

WWF M&S TESCO

DON ÇAB

Maria

This checklist was funded through the WWF M&S partnership and the WWF Tesco partnership.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank all of those who provided valuable inputs and feedback into the document and the checklist, including Alec Taylor, Clarus Chu, Eilidh Milligan, Lief Hendrikz, Lucinda Kay, Simon Walmsley and Susan Hull from WWF, Ben Lambden from Tesco, Linda Wood from M&S and key seafood suppliers of WWF Basket signatory retailers.

For further information: Eilidh Milligan, Seafood Sustainability Officer, WWF-UK Email: <u>emilligan@wwf.org.uk</u>

Design: Clean Canvas Studio <u>cleancanvasstudio.co.uk</u>

January 2024



BACKGROUND

Food production is one of the biggest threats to our environment. It accounts for nearly 60% of global biodiversity loss and contributes to at least 30% of global greenhouse emissions¹. To tackle these impacts, the WWF Basket² was launched in 2021, with signatories to the WWF Retailers' Commitment for Nature committed to work with WWF towards our overall goal of halving the environmental impact of UK shopping baskets by 2030.

The WWF Basket includes key outcomes and measures across seven key areas including marine sustainability. The associated Blueprint for Action³ sets out key work priorities for retailers, governments, and other supply chain actors across each area, with the overall goal for marine sustainability being that 100% of seafood will be from sustainable sources by 2030. Within this, one of marine sustainability targets is the adoption of the seafood jurisdictional initiative⁴ (formerly known as Seascape approach).

The seafood jurisdictional initiative aims to set preferential sourcing from the "seascapes" or "sea areas" (i.e., within defined jurisdictional boundaries) that are well-managed and reward market actors (i.e., value chain stakeholders) who support this new hybrid approach towards ecosystem-based ocean management and beyond seafood certification schemes. This approach encourages value chain stakeholders to advocate for better and improved management at regional and national levels, as well as at their supply chain levels. Engagement with key market stakeholders through a jurisdictional seascape approach is expected to support more effective fisheries management.

In 2021, following WWF's launch of its global tuna strategy⁵, WWF launched the tuna jurisdictional seascape approach ⁶ (now referred to as the tuna seafood jurisdictional initiative). To support this approach, WWF released the Tuna Sourcing Issues Identification Checklist⁷ in 2022 to link market actors such as retailers and suppliers to the level of governance at which regional fisheries management is decided. Since seafood scouring involves a wide range of species, there is a need to transform the sustainability of seafood supply chains beyond tuna species. As such WWF has, in this document, expanded the sourcing issues identification checklist to cover other wild-caught seafood commodity groups.



A CHECKLIST TO IDENTIFY ISSUES IN SOURCING SUPPLY CHAINS FOR WILD-CAUGHT SEAFOOD COMMODITY GROUPS

The first step to supporting the seafood jurisdictional initiative is to have a better understanding of specific seafood commodity group value chains that companies are sourcing from. This involves checking with the downstream and/or upstream stakeholders to seek evidence, verifying existing information and identifying any gaps in information.

This checklist aims to help wild-caught seafood value chain stakeholders to identify the strengths and shortcomings of a specific supply chain against key elements of the seafood jurisdictional initiative. These areas include:

Topics	Areas
Human rights	Human rights, decent work conditions on vessels for crew and local communities
Climate change	Carbon emission measuring and reporting e.g., MRV (measurement, reporting, verification) ⁸
Biology	Fish stock levels, Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB8) and fishing mortality ⁹
Fishing activity (supply chain practice)	Bycatch of Endangered, Threatened or Protected (ETP9) and other species, gear specific best practices, habitats and ecosystems, transhipment, observer coverage and fishing activities transparency ¹⁰
Fisheries governance on management and/or conservation measures	Management in terms of Harvest Strategies (HS10), Harvest Control Rules (HCR), complementary with high seas treaty BBNJ (legally binding instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction), Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA), fins naturally attached policy
Value chain stakeholder actions	Advocacy towards human rights and decent working conditions and measures towards them, transparency and traceability, and fisheries market improvement



This checklist serves as a one-stop shop that covers the key, known issues identified in wild-caught seafood sourcing. These key issues are also important elements to implement the seafood jurisdictional initiative where pre-competitive collaborations, particularly when it comes to advocacy, are needed.

The checklist lists four scenario stages ranging from the worst to the best-case scenarios, which provide a path for value chain stakeholders to work toward the seafood jurisdictional initiative "best case scenario" for wild-caught seafood.

