

CERTIFICATION AND RATINGS COLLABORATION



Framework for Social Responsibility in the Seafood Sector

Charlotte Opal

for the Seafood Certification & Ratings Collaboration

First published in 2018.
Updated in 2020.

FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SEAFOOD SECTOR

CONTENTS

2020 update from the Certification and Ratings Collaboration Steering Committee	3
Introduction and background	5
Scope of the Framework	6
Overview of the Framework	6
Tools to assess or improve performance	8
Relevant conventions, protocols, and guidance	9
Key terms used in the Framework	11
1. Protect Human Rights, Dignity, and Access to Resources	13
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	13
1.2 Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights.	23
2. Ensure Equality and Equitable Opportunity to Benefit	25
2.1 Recognition (standing), voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status	25
2.2 Equal opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain	28
3. Improve Food and Livelihood Security	29
3.1 Nutritional and sustenance needs of resource-dