Applying and Using the Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) Tool Equivalency Mapping

September 2021, Version 1.0

Table of Contents

1. About the SRA

The Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector (SRA) is a risk-assessment or benchmarking tool for conducting human rights due diligence in seafood supply chains and can be used to inform the development of a workplan towards improvement. In this context the SRA can be applied to:

- assess risks of social issues
- uncover critical information gaps
- identify areas in need of improvement

The purpose of this tool is ultimately to improve crew welfare and well-being, but it also provides multiple benefits to other stakeholders by de-risking and diversifying seafood production to ensure global food security needs are met into the future.

> **DEVELOPMENT OF THE SRA:**
> The SRA was co-produced, and thus co-owned. Since 2017, over two-dozen organizations have contributed over the course of the development phase, including many organizations comprising the Conservation Alliance, human and labor rights organizations (Verité, International Labor Rights Forum, FairAgora Asia, Liberty Shared, Humanity United), university scholars, intergovernmental agencies, and industry.

1.1. Application and Usage of the SRA

The SRA is not a certification, but it can be used to identify and make improvements that could facilitate certification to another social program. It is a risk assessment tool that can be used by any fishery and/or aquaculture operation. It can also be used as a sister tool to the Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) needs-assessment or pre-assessment.

1.2. Structure of the SRA

The SRA is organized around three Principles, with components and Performance Indicators (PIs) shown below that cover issues such as human rights, labor rights, working conditions, responsible use of resources and impact on communities. Each component contains multiple PIs.

PRINCIPLE	COMPONENT	PI	PERFORMANC INDICATOR
1 Protect human rights, dignity, and access to resources	1.1 Human and labor rights	1.1.1	Abuse and harassment
		1.1.2.a	Human trafficking and forced labor
		1.1.2.b	Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries
		1.1.3	Child Labor
		1.1.4	Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining
		1.1.5	Earnings and Benefits
		1.1.6	Adequate Rest
		1.1.7a	Access to basic services
		1.1.7b	Access to basic services (Small-scale fishing communities)
		1.1.8	Occupational safety
		1.1.9	Medical response
	1.2 Access Rights	1.2.1	Customary use rights
		1.2.2	Corporate responsibility and transparency

2	2.1	2.1.1	Grievance reporting and access to remedy
Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit	Equality	2.1.2	Stakeholder Participation and Collaborative Management
	2.2	2.2.1	Equitable opportunity to benefit
	Equity	2.2.2	Discrimination
3	3.1	3.1.1a	Food and Nutrition Security
Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security	Food and nutrition security	3.1.1b	Food and Nutrition Security
		3.1.2	Healthcare
		3.1.3	Education
	3.2	3.2.1	Benefits to and within community
	Livelihood security	3.2.2	Economic value retention
		3.2.3	Long-term profitability and future workforce
		3.2.4	Economic flexibility and autonomy
		3.2.5	Livelihood security
		3.2.6	Fuel resource efficiency

2. Applying and Using the SRA Equivalency Mapping

Many seafood producers, including those in FIPs, are already working with sustainable fishing or aquaculture certifications, or align with standards for sustainable seafood production. Once implemented, these programs should lead to lower levels of social risk.

In order to better understand how these programs affect the level of risk, the SRA has been mapped to other social tools/standards used in the seafood industry through an equivalency exercise. The purpose of the exercise is to:

1. Help seafood producers to use pre-assessments and audits from other social programs to evaluate their level of risk using the SRA.
2. Highlight indicators of risk that are not covered by other social programs as areas for potential further evaluation.

This mapping / equivalency exercise is designed to ease a seafood production entity's access to the SRA and lower their burden of access by allowing them to not duplicate the work they may have already done to align with these standards / achieve their certifications.

> All standards that have been mapped to the SRA and that have an associated Equivalency Mapping document are listed on the RISE platform "Monterey Framework Resources" page.
>
> Be sure to verify that the version you are certified against is consistent with the version numbers listed above that have been mapped in the associated Equivalency Mapping documents.

2.1. Applicability of Performance Indicators and Scoring Guideposts

The SRA Performance Indicators (PI) that are applicable for evaluation for a given fishery or aquaculture farm depend on the context of that specific seafood operation.