- The **worst-case scenario** indicates that either conservation targets within the checklist are not met or there is a lack of evidence, data, or information to support claims that targets are met. This implies improvement actions need to be taken and/ or require higher transparency at fleet, fisheries, national and/or regional levels.
- The **best-case scenario** indicates that targets are met and there is supporting evidence to demonstrate that these targets are met. The best-case scenario is built on the outcomes of established WWF initiatives and positions, other developed projects, or guidelines from other NGOs and/or other organisations to allow value chain stakeholders to continue to support good courses. It should be noted that if multiple guidelines on the same issues are available, the most precautionary approach will be adopted in this checklist.

HOW TO USE THE CHECKLIST

It is recommended value chain stakeholders use the checklist to identify risks, and support their own supply chains to drive improvements, as well as to collaborate with other supply chains within the same jurisdictional boundary to advocate for regional improvement on seafood commodity resource management.

This can be applied at the lowest level of the supply chain, and looked at for wildcaught commodity groups such as: whitefish (e.g. cod, haddock, monkfish, pollock, bass), flatfish (plaice, sole, turbot, halibut, flounder), salmonids (Atlantic, Danube, Pacific salmons, trout), small pelagics (sardines, mackerel, anchovies, herring), large pelagics other than tuna (swordfish, sailfish, king mackerel), crustaceans (lobsters, crabs, prawns, langoustines, crayfish), and molluscs (mussels, oysters, scallops, squid, octopus). The checklist can be used as a supplementary tool to accompany existing risk assessment tools such as seafood rating guides, sourcing risk assessment guidelines or seafood certification reports. The checklist also provides useful resources, where available, on each topic area to ensure information, and recommendations for best practice can be easily found.

It is recognised the seafood jurisdictional initiative is a novel approach, which requires the collaboration of a wide range of stakeholders, not just retailers and suppliers. It is hoped this checklist will provide a concrete tool for wild-caught seafood value chain stakeholders to track their progress towards greater sustainability, in line with WWF Basket target outcomes. The marine pillar of the WWF Basket supports the overall aim of the WWF Basket to halve the environmental impact of UK shopping baskets by 2030, by driving down impacts on the marine environment.





e.G

				4 STA	GES OF PROGRE	SSION		
AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Human rights	Human rights and decent working conditions	Company/fleet policy on human rights, decent working conditions and local communities	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood	No policy	Policy in development and will be available in the next 3 months	Policy in place, included in employment contracts and available upon request	Policy in place, included in employment contracts and publicly available	 Individual company human right and decent working conditions policies and audit report Exploring the human rights-based approach in the context of the implementation and monitoring of the SSF Guidelines: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/es/c/cf221202-89fc-4c97-9f5b-3dfbe9f5e32e/
			Enabling legal framework and policies	No or unknown consideration of local communities' rights and interests when the supply chain exploits the same species			Rights and interests of local communities are incorporated in the company policy	PAS 1550:2017 Code of Practice: https://www.iuuwatch.eu/role-of-industry/
			Social and political will to support improvement	No engagement on forums to advance human rights at sea	Ad-hoc engagement on forums to advance human rights at sea		Regular engagement (more than 1x per year) with forums to advance human rights at sea	 Seafood Taskforce IUU Supply Chain Oversight: https://www.seafoodtaskforce.global ILO stakeholder engagement - inquiries of interest: https://roadsafetyfund.un.org/sites/default/files/downloads/ resources/2022-05/2022%20UNRSF%20PUNO%20Strategy%20 Document_ILO.pdf
		Compliance with standard or certification	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood	No certification and no voluntary standard/code	Voluntary standard/code in place or being worked towards, with self-auditing and audit report available	Voluntary standard/code in place with independent auditing	All relevant vessels certified, and information is publicly available	 Global Seafood Alliance (GSA) Responsible Fishing Vessel Scheme (RFVS): https://bspcertification.org PAS 1550 Voluntary Code: https://ejfoundation.org/resources/downloads/PAS_1550.pdf Seafood Ethics Action Alliance Risk Tool: https://seaa.org Fisheries Progress Social Responsibility Policy and Assessment Tool: https://fisheryprogress.org/social-responsibility Human Rights at sea report - reviewing certification standards: https://www.humanrightsatsea.org/sites/default/files/media- files/2023-02/Does_it_do_What_it_Says_on_the_Tin_Fisheries_ and_Aquaculture_Certification_Standards_and_Ratings_Ecosystem_ Review.pdf

