3.5); actively employed (7); working almost totally satisfactorily (10).	0	10	7.5.3	7.2.1
5	Are there viable contingency plans to restrict fishing in the event of an environmental emergency? No (0); plan exists (3.5); a good plan with clearly identified rapid-acting triggers exists (7); almost completely satisfactory plan with triggers in place, and defined ways to validate trigger data (10).	0	10	7.5.5	
6	Are there viable contingency plans to restrict fishing in the event of an unforeseen emergency caused by excess fishing? No (0); plan exists (3.5); a good plan with clearly identified rapid-acting triggers exists (7); almost completely satisfactory plan and triggers in place, and defined ways to validate trigger data (10).	0	10	7.5.5	
7	Are management instruments under continuous review? No (0); infrequently and informal review (3.5); formal review (7); formal review every year (10).	0	10	7.6.8	7.1.4
8	Are no-take areas of sufficient size to work, established, policed and monitored? Add up to one two points for effective monitoring; add up to two points for effective enforcement. None (0); no-take areas less than 1% of EEZ (2); 1-5% of EEZ (4); >5% (6).	0	10	7.6.9	
9	Are plans in place to restrict fishing if species linked through the ecosystem (predators, prey or competitors) to the target(s) of this fishery become threatened? Add up to two points for effective monitoring of potentially endangered species; add up to two points for effective enforcement. No plans (0); informal plans (2); formal plans in place (4); tested with models or simulations (6).	0	10	7.2.2	7.2.3

*Intermediate scoring is encouraged where small differences among the fisheries evaluated can be justified.*

## Evaluation Field 4: Stocks, fleets and gear

### SCORES RESULTS OF MANAGEMENT

Attributes		Reference Points		Code Clauses	
		BAD	GOOD	main	Other
1	Is excess fleet capacity being reduced? Scored on a graduated scale from: no (0); mainly measures aimed at avoiding an increase in capacity (3.5); measures actually aimed at capacity reduction (5); effective capacity reduction measures (7); completely effectively (10).	0	10	7.6.3	7.2.2
2	Are fishing methods known to be harmful to habitats, to create by-catch problems, or whose high fishing capacity is difficult to control, being phased out? Score on a graduated scale from: no (0); partial phasing out (5); substantial, effective and monitored plans for phasing out (10). To gain maximum score in a category, all harmful gear types should be covered.	0	10	7.6.3	7.2.2
3	Is by-catch of non-target species minimised? No, there are serious problems with by-catch (0); some attempts to assess and reduce by-catch (2); by-catch is estimated and reduction of by-catch is a priority (4); by-catch is very low or greatly reduced in this fishery (6). Score up to 2 extra points for gear that reduces by-catch (newly-introduced gear, or existing gear). Score up to an extra 2 points if by-catch reduction gear is mandatory.	0	10	7.6.9	7.2.3
4	Are discards minimised? No (0); some attempt to reduce discards (2); discards reduced or very small (4); discards almost non-existent or completely under control (6). Reduction of discards through utilising all the catch can count for categories 1 and 2. Score up to an extra 2 points if discards are effectively reported. Score an extra 2 points if discards are legally banned.	0	10	7.6.9	7.2.3
5	Is the gear designed to minimise ghost fishing if lost? No (0); partially (5); effectively (10). (Score 10 for gear that cannot be lost, or cannot catch fish if lost).	0	10	7.6.9	7.2.2
6	Is the fishing of juveniles and spawners restricted to safe levels? No (0); a little (2); partially (4); almost completely satisfactorily (6). Add up to 2 points for effective monitoring of under-age fish and spawners. Add up to 2 points for effective enforcement of restrictions on under-age fish and spawners.	0	10	7.6.9	7.2.2
7	Are depleted stocks being rebuilt? Score on a graduated scale from; no (0); the intention is to rebuild, but it is not effective (2.5); some attempts at rebuilding with limited success in some stocks (5); some effective rebuilding of most depleted stocks (7.5); completely satisfactory rebuilding of all depleted stocks (10).	0	10	7.6.10	7.2.2

*Intermediate scoring is encouraged where small differences among the fisheries evaluated can be justified.*

## Evaluation Field 5: Social & Economic

### SCORES RESULTS OF MANAGEMENT

Attributes	Reference Points		Code Clauses	
	BAD	GOOD	main	other
1	0	10	7.6.5	7.1.9
2	0	10	7.6.6	7.4.5
3	0	10	7.6.6	7.1.6
4	0	10	7.6.7	7.2.2
5	0	10	7.6.7	7.4.2
6	0	10	7.7.4	7.4.3

*Intermediate scoring is encouraged where small differences among the fisheries evaluated can be justified.*

## Evaluation Field 6: Monitoring, Control & Surveillance (MCS)

### SCORES RESULTS OF MANAGEMENT

Attributes	Reference Points		Code Clauses	
	BAD	GOOD	main	other
1 On a scale of 0 to 10, how effective is the observer scheme? No scheme (0) to almost fully effective (10).	0	10	7.7.3	7.1.7
2 On a scale of 0 to 10, how effective is the catch inspection scheme? No scheme (0) to almost fully effective (10).	0	10	7.7.3	7.4.4
3 On a scale of 0 to 10, how effective is the vessel monitoring scheme? No scheme (0) to almost fully effective (10).	0	10	7.7.3	7.4.4
4 Are vessels fishing illegally in the area of this fishery? No (10); occasionally (7.5); often (5); a great deal - half as much as legal vessels (2.5); almost as much as, or more than legal vessels (0). If no information is available, score 10. <i>Note scoring direction.</i>	0	10	7.7.5	7.7.1
5 How effective is control of access in stopping illegal fishing? Not at all effective (0), to almost fully effective (10).	0	10	7.6.2	7.8.1
6 Are vessels that really derive from this jurisdiction re-flagged in States of Convenience to avoid reporting or other fishery regulations. Never (10), sometimes (9-5), often (4-3), practice is very common (2-0). <i>Note scoring direction.</i>	0	10	7.7.5	8

*Intermediate scoring is encouraged where small differences among the fisheries evaluated can be justified.*

#### 44 attributes scored in 6 evaluation fields

Revised Nov 2004, March 2007, August 2011 tjp