Recognizing that industrial and small-scale fisheries and farms face different social issues, some PIs and related Scoring Guideposts (SG)s will not be relevant to certain fisheries, farms, and contexts. To guide this journey, the SRA Scoring Guidance provides a Decision Tree (see Appendix 1) that enables the user to understand which PIs

are relevant to its operation. Any SRA Performance Indicator (PI) where the SRA designates "score for all fisheries/farms" (designated with a checkmark) has been included in the mapping for all indicators.

As the SRA protocol is intended to be flexible and adaptable for a diversity of situations, the remaining PIs are paired with qualifying questions to guide the user on their application to:

a. Industrial/ medium or large fisheries/farms;
b. Small-scale fisheries/farms; or
c. Both industrial/ medium or large fisheries/farms and small-scale fisheries/farms.

Please note that no PIs should be ignored solely based on the characteristics of the fishery or farm, but rather provide guidance, and ultimately leave conditionality of scoring indicators up to the discretion of the expert assessor based on their in-depth knowledge of the system.

Note that each program has their own criteria for how to define the Unit of Assessment. Please review the Unit of Assessment definition of each respective program before implementing the SRA using the Equivalency Mapping. In many places, where relevant, scoping differences have been flagged in the Equivalency Mapping.

2.2. Equivalency / Mapping Process

The equivalency / mapping process maps the SRA Performance Indicator Scoring Guidepost (PISG) against criteria in the corresponding standards or the program's supporting documentation. The process results in 3 types of matches:

- **Full Match:** the SRA PISG is fully addressed by the standard (i.e., one or more criteria in the standard)
- **Partial Match:** the SRA PISG is partially addressed by the corresponding standard– there are one or more aspects of the SRA PISG that are not accounted for by the corresponding standard criteria
- **No Alignment:** the SRA PISG is not addressed by the standard – no aspects of the SRA PISG can be accounted for by the corresponding standard criteria

Please note that the mapping serves to identify PISGs from the SRA that would not have been assessed during an audit of the program to which it compares. Where there is no alignment, it does not mean the unit of assessment is at a high risk for that particular PISG. This simply means that the audit findings from the comparison program cannot be used to evaluate a particular PI Scoring Guidepost and therefore must be evaluated to adequately determine risk according to the SRA methodology.

Examples of the matching process are shown in the table below:

Match	SRA PI Scoring Guidepost	EXAMPLES	
		Other Standard Criteria	Key Findings
Full	Children below the legal age of employment are not employed as waged workers	STF: The workplace is free of all forms of child labor	None
Partial	Workers/fishers/farmers receive wage slips with deductions itemized or written receipts.	FTUSA: Where a significant number of crew members and/or workers are employed, crew members and workers receive pay slips with each pay check that provide a clear account of wages earned, allowances, bonuses, overtime payment, and all deductions in detail. This information is available upon request at any time.	FTUSA only specifies this to be met where there is a signification number of crew/workers employer (which is defined as >5), however the SRA PISG refers to any situation.

No Alignment	Workers/fishers/farmers receive wage slips with deductions itemized or written receipts.	RFVS: Every crew member shall have an employment contract or work agreement, written and explained, in a language they understand which defines their terms of employment relationship with the vessel owner.	Although crew are aware of their work agreement, including deductions, here is no mention of the key criteria set out in the SRA PISG that they are given pay slips

2.3. How to Read the Equivalency Mapping Documents

Equivalency Mapping documents have been created to assist producers in applying the mapping / equivalency exercise when assessing risk against the SRA.

- There is a Equivalency Mapping document for each of the standards that the SRA has been mapped to.
- The Equivalency Mapping shows:
  - all the SRA PISGs and how each one is or is not addressed by the standard,
  - where applicable, the corresponding standard criterion or criteria IDs that address the PISG, and
  - in the case of a Partial Match, guidance on evaluating any PISG aspects not covered by the other standard are provided.

Figure 1 Structure of the Equivalency Mapping

2.4. Steps to Use the SRA Equivalency Mapping Documents

Step 1: Download and open the necessary documents.

In order to use your existing audit or assessment to complete the SRA, you will need the following documents:

- ***The Equivalency Mapping Document for the corresponding standard you are working with.*** There are multiple Equivalency Mapping documents (one for each of the corresponding standards the SRA is

mapped against), so be sure you select the correct one. All Equivalency Mapping documents can be found on the "Actioning the Monterey Framework" subpage on the RISE platform.