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED IMPROVEMENT/ PROGRESS	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Human rights	Human rights and decent working conditions	Historical records of human rights abuses	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood	Recent report(s) of event(s) (<1 year) in vessel(s) and/or other vessel(s) of parent company. No action plan	Report(s) of event(s) (1-3 years) in fishery and/or parent company. Action plan implemented. Older reports but no action plan	Report(s) of event(s) (3-5 years) in fishery and/or parent company. Action plan implemented	No report(s) of event(s) >5 years, with implemented mitigation plan to prevent occurrence	 News reports, articles, studies or other documents recording human rights abuses in the fishery and/or parent company The Seafood Ethics Action Alliance risk assessment: <u>https://seaa.org/</u> Seafood Social Risk Tool: <u>https://www.seafoodwatch.org/our-projects/seafood-social-risk-tool</u> Walk Free - Global Slavery Index: <u>https://www.walkfree.org/global-slavery-index/map/</u>
		Worker grievance policy and reporting	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood	No procedure, policy or reporting in place. No record of employee grievance policy training	Procedure in place with response protocols but no regular review or reporting (> 1 year). No record of employee grievance policy training	Procedure in place with response protocols and with regular review and reporting (at least once a year). Record of employee grievance policy training	Procedure in place with response protocol and is regularly (at least once a year) independently reviewed and reported. Evidence available upon request. Record of regular employee grievance policy training	 Fishery Progress Social Performance: https://fisheryprogress.org/social-responsibility/our-approach UN Guiding Principles: https://www.ungpreporting.org/ Accountability Framework Initiative – Human Rights: https://accountability-framework.org/issues/human-rights/.
		Employment rights and agreements	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood Enabling legal framework and policies	No policy or agreements in place	Policy in place, no or unknown agreement status for all workers	Policy in place and employment rights and agreements for some workers in employment contracts	Policy in place and employment rights and agreements for all workers/ collective agreement in place in employment contracts	 Human Rights at Sea: An independent Business and Human Rights Review of the Maritime Environment: https://www.humanrightsatsea.org/sites/default/files/media- files/2022-10/HRAS_Business_Human_Rights_Review_All_at_Sea- October%202022-LR%20Unlocked.pdf Staff handbook available, in languages spoken by workers
		Health and safety	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood	Incidents are not reported, with no health and safety policy or procedure in place	Policy in place but no regular inspections or reporting (> 1 year) by a competent Occupational Health & Safety (OHS) trained member of staff		Policy in place, with regular inspections by a competent OHS trained member of staff and reporting (at least once a year)	 UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/big-issues/un-guiding- principles-on-business-human-rights/ UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework: https://www.ungpreporting.org/

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Climate change	Carbon emission measuring and reporting	Carbon emissions reporting	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	No measurement or information reporting of scope 1, 2, or 3 emissions supply chain emissions	Measurement and/or reporting information of one of scope 1 and 2 or 3 supply chain emissions only	Measurement and/ or reporting scope 1, 2 and 3 supply chain emissions	Measurement and reporting of information of scope 1, 2, and 3 supply chain emissions and science-based target in place for to reach net zero is in place and evidence available to share upon request	 World Economic Forum on Scope 1, 2 and 3: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/09/scope-emissions-climate-greenhouse-business/. Environmental performance of blue foods: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03889-2 Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers: https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aaq0216 Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTI) Corporate Net-Zero Standard: https://sciencebasedtargets.org/resources/files/ Net-Zero-Standard.pdf Seafish: Climate Change - Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Seafood Production: https://www.seafish.org/insight-and-research/current-and-future-trends/greenhouse-gas-emissions-from-seafood-production/ Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHGP) - Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard: https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-value-chain-scope-3-standard#:~ttext=The%20Scope%203%0Standard%20 provides.accounting%20more%20easy%20and%20accessible. Wrap: Scope 3 GHG Measurement and Reporting Protocols for Food and Drink: https://wrap.org.uk/resources/guide/scope-3-ghg-measurement-and-reporting-protocols-food-and-drink
		Emissions from fishing/ transhipment activities (e.g., fossil fuels)	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	Unknown emissions or no measures or practices to reduce emissions from baseline level	Policy to reduce emissions from baseline level is in place, but not implemented or no action in place	Policy in place and action plan implemented to reduce emissions from baseline level in place, but not reported	Policy in place and action plan implemented, with monitoring showing reduction in emissions over time from baseline level	 Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch and Dalhousie University Seafood Carbon Emissions Tool: <u>http://seafoodco2.dal.ca/</u> Individual vessel(s) emission assessment Fuel consumption of global fishing fleets: current understanding and knowledge gaps: <u>https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/faf.12087</u>
		Gear interaction with blue carbon in the seabed	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	Unknown impact to seabed blue carbon stores			Impact of gear on blue carbon seabed stores is known and has been minimised or is proven to be negligible	 Assessment of carbon capture & storage within English North Sea: https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/sams_03745_ bcnsea_final_reportissue_03_wwf.pdf

