

Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) Tool: Processing Interpretation

April 28, 2023

Version 1.0 DRAFT

Contents

Background & Introduction	4
Purpose	4
How to Read this Document.....	4
Principle 1: Protect human rights, dignity, and access to resources.....	6
Component 1.1: Fundamental human rights are respected, labor rights are protected, and decent living and working conditions are provided, particularly for vulnerable and at-risk groups.	6
Indicator 1.1.1: Abuse and harassment	6
Indicator 1.1.2: Human trafficking and forced labor (1.1.2a); Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries (1.1.2b)	6
Indicator 1.1.2a: Forced labor and human trafficking	7
Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries.....	7
Indicator 1.1.3: Child labor	7
Indicator 1.1.4: Freedom of association and collective bargaining	8
Indicator 1.1.5: Earnings and benefits.....	9
Indicator 1.1.6: Adequate rest.....	10
Indicator 1.1.7: Access to basic services (1.1.7a and 1.1.7b)	10
Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities	11
Indicator 1.1.8: Occupational safety	11
Indicator 1.1.9: Medical response.....	12
Component 1.2: Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights.....	12
Indicator 1.2.1: Customary resource use rights.....	12
Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency.....	14
Principle 2: Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit	14
Component 2.1: Recognition, voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status.....	14

Indicator 2.1.1: Grievance reporting and access to remedy	14
Indicator 2.1.2: Stakeholder participation and collaborative management	15
Component 2.2: Equitable opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain	15
Indicator 2.2.1: Equitable opportunity to benefit.....	15
Indicator 2.2.2: Discrimination.....	16
Principle 3: Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security	16
Component 3.1: Nutritional and sustenance needs of resource-dependent communities are maintained or improved.....	16
Indicator 3.1.1: Food and nutrition security (3.1.1a and 3.1.1b)	16
Indicator 3.1.1a: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries.....	17
Indicator 3.1.1b: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries.....	17
Indicator 3.1.2: Healthcare	18
Indicator 3.1.3: Education.....	18
Component 3.2: Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation	18
Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to and within community	18
Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention	19
Indicator 3.2.3: Long-term profitability and future workforce	19
Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy	19
Indicator 3.2.5: Livelihood security	20
Indicator 3.2.5: Fuel resource efficiency	20

Background & Introduction

The Social Responsibility Assessment Tool (SRA) was developed in 2017 as a means to action the [Monterey Framework](#) as a risk assessment for users to better understand social risk in seafood supply chains. The Monterey Framework is based on three main principles:



The SRA itself actions these principles by further breaking them down into components, indicators, and specific Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts (PISGs). During an assessment, data are collected against the PISGs, which can then be used to determine risk levels based on the SRA framework.

The SRA was designed for applicability in a broad range of contexts, including fisheries (small-scale and industrial), processing, and seafood processing. The applicability Decision Tree (page 7 of the SRA) was designed to ensure the SRA indicators are suited for the context within which the SRA is being implemented. This Decision Tree poses a set of very intentional yes / no questions which once answered, determines which SRA indicators should be assessed during an SRA.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide detailed guidance and explanation on how to interpret certain SRA PISGs for the processing context. It is meant to be used in preparation for and during an SRA to ensure appropriate data are being collected to adequately assess risk according to the SRA intent.

How to Read this Document

The document is divided into principles and components and includes tables for each indicator where interpretation is merited. Each indicator also notes applicability for the processing context, with anecdotes to demonstrate for additional clarity.

The following outlines the format of each indicator:

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
##.##	Applicability decision tree questions verbatim.	Indicates if / which indicators are applicable according to your answer related to the scoring guidance	Describes why this indicator is important generally	Details about applicability and how it may differ in processing. This section should make it clear to the reader whether or not they should collect data on the respective indicator according to Unit of Assessment characteristics.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection
SRA#.#.# S#	HIGH MEDIUM LOW	Verbatim text from the SRA.	Details on how the SRA PISG should be interpreted for processing and guidance on relevant data collection sources.

Only PISGs that need interpretation are listed. If there is no interpretation, the assessor should collect data on the PISG as it is written. There are some indicators within which none of the PISGs include interpretation for processing, however these indicators will have interpretation on applicability. Where there is no further interpretation, this will be noted.

In this document, the following definitions specific to the processing sector will apply:

- **Piece Rate:** The ILO defines piece rate as “pay occurs when workers are paid by the unit performed (e.g. the number of tee shirts or bricks produced) instead of being paid on the basis of time spent on the job”¹.

¹ Find more information about piece rate pay on the ILO website: https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/wages/minimum-wages/definition/WCMS_439067/lang-en/index.htm#1

Principle 1: Protect human rights, dignity, and access to resources

Component 1.1: Fundamental human rights are respected, labor rights are protected, and decent living and working conditions are provided, particularly for vulnerable and at-risk groups.

Indicator 1.1.1: Abuse and harassment

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.1	Score for all fisheries / farms	Abuse and harassment	In any occupation anywhere in the world, workers should be able to undertake their roles free from abuse and harassment.	This is applicable in all cases.

(No additional guidance)

Indicator 1.1.2: Human trafficking and forced labor (1.1.2a); Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries (1.1.2b)

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.2	Is the fishery/farm industrial or medium scale with labor recruitment from other countries and/or contracts with employers likely?	If YES, score 1.1.2a Human trafficking and forced labor If NO, score 1.1.2b Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries	The main risk in 1.1.2a is focused on an employee-employer relationship, as this is where forced labor situations occur most commonly (i.e., due to power dynamics). This can also be true for hired labor on smallholder farms that may be put in a vulnerable situation. Conversely, the main risk in 1.1.2b is that a small-scale fisher or farmer may be coerced into an abusive relationship with a buyer / debtholder (such as a lender supporting the purchase of a farm or vessel), hindering the fisher / farmer's ability to earn an income.	1.1.2a will always be applicable for processing and 1.1.2b will always be N/A.

Indicator 1.1.2a: Forced labor and human trafficking

Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries

(No additional guidance)

Indicator 1.1.3: Child labor

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.3	Score for all fisheries / farms	Child labor	Protection of children is fundamental to their rights to develop free from hazardous labor that may infringe on their ability to complete schooling. For small, family-owned operations, it is common that children grow up supporting the family farm, however there is still a need to protect those children from abusive labor practices and any support to their family should not interfere with their right to attend school.	This indicator will always be applicable for processing; however, family labor is not permitted. Under no circumstances should a child below the legal age of employment be hired to work in a seafood processing facility.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.3 S4	MEDIUM	Children below the legal age of employment work alongside family members only if this does not interfere with schooling, and on tasks which do not harm their health, safety or morals, and do not work at night,	This PISG should be marked as “Not Assessed” for processing sites. Under no circumstances should children below the legal age, whether or not they are working alongside family members, be employed at a seafood processing facility.
SRA1.1.3 S5	MEDIUM	There is no evidence of hazardous child labor, children below the legal age of employment are not paid as waged workers, nor does the work interfere with their schooling or pose risk to their health and safety, BUT the farm or fishery does not have a child labor policy that ensures the best interests of the child and that the child does not end up in a worse form of employment.	These PISGs combine language from other PISGs in the child labor indicator, including SRA1.1.3 S3 regarding children working alongside family. As SRA1.1.3 S3 is not permissible in the processing context, that holds true for these two indicators as well.
SRA1.1.3 S6	LOW	There is no evidence of hazardous child labor, children below the legal age of employment are not paid as waged	Under no circumstances should children below the legal age, whether or not they are working alongside family members, be employed at a seafood processing facility.

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
		workers, nor does the work alongside family members interfere with their schooling or pose risk to their health and safety, and the farm or fishery has a child labor policy that ensures the best interests of the child and that the child does not end up in a worse form of employment.	

Indicator 1.1.4: Freedom of association and collective bargaining

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.4	Score for all fisheries / farms	Freedom of association and collective bargaining	Worker voice is critical right to those in the labor force. Employees of any kind should be supported in speaking up as a group and bring forward issues in a constructive manner at their place of work, whether as a right protected by law, or as a protection offered by their employer.	This is applicable in all cases.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.4 S4	MEDIUM	Human rights defenders are not actively suppressed and there is no recent record of litigation by employers against human rights defenders,	This PISG as it is written does not specify if this is suppression via the Unit of Assessment or generally, but the intent is that this covers both. The assessor should collect secondary data (desk research) that indicates whether this is an issue in the country or sector, independent of the site, in addition to the site specifically. Furthermore, the assessor should collect data that indicates whether they have reason to believe the Unit of Assessment itself is engaged in any suppression of human rights defenders. This may include supporting groups that are engaging in these kinds of activities.
SRA1.1.4 S5	MEDIUM	There is no discrimination against workers/fishers/farmers who are members or leaders of organizations, unions or	For processing facilities, this also applies to any alternative worker organizations inside the company.

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
		cooperatives, and workers / fishers / farmers are not dismissed for exercising their right to strike.	

Indicator 1.1.5: Earnings and benefits

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.5	Are workers or farmers wage workers?	If YES, score 1.1.5 Earnings and benefits	<p>This indicator is designed to have an assessor collect data on pay to workers hired by an employer to ensure the terms are fair and in line with legislation.</p> <p>For a small-scale fishery or smallholder farm, if hired labor is not present and/or only family labor is used, the risk is related to livelihood security covered in Principle 3 of the SRA.</p>	“Wages” here can also refer to “piece rate”. A processing site that pays a \$/unit amount is still responsible for rates allowing employees to earn at least the legal minimum wage in a regular work week (i.e., without having to work overtime hours).

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.5 S4	MEDIUM	Wage levels and benefits meet the minimum legal requirements according to domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel.	In processing, it is common that workers may be paid via a piece rate system whereby they earn a set amount per unit produced. If workers are paid via piece rate, the assessor must still verify whether the defined rates allow for workers to earn at least the minimum wage during a regular work week, as defined by the ILO as 48 hours (i.e., workers should not have to work overtime to earn equivalent to the minimum wage).
SRA1.1.5 S7	MEDIUM	Employers legally contract employees,	This is in relation to labor contracting. This can be contracting of production workers, but may also include dispatched workers such as security, transportation workers, canteen workers, etc.

Indicator 1.1.6: Adequate rest

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.6	Are workers or farmers self-employed?	If NO, score 1.1.6 Adequate rest	This indicator is designed so the assessor can collect data on working hours allocated by an employer, as risk increases with excessive working hours.	This is applicable in all cases.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.6 S4	MEDIUM	Workers have at least 10 hours of rest in a 24-hour period and at least 77 hours in a 7 day period,	This is not applicable for processing, these guideposts are included in ILO C188, which is specific to vessels.

Indicator 1.1.7: Access to basic services (1.1.7a and 1.1.7b)

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.7	Does the fishery/farm provide worker housing or require live-aboard vessel time?	If YES, score 1.1.7a Access to basic services for worker housing/live-aboard vessels If NO, score 1.1.7b Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities*	The risks here differ depending on whether an employer is responsible for a worker's safety and wellbeing outside of work.	A processing employer may or may not be responsible to provide their employees with housing. If a processor does provide housing as an option to employees, they are responsible for the conditions of the housing, and the burden of risk for worker safety and wellbeing falls on the employer (1.1.7a). When employers do not provide housing, 1.1.7b is applicable and is to be assessed only for any community adjacent to the processing facility, even if workers live elsewhere.

*Fishing communities here includes communities of smallholder farms in the processing context.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.7a S3	MEDIUM	When present, fisheries observers are provided adequate accommodation appropriate to the size of the monitored entity and equivalent to that of the officers of the monitored entity	This is always N/A for processing.

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.7a S8	LOW	There are separate sleeping quarters for men and women, or if there is one sleeping space, men and women have separate bunks, or share same bunk during different shifts	This PISG indicates that workers can share the same bunk during different shifts – this is not an acceptable practice for employer-provided housing onshore. Men and women are always expected to have separate bunks.

Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities

(No additional guidance)

Indicator 1.1.8: Occupational safety

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.8	Score for all fisheries / farms	Occupational health and safety	Work in fisheries, aquaculture, or processing all come with risks associated with the day-to-day activities of fishers/crew/workers. Ensuring protections are in place is essential to minimize risks to reduce the likelihood of injury or fatality.	This is applicable in all cases.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.8 S2	MEDIUM	On large vessels, making long trips, vessels carry a crew list and provide a copy to authorized persons ashore at the time of vessel departure [long trips defined as 3 days],	This is always N/A for processing.
SRA1.1.8 S3	MEDIUM	Workers/fishers/farmers/observers have access to communication equipment, or there is a radio on board for vessels over 24 meters	Communication equipment can vary onshore for processing, however it is a baseline expectation. For processing facilities operating in remote locations, communication equipment should be appropriate based on the accessibility to medical services. If they are operating in a location with little to no cell service, there should be an alternative means of communication to ensure timely response in case of emergency.
SRA1.1.8 S7	LOW	On small vessels (<24 meters), there is a working radio on board,	This is N/A for processing, as this is covered in SRA1.1.8 S3. This can be marked as met if SRA1.1.8 S3 is met.

Indicator 1.1.9: Medical response

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.1.9	Score for all fisheries / farms	Medical response	In the fishing, aquaculture, or processing sector, the nature of the work may lead to injury. Ensuring that there is due diligence in place to respond adequately to potential accidents can mean the difference between life and death.	This is applicable in all cases.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.9 S4	MEDIUM	On large vessels, making long trips, fishers have a valid medical certificate attesting to their fitness to work [long trips defined as 3 days],	This is always N/A for processing.
SRA1.1.9 S7	LOW	Workers/fishers/farmers are trained in emergency response and first aid.	In comparison to SRA1.1.9 S3 which requires a trained first aid responder, this PISG is focused on ALL workers. However, not all workers need to be formally trained in first response (e.g., not all have to be CPR certified). Emergency response includes, for example, fire drills, and first aid can be limited to basic first aid knowledge (e.g., knowing where the first aid kits are, what is in them, and how to use equipment). This is cumulative with SRA 1.1.9 S3, as in this is expected in addition to having someone onsite who is formally trained in first aid response.

Component 1.2: Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights

Indicator 1.2.1: Customary resource use rights

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.2.1	Does the fishery/farm operate within or adjacent to a customary use area?	If YES, score 1.2.1 Customary resource use rights If NO, not applicable	It is essential that farm operations are not limiting access to resources that are claimed by customary users, either legally or otherwise. Engaging customary users regarding resource use is key to protect communities and users from unfair competition for resources essential to their culture and livelihoods.	This will be applicable in processing in relation to land use / tenure. Within several PISGs in this section, the terminology “fishery or farm” is used, however this is also applicable to processing facilities unless otherwise noted in the section below.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.2.1 S4	MEDIUM	Fishers are not denied or revoked of fishing rights due to discrimination (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, political affiliation) by authorities and/or other communities or entities,	This PISG specifically refers to this in relation to fishers and is N/A for processing.
SRA1.2.1 S7	LOW	There is an active process to establish a protocol agreement, or there is a protocol agreement in place, with indigenous communities, or communities with customary use rights, using Free, Prior, and Informed Consent,	For processing, this may include both land-use or contamination issues (e.g., effluent discharge contaminating local waterways).
SRA1.2.1 S10	LOW	Communities or people with claims to the resource are strongly involved in management of the resource, and traditional practices and knowledge are incorporated into resource management,	This PISG is much more directly interpreted when considering an open access resource, such as fisheries. For processing, however, this can be related to land-use rights and the processes the government and other stakeholders undergo when developing land (e.g., a social or environmental impact assessment prior to the development of the processing facility on that land).

General note on Indicator 1.2.1:

In many cases, desk research will be a key source of data collection for this indicator as the Unit of Assessment can either be affected as customary users themselves or may be affecting customary users through processing activity. It is important that the assessor first understands the Unit of Assessment’s role more broadly before making conclusions in this section. For example, in many regions, it is required to undertake a social and/or environmental impact assessment before building a processing site or gaining a business license to operate a farm. These processes may or may not include FPIC processes, and the assessor should make note of what the Unit of Assessment has done well or poorly as it relates to this indicator.

Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
1.2.2	Does the fishery/farm constitute a single taxable enterprise or business?	If YES, score 1.2.2 Corporate responsibility and transparency	A company that is committed and transparent about social responsibility, and who holds themselves to a higher standard, is in a better position to enable social responsibility throughout their operations.	This is applicable in all cases.

(No additional guidance)

Principle 2: Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit

Component 2.1: Recognition, voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status

Indicator 2.1.1: Grievance reporting and access to remedy

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
2.1.1	Score for all fisheries / farms	Grievance reporting and access to remedy	Social risks can only be understood when you are aware of the issues that fishers / farmers / workers are facing in the workplace. The only way to know this is to create an environment of trust, whereby workers feel comfortable coming forward with issues and trust their voices will be heard. The more effective these channels of communication, the lower the risk of social issues going unnoticed.	This is applicable in all cases.

(No additional guidance)

Indicator 2.1.2: Stakeholder participation and collaborative management

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
2.1.2	Score for all fisheries / farms	Stakeholder participation and collaborative management	There are two main pieces to this indicator: 1) internal stakeholder participation within the Unit of Assessment, and 2) stakeholder participation in broader management of a resource (e.g., community / government) between the Unit of Assessment and stakeholders outside of the Unit of Assessment.	For processing, only 1) is applicable and will focus on worker engagement within a company.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA2.1.2 S5	LOW	Decisions are publicly communicated, promoted, and transparent,	“Public” in this PISG in the context of a processing facility refers to internal communication. Decisions of a private company need not be made public unless decisions made affect the public broadly. These will likely be decisions about topics such as altering shifts, decisions on new production processes, new products, etc.
SRA2.1.2 S7	LOW	All affected and relevant stakeholders are free to engage in all aspects of fishery/aquaculture governance including decision-making, monitoring, enforcement, and conflict resolution,	In this PISG “governance” is referring to company governance, in particular, how decisions are made.

Component 2.2: Equitable opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain

Indicator 2.2.1: Equitable opportunity to benefit

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
2.2.1	Does the fishery/farm employ women or other marginalized	If YES, score 2.2.1 Equitable opportunity to benefit	This indicator is similar to 2.2.2, but is related to the industry in general, rather than internal to a farm. The intent of this indicator is to	This indicator is N/A for processing.

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
	groups (i.e., migrants, ethnic, or religious minorities)?	If NO, not applicable	better understand access issues of any minority groups to benefit from the economic opportunity created by the processing industry. Minority groups having access to resources can be beneficial for livelihood security and can create a multiplying effect within the community.	

Indicator 2.2.2: Discrimination

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
2.2.2	Score for all fisheries / farms	Discrimination	<p>The intent of this indicator is that individuals that are participating within the Unit of Assessment are not facing any form of discrimination based on race, color, gender, religion, political opinion, immigration status, national extraction, disability, family responsibilities, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, trade union membership, trade union activities, or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation.</p> <p>In comparison to 2.2.1, this relates to those who are already participating in the industry, rather than access to the industry.</p>	This is applicable in all cases.

(No additional guidance)

Principle 3: Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security

Component 3.1: Nutritional and sustenance needs of resource-dependent communities are maintained or improved

Indicator 3.1.1: Food and nutrition security (3.1.1a and 3.1.1b)

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.1.1a	Does the fishery/farm operate adjacent to or offshore of a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies) (within the country's EEZ) and is industrial to medium-scale?	If YES, score 3.1.1a Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries If NO, answer applicability question for 3.1.1b	3.1.1a and 3.1.1b are conceptually opposites of one another. These indicators are seeking to understand food security. The risks involved are 1) the Unit of Assessment is creating food insecurity via competing for local resources, or 2) whether food insecurity is affecting those participating in the Unit of Assessment due to reliance on local resources.	Both 3.1.1a and 3.1.1b are N/A for processing.
3.1.1b	Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies)?	If YES, score 3.1.1b Food and nutrition security for small-scale fishing communities If NO, not applicable		

Indicator 3.1.1a: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA3.1.1a S2	MEDIUM	The fishery/farm is operating offshore a marine resource-dependent community or fishing for the same resource (or fish stock) as the local community (either directly as target catch, or indirectly as bycatch), but active measures are being taken to address these impacts, OR The majority of the catch landed by the fishery/farm is not retained for local consumption, or the country or community in question is food/nutrition insecure (i.e., based on % undernourished or FIES, respectively), but active measures are being taken to address these impacts.	