- *The original standard you are working with.* The Equivalency Mapping lists the relevant standard criteria IDs, but does not list the full text. The standard will be a useful resource as you are completing the SRA. Be sure to verify you have the correct version of the standard.
- *A copy of your most recent audit or pre-assessment against the standard.* The Equivalency Mapping only shows whether or not a PISG was assessed by the standard. Depending on the program, and where you are in the program, you may or may not have met all criteria in the standard. The audit or assessment report will provide additional information on how your fishery or farm is currently performing against the standard.
- *The SRA reporting template.* The reporting template covers the entire SRA and allows you to easily document the outcome of your assessment against the SRA. The template can be found on the "Actioning the Monterey Framework" subpage on the RISE platform.

Step 2: Record the risk level for the PISGs that are fully or partially addressed by the standard.

- Browse the Equivalency Mapping document to locate *Full Matches* and *Partial Matches*.
- Using the corresponding standard criteria ID provided in the "Standard Criteria" column, determine whether or not you have met the relevant criteria by reviewing your audit or pre-assessment report
- Record the results under the appropriate SRA PISG in the SRA reporting template.

Step 3: Identify PISGs that are not fully addressed by the standard for further evaluation.

- Browse the Equivalency Mapping document to locate *Partial Matches* and matches where there is *No Alignment*
- Open the corresponding standard and use the Standard Criteria ID provided to locate the corresponding criteria, if needed as an additional reference.
- Identify PISGs that require additional data collection based on the following:
  - For PISGs marked as *Partial Matches*, see the additional information provided in the Equivalency Mapping Documents on the key findings between the SRA and the corresponding standard criteria and what is needed to fully evaluate the PISGs.
  - PISGs marked as *No Alignment* cannot be evaluated using the audit or pre-assessment report.

Step 4: Compare the scope of the standard audit or pre-assessment with the planned scope of the SRA.

- If the scope is not the same, you will need to determine whether the unit of assessment for the standard audit or pre-assessment is representative of the planned scope of the SRA.
- If the unit of assessment is not representative, you will need to collect data from additional units for all PISGs.
- If the scope is the same, you will only need to collect data for the PISGs that are not fully addressed by the standard.

Step 5: Collect additional information as needed and desired.

- PISGs that are either Partial Match or No Alignment cannot be fully assessed using the audit or pre-assessment report and require additional data collection. Use the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool: A Guide to Data Collection to guide you in collecting data to complete the assessment of these PISGs.

For questions about the SRA or the Equivalency Mapping Documents, please contact: SRAsupport@elevatelimited.com

Appendix 1: Decision Tree

PI	SCORING GUIDANCE	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	
1.1.1	Score for all fisheries/farms	Abuse and harassment	✓
1.1.2a 1.1.2b	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	
1.1.3	Score for all fisheries/farms	Child labor	✓
1.1.4	Score for all fisheries/farms	Freedom of association and collective bargaining	✓
1.1.5	Are workers or farmers wage workers?	If YES, score 1.1.5 Earnings and benefits	
1.1.6	Are workers or farmers self-employed?	If NO, score 1.1.6 Adequate rest	
1.1.7a 1.1.7b	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	
1.1.8	Score for all fisheries/farms	Occupational safety	✓
1.1.9	Score for all fisheries/farms	Medical response	✓
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	
1.2.2	Does the fishery/farm constitute a single taxable enterprise or business?	If YES, score 1.2.2 Corporate responsibility and transparency	
2.1.1	Score for all fisheries/farms	Grievance reporting and access to remedy	✓
2.1.2	Score for all fisheries/farms	Stakeholder participation and collaborative management	✓
2.2.1	Does the fishery/farm employ women or other marginalized groups (i.e., migrants, ethnic, or religious minorities)?	If YES, score 2.2.1 Equitable opportunity to benefit	
2.2.2	Score for all fisheries/farms	Discrimination	✓
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	
3.1.1b 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2.1	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 YES, score 3.1.2 Healthcare	
		If YES, score 3.1.3 Education	
		If YES, score 3.2.1 Benefits to and within community	
3.2.2 3.2.3	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If NO, score 3.2.2 Economic value retention	
		If NO, score 3.2.3 Long-term profitability and future workforce	
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	
3.2.5	Is the fishery/farm contributing to local livelihood security?	If YES, score 3.2.5 Livelihood security	
3.2.6	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If YES, score 3.2.6 Fuel resource efficiency	