Biology Stock health Stock health Stock health Stock health Rated as unstallow report (Principle reporting and reporting Rated as unstallow report (Principle reporting and reporting Rated as unstallow report (Principle assessment tools Rated as yellow/F0-80 with stock trend as stable or going assessment tools Rated as yellow/F0-80 with stock rend as stable or going assessment tools Rated as healthy wassessment tools	AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
	Biology	Stock health	Stock health level	institutions and capacity for monitoring and	'unhealthy' / 'red' / <60 by established key assessment tools No control on fishing mortality (input or output control)	'yellow/'60-80' with stock trend as stable or going downward by key assessment tools Some control (e.g., moratorium, closure, etc.) but impacts or targets not clear (F/Fmsy	'yellow/'60-80' with stock trend as stable or going upward by key assessment tools Some control on fishing mortal and fishing is progressing to	/ 'green' / '<80' by established key assessment tools Full control on fishing mortality and is at	 Indicators (PIs) 1): https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/ FishSource profiles: https://www.fishsource.org/ WWF Seafood Guides: https://wwf.panda.org/act/live_green/out_shopping/seafood_guides/ UK Marine Conservation Society (MCS) - Good Fish Guide: https://www.mcsuk.org/goodfishguide/ Fish Wise Seafood Guide: https://seafood.ocean.org/seafood/. Stock assessment Databases: ICES Stock Assessment Database: https://sid.ices.dk/Default.aspx NAFO Stock Assessment Database: https://www.nafo.int/Science/Stocks-Advice Australian Stock Assessment Database: https://fish.gov.au/Reports/Key-results Mediterranean Stock Assessments: https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/medbs

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Fishing activity (supply chain network)	ETP bycatch	100% retention or non-retention of ETP species (in line with countries ETP policies) If trip was observed, report should come from observers, if not then aggregated logbook reports will suffice	Threatened and Endangered species recovery	No reporting	Reporting a portion of the interactions and retention where observed (e.g., only from some vessels)	Reporting of all interactions and retentions (e.g., submitted to the management authority, where observed, but not available to share upon request	Reporting of all interactions and retentions where observed, available to share upon request, proving 100% non-retention	 IUCN Red List Database: https://www.iucnredlist.org/ MSC final and/or audit report (Pls 2.2 & 2.3): https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/ Fisheries Improvement Project - Directory: https://fisheryprogress.org/directory Consolidated/aggregated national observer reports or logbooks FishSource profiles: https://www.fishsource.org/ WWF Seafood Guides: https://wwf.panda.org/act/live_green/out_shopping/seafood_guides/ UK Marine Conservation Society (MCS) - Good Fish Guide: https://www.mcsuk.org/goodfishguide/ Fish Wise Seafood Guide: https://seafood.ocean.org/seafood/ Monterey Bay Aquarium - Seafood Watch recommendations: https://www.seafoodwatch.org/recommendations
		ETP Bycatch handling and mitigation measures	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	No implementation of measures or action plan	Partially implemented with gap analysis and action plan	Implemented, but no evidence	Implemented and bycatch species encounter reports available to share upon request, evidence of reduction since implementation	 Bycatch mitigation guidelines: FAO – Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries: https://www.fao.org/3/cb2887en/cb2887en.pdf NOAA – National Bycatch Reduction Strategy: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/international/bycatch/national- bycatch-reduction-strategy Fisheries Bycatch of Sharks – Options for Mitigation: https://www.sarri.org/storage/app/media toolspdfsPewOSSsharkbycatchreviewpdf.pdf Can we manage marine mammal bycatch effectively in low-data environments: https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/ full/10.1111/1365-2664.13816 UK Clean Catch Bycatch Mitigation Hub: https://www.cleancatchuk.com/hub/

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Fishing activity (supply chain network)	Other species bycatch	Bycatch of other species (non-ETP species and other than the target species)	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	Unknown or high levels of bycatch of non-ETP species, including juveniles and choke species (in relation to the Landing Obligation in the UK and EU). No methods in place to reduce bycatch and no monitoring or reporting in place	Some methods in place to reduce bycatch but no evidence on monitoring or reporting	>5% bycatch although mitigation methods displaying reduction, with evidence of monitoring and reporting system. Evidence available upon request	Low levels (<5% of total catch) of bycatch non-ETP species, juveniles and choke species. Mitigation methods displaying reduction, with monitoring and reporting system in place. Evidence available upon request	 UK Clean Catch Application: https://www.cleancatchuk.com/clean-catch-uk-launches-new- wildlife-bycatch-reporting-app/ Bycatch management information system (BMIS) - Identification, Safe Handling and Release: https://www.bmis-bycatch.org/about- bmis/Identification-safe-handling-and-release FishSource profiles: https://www.fishsource.org/ WWF Seafood Guides: https://wwf.panda.org/act/live_green/out_shopping/seafood_guides/. UK Marine Conservation Society (MCS) - Good Fish Guide: https://www.mcsuk.org/goodfishguide/ Fish Wise Seafood Guide: https://seafood.ocean.org/seafood/ Monterey Bay Aquarium - Seafood Watch recommendations: https://www.seafoodwatch.org/recommendations
		Discards and high grading (other than ETP bycatch)	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	No control on discards and high-grading and contribute to overfishing of species	Some control in discards and high grading but contribute to overfishing of species	Significant control to eliminate discards and high grading but they do not contribute to overfishing of species	No discards and high grading reported with evidence	 ICES latest Advice: https://www.ices.dk/advice/Pages/Latest-Advice.aspx. FishSource profiles: https://www.fishsource.org/ WWF Seafood Guides: https://wwf.panda.org/act/live_green/out_shopping/seafood_guides/ UK Marine Conservation Society (MCS) - Good Fish Guide: https://www.mcsuk.org/goodfishguide/ Fish Wise Seafood Guide: https://seafood.ocean.org/seafood/ Monterey Bay Aquarium - Seafood Watch recommendations: https://www.seafoodwatch.org/recommendations