Indicator 3.1.1b: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries

(No additional guidance)

Indicator 3.1.2: Healthcare

Indicator 3.1.3: Education

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.1.2	Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies)?	If YES, score 3.1.2 Healthcare If NO, not applicable	Healthcare and education are primarily related to the wellbeing of individuals that are part of a community, but at the national level, can also be an indication of development and livelihood security more broadly.	If there is a clear community for which workers at the processing facility pertain to, data can be collected within that community. If there is no one clear community, these indicators can be evaluated at the country-level via desk research exclusively.
3.1.3		If YES, score 3.1.3 Education If NO, not applicable		

(No additional guidance)

Component 3.2: Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation

Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to and within community

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.2.1	Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies)?	If YES, score 3.2.1 Benefits to and within community If NO, not applicable	In communities where seafood production is a key economic driver, it can become a source of livelihood security for that community. It is possible that when regions are identified as key production areas, larger companies can come in and scale up production, bringing in migrant labor, and acquiring all the licenses / permits for operation, which can compromise livelihood security in those communities.	In the processing sector, there is an opportunity for processing facilities, especially in more remote locations or smaller communities, to make efforts to hire local workers which can then build the local economy through job creation. Some indicators in this PISG are N/A for processing.

PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA3.2.1 S2	MEDIUM	People from within the community hold at least some resource access rights or permits,	This is N/A for processing.

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Processing Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA3.21 S5	LOW	People from within the community hold the majority of resource access rights or permits,	This is N/A for processing.

Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.2.2	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If NO, score 3.2.2 Economic value retention	This indicator is related to business operations, using the ratio of gross value added to turnover to understand if there are risks to livelihood security.	This is N/A for processing.

Indicator 3.2.3: Long-term profitability and future workforce

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.2.3	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If NO, score 3.2.3 Long-term profitability and future workforce	This indicator is related to business operations, using the profit margin to understand if there are risks to livelihood security. An inconsistent or diminishing profit margin can mark a risk to livelihood security.	This is N/A for processing.

Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.2.4	Do fishers/farmers or their organization (i.e., cooperative, association, etc.) sell their own product?	If YES, score 3.2.4 Economic flexibility and autonomy	This indicator is specifically targeted at understanding the risk of livelihood security of a fisher or farmer selling their own product (individual operators that are self-employed). This indicator specifically seeks to collect data to better understand the dynamics between fishers or farmers and their buyers as transparency and negotiation are essential piece to protect fishers and farmers from potential abusive buying practices.	This is N/A for processing (i.e., this does not apply to the processing facilities relationship with its buyers, this is specifically for individual operators that are self-employed).

Indicator 3.2.5: Livelihood security

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.2.5	Is the fishery/farm contributing to local livelihood security?	If YES, score 3.2.5 Livelihood security	Seafood industry production can be a major driver of the local economy for communities, which then inherently links the livelihood of those locals participating to that industry, whether via direct primary production, processing, or other steps along the way.	This is N/A for processing.

Indicator 3.2.5: Fuel resource efficiency

Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for processing
3.2.6	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If YES, score 3.2.6 Fuel resource efficiency	Fuel resource use can be a main indicator of the health of a fishery and whether it is financially sound. If fishers have to stay out longer to bring home a consistent supply of fish, this can be an indication that the SSF is being hindered, either by competition with industrial fleets, a depleting fish stock, or other potential factors (e.g., climate change, legislation, etc.). This poses a risk to livelihood security for those participating in the fishery.	This is N/A for processing.