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Fishing activity (supply chain network)	Gear Best Practice	Abandoned, lost, discarded, fishing gear (ALDFG) and ghost fishing measures	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon Maintenance and restoration of critical habitats and ecosystems including MPAs Threatened and Endangered species recovery	No implementation of measures or action plan	Partially implemented with gap to identify where improvement measures are required and action plan to be developed	Implemented, but limited or no evidence	Effective measures implemented and reports available to share upon request	 Global Ghost Gear Initiative (GGGI) Data Portal: https://globalghostgearportal.net/login.php FAO - Responsible Fishing Practices for Sustainable Fisheries: Abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear: https://www.fao.org/responsible-fishing/resources/detail/ en/c/1316896/ MSC final and/or audit report: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/
		Bait fisheries management where relevant (e.g., pot & trap)	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	No management and/or no information	Partially implemented with gap analysis to identify where improvement measures are required and action plan to be developed	Implemented, but limited or no evidence	Effective management implemented and reports available to share upon request	 MSC final and/or audit report: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/ Fishery Progress: https://fisheryprogress.org/_ Individual fisheries management plans
		Demersal towed gears (beam, dredge and otter trawls) modification	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	No reporting/ unknown modification to reduce habitat impacts and/or improve selectivity	Pilot trials/ <50% of the supply is from modified gears to reduce habitat impacts and/or improve selectivity but limited or no evidence	>50% of the supply is from modified gear to reduce habitat impacts and/or improve selectivity with evidence upon request	100% of the supply is from modified gear to reduce habitat impacts and/or improve selectivity with evidence upon request	 UK Clean Catch Application: https://www.cleancatchuk.com/clean-catch-uk-launches-new- wildlife-bycatch-reporting-app/ UK Fishing Gear Database: https://www.seafish.org/responsible-sourcing/fishing- gear-database/

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED IMPROVEMENT/ PROGRESS	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Fishing activity (supply chain network)	Habitats and ecosystems	Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) and habitat impacts (including spawning and nursery grounds)	Maintenance and restoration of critical habitats and ecosystems including MPAs	No mapping or knowledge of impact in fishing area	VMEs and habitats partially mapped and impacts partially known within fishing area, but no mitigation action or avoidance	VMEs and habitats fully mapped, and impacts known within fishing area, with some mitigation and or avoidance action	VMEs and habitats fully mapped, and impacts known within fishing area, with effective mitigation and avoidance actions implemented or impacts are proven to be negligible. Evidence available upon request	 FAO Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME) Database: https://www.fao.org/in-action/vulnerable-marine-ecosystems/en/
		MPA avoidance	Maintenance and restoration of critical habitats and ecosystems including MPAs	No reporting of MPA avoidance	Avoidance of fishing in MPA(s) according to MPA management objective. Evidence available upon request		Voluntary avoidance of fishing in MPA(s) regardless of the MPA management objective. Evidence available upon request	 MSC final and/or audit report: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/_ UK Seafish King Fishers Bulletin: https://kingfisherbulletin.org/ Evidence from individual/group of vessels
	Transhipment (if transhipment occurs)	NGO Transhipment best practice recommendations	Enabling legal framework and policies	No implementation or action plan	Partially implemented with gap analysis and action plan	Implemented, but no evidence	Implemented and reports available to share upon request	 The Pew Charitable Trusts - Best Practice for Transhipment: https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2017/11/gtc_best_ practices_for_transshipment.pdf%20Also%20look%20into%20PAS %201550%20recommendations
			Social and political will to support improvement					 FAO guidelines on transhipment: <u>https://www.fao.org/3/nj938en/nj938en.pdf</u> PAS 1550:2017 Code of Practice: <u>https://www.iuuwatch.eu/role-of-industry/</u>

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Fishing activity (supply chain network)	Observer coverage on fishing vessels	100% observer coverage for distant fishing vessels (EM/human observers on all voyages)	Enabling legal framework and policies	No observer coverage on sourcing fishing vessels	Up to 5-30% observer coverage	Up to 31-60% observer coverage	100% observer coverage and observer report available upon request and/ or submitted to the management authority	 Provided by the fleet/vessel(s) Planet Tracker Bonding with Observers (includes average coverage by fishery management organisation): https://planet-tracker.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Observers- Briefing-Paper.pdf
		Remote Electronic Monitoring (REM) with camera on- board for domestic fishing within/ adjacent to EEZ	Enabling legal framework and policies	No REM installed or REM on-board with no analysis	Up to 30% REM installed and data analysed	Up to 60% REM installed and data analysed	100% REM installed and reports available upon request and/ or submitted to relevant authorities	Provided by the fleet/vessel(s)
	Transparency	Vessel list: including vessel's name, size, gear, flag, IMO number or another Unique Vessel Identifier (UVI)	Enabling legal framework and policies	Not available	Available upon request		Publicly available	 MSC final and annual audit reports: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/ Global Fishing Watch (GFW) Map: https://globalfishingwatch.org/ Trygg Mat Tracking (TMT) Combined IUU Vessel List: https://iuu-vessels.org/ FAO Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels: https://www.fao.org/global-record/information-system/en/ Vessels listed on Fisheries Progress: https://fisheryprogress.org/ FAO - Voluntary Guidelines for Catch Documentation Schemes: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/rulesneg_e/fish_e/ 2017_vg_cds.pdf

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Governance	Management	Harvest Strategies (HS) - target stock	Enabling legal framework and policies	No HS	Under a plan to implement harvest strategy within next 5 years	HS adopted, but may be non- binding	HS adopted and binding, with regularly updated stock assessments (no more than 3 years)	State or country level fishery management plans
		Healthy stock target and fishing mortality control	Enabling legal framework and policies	Rated as 'fail' /'not effective' / 'red' / <60 by established key assessment tools	Rated as 'partially effective', 'yellow'/'60-80' with stock trend as stable or going downward by key assessment tools	Rated as 'largely effective'/ 'yellow'/'60-80' with stock trend as stable or going upward by key assessment tools	Rated as 'good' / 'green' / '<80' by established key assessment tools	 WWF seafood guides: https://wwf.panda.org/act/live_green/out_shopping/seafood_guides/ MSC final and/or audit report: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/ UK Marine Conservation Society (MCS) - Good Fish Guide: https://www.mcsuk.org/goodfishguide/ Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch: https://www.seafoodwatch.org/recommendations FishSource profiles: https://www.fishsource.org/
		ETP protection and recovery	Threatened and Endangered species recovery	No/unknown fisheries related regulatory target(s) on ETP protection and recovery	Fisheries related regulatory target(s) on ETP protection and recovery set but with no/unknown outcomes	Fisheries related regulatory target(s) on ETP protection and recovery set and strong compliance in ETP mortality reduction	Fisheries does not result in ETP mortality with evidence	 Stock assessment Databases: ICES Stock Assessment Database: https://sid.ices.dk/Default.aspx NAFO Stock Assessment Database: https://www.nafo.int/Science/Stocks-Advice Australian Stock Assessment Database: https://fish.gov.au/Reports/Key-results
		Discards and protection of juvenile bycatch	Sufficient institutions and capacity for monitoring and reporting	No/unknown discards and juvenile bycatch reduction/ban policy	Discards and juvenile bycatch reduction/ ban policy in development	Discards and juvenile bycatch reduction/ban policy in place but with no evidence that the policy is effective	Discards and juvenile bycatch reduction/ban policy in place with evidence that the policy is effective	Mediterranean Stock Assessments: <u>https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/medbs</u>

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Governance	Management	Ecosystem based approach for fishery management implementation	Ecosystem-based management including blue carbon	No commitment/ unknown	Commitment to ecosystem- based approach for fishery management but no implementation	Ecosystem based approach for fishery management implemented but no evidence	Ecosystem based approach for fishery management implemented with clear parameters and measured with evidence	 Based on national commitment: European commitment to EBFM: https://cinea.ec.europa.eu/publications/implementation- ecosystem-based-approaches-applied-fisheries-management- under-cfp_en Fishsec - Ecosystem based approach: https://www.fishsec.org/management-strategies/ecosystem- based-approach/ NOAA - Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/ecosystems/ecosystem- based-fisheries-management Australian Fisheries Management Authority - Ecological risk management strategies: https://www.afma.gov.au/fisheries-management/management- tools/ecological-risk-management-strategies
		National government (flag country) with strategy that aligns with the High Seas	Enabling legal framework and policies	No			Yes, aligned	 UN BBNJ: Agreement Under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction: N2317728.pdf (un.org)
		Treaty (BBNJ)	Maintenance and restoration of critical habitats and ecosystems including MPAs					National government websites
		Historical records of IUU fishing	Enabling legal framework and policies	Recent report(s) of event(s) (<5 years) on vessel(s) or other vessel(s) of parent company or flag state	Report(s) of event(s) (5-10 years) on vessel(s) or other vessel(s) of parent company or flag state	Report(s) of event(s) (10-20 years) on vessel(s) or other vessel(s) of parent company or flag state	No report(s) of event(s)	 FAO Illegal, Unreported, Unregulated (IUU) fishing: https://www.fao.org/iuu-fishing/background/what-is-iuu-fishing/en/. Combined IUU Vessel List: https://www.iuu-vessels.org IUU fishing index: https://iuufishingindex.net/ News reports, articles, studies or other documents recording human rights abuses in the fishery and/or parent company

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Governance	Management	Port State Measure Agreement (PSMA) (landing country or flag state)	Enabling legal framework and policies	Not ratified by the landing country / flag state and no plan for ratification	Ratified by the landing country / flag state, but no action plan or enforcement	Ratified by the landing country / flag state, have action plan but unknown or weak enforcement	Yes, ratified by the landing country / flag state, effectively implemented, enforced and reported	 UN FAO Agreement on Port State Measures: <u>https://www.fao.org/port-state-measures/resources/detail/en/c/1419027/</u> Letters, email or meeting notes with management authorities of the landing country or flag state re enforcement & report
		Fins Naturally Attached (FNA) policy in line with industry best practice at company/fleet level (as relevant)	Threatened and Endangered species recovery	No action plan in place and no plan for implementation	Action plan in place but implementation outcomes not available		Yes, policy effectively implemented and evidence available upon request	 UK Parliament Shark Fins Bill: https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9591/ CBP-9591.pdf NOAA Technical Memorandum Guide to Landing Shark Species with
			Enabling legal framework and policies					 Fins Naturally Attached: https://www.cms.int/sharks/sites/default/files/publication/NMFS- SEFSC-712%20%283%29.pdf MSC final and annual audit reports: https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/
		ILO Convention 188 implementation (flag state)	Enabling legal framework and policies	ILO convention 188 not ratified and no plan for ratification	Ratified but no action plan or enforcement	Ratified, have action plan but unknown or weak enforcement	Yes, ratified, effectively implemented, enforced, and reported	 International Labour Organization: Ratifications of C188 – Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (No.188): https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/ en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:11300:0::NO::p11300_instrument_id:312333 Letters, email or meeting notes with management authorities of
			Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood					the landing country or flag state re enforcement & report
Value chain stakeholder actions	Advocacy towards human rights and decent working conditions	Participation in industry groups to advance human rights and working condition in seafood sourcing (e.g., Seafood Task Force, SEA Alliance, ISSF, GTA)	Human well-being benefits including human rights and livelihood	No	Yes, interact with relevant management authority not regularly (<1/year)	Yes, interact with relevant management authority and regularly (>1/year)	Yes, interact with relevant management authority and as a member of related committee(s)/ group(s) (>1/year)	 UK Seafood Ethics Action Alliance: https://www.seafish.org/responsible-sourcing/social-responsibility- in-seafood/seafood-ethics-action-alliance/ Seafood Task Force: https://www.seafoodtaskforce.global/

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Value chain stakeholder actions	Advocacy towards improving the above measures	Participation in industry groups with a mission related to sustainable fisheries management	Social and political will to support improvement	No	Yes, interact with relevant management authority not regularly (<1/year)	Yes, interact with relevant management authority and regularly (>1/year)	Yes, interact with relevant management authority and as a member of related committee(s)/ group(s) (>1/year)	 Marine Conservation Alliance - promoting sustainable fisheries to feed the world: <u>http://marineconservationalliance.org/</u> North Atlantic Pelagic Advocacy Group (NAPA): <u>https://www.seafish.org/responsible-sourcing/uk-fisheries- management-and-supply-chain-initiatives/north-atlantic-pelagic- advocacy-group/</u> Sustainable Seafood Coalition (SSC): <u>https://www.sustainableseafoodcoalition.org/</u> UK Seafood Ethics Action Alliance: <u>https://www.seafish.org/responsible-sourcing/social-responsibility- in-seafood/seafood-ethics-action-alliance/</u>
		Independent advocacy (direct meetings, letters, etc) with fisheries management authority	Social and political will to support improvement	No	Yes, interact with fisheries management authority not regularly (<1/year)	Yes, interact with fisheries management authority and regularly (>1/year)	Yes, interact with relevant fisheries management authority and as a member of fisheries related committee(s)/ group(s) (>1/year)	 Letters, email or meeting notes with management authorities and/or catching sector Individual company press releases
		Direct interaction & advocacy with catching sector	Social and political will to support improvement	No	Yes, but not regularly (<1/year)	Yes, and regularly (>1/year)	Yes, joint with the catching sector to have continuous relationship with the flag state(s) or relevant management authority	 Letters, email or meeting notes with management authorities and/or catching sector (e.g., fishing company, producer organisation, fishers)
		Product source made public and at least updated yearly through the Ocean Disclosure Project (ODP) or company website	Social and political will to support improvement	No	Yes, updates have been implemented but not annually (>3 year	Yes, updates have been implemented but not annually (<3 years)	Yes, annual updates have been implemented	Ocean Disclosure Project (ODP) – Transparency in Seafood: <u>https://oceandisclosureproject.org/</u>

AREA	SUBAREA	MEASURE	SEAFOOD Jurisdictional Initiative Component	WORST CASE Scenario	MINOR Improvement/ Progress	ADVANCED Improvement/ Progress	BEST CASE Scenario	USEFUL RESOURCES FOR BACKGROUND OR GUIDANCE
Value chain stakeholder actions	Transparency	Company sustainability policy (including environmental, social and climate) publicly available	Social and political will to support improvement	No	Yes, for at least 1 (environmental, social and climate) component	Yes, for at least 2 (environmental, social and climate) components	Yes, for all 3 (environmental, social and climate) components	Individual company or PO website
		Public annual company reporting on sustainability (including environmental, social and climate)	Social and political will to support improvement	No			Yes	Individual company or PO website
	Traceability	Full chain traceability	Enabling legal framework and policies	Minimum legal requirements	Traceability between select levels of the supply chain		Full chain traceability available from catch to consumer	 EU IUU Fishing Coalition: Sustainable Supply Chains: PAS 1550: https://www.iuuwatch.eu/role-of-industry/_ Planet Tracker - Seafood Database: https://planet-tracker.org/seafood-database
			Enabling legal framework and policies	No data sharing commitment	Public commitment on interoperable data sharing via third party system(s)	Implementation of interoperable data sharing via third party system(s)	Data available to be shared upon request and interoperable within 48 hours	The Global Dialogue on Seafood Traceability: <u>https://traceability-dialogue.org</u>
	Market improvement approach	Fisheries specific improvement projects	Social and political will to support improvement	Not sourced from a Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) or other improvement initiatives	Sourced from FIP or other improvement initiatives but no participation/ funding to the project	Sourced from and funded the FIP or other improvement initiatives but no participation in project implementation	Sourced, funded and active participation in FIP or other improvement initiatives project implementation and relevant meetings with evidence	 Fisheries Progress - Directory: <u>https://fisheryprogress.org/directory</u> Fishery Improvement Project: <u>https://www.fisheryimprovementprojects.com/</u> Individual FIP website

REFERENCES

- 1 Statistic on food production GHG emissions: <u>Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG</u> <u>emissions | Nature Food</u>
- 2 WWF Basket: https://www.wwf.org.uk/basket-metric
- 3 WWF Basket Blueprint for Action: https://www.wwf.org.uk/sites/default/files/2021-11/WWF-BasketBlueprint-for-Action.pdf
- 4 Apel et al., 2023. Developing Jurisdictional Initiatives for the Seafood Sector: Full Guidelines. Conservation International & WWF. https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/developing-jurisdictionalinitiatives-for-the-seafood-sector-full-guidelines
- 5 WWF global tuna strategy: https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/tuna_strategy_2021_web.pdf
- 6 WWF Transforming the future of tuna: https://www.wwf.org.uk/transforming-the-future-of-tuna
- 7 WWF Tuna Sourcing Issues Identification Checklist https://www.wwf.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-03/WWFUK_TUNA_ID_ CHECKLIST_F_MAR2022.pdf
- 8 ISSF online glossary: https://www.iss-foundation.org/tuna-stocks-andmanagement/tuna-fishing/ issf-glossary/
- 9 MSC Vocabulary: https://www.msc.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/forbusiness/program-documents/chain-of-custody-supporting-documents/mscmsci-vocabulary.pdf?sfvrsn=c4ea6474_38_
- 10 ISSF online glossary: https://www.iss-foundation.org/tuna-stocks-andmanagement/tuna-fishing/ issf-glossary/
- 11 UN FAO Fisheries Glossary: https://www.fao.org/3/y3427e/y3427e0a.pdf





For a future where people and nature thrive | wwf.org.uk © 1986 panda symbol and ® "WWF" Registered Trademark of WWF. WWF-UK registered charity (1081247) and in Scotland (SC039593). A company limited by guarantee (4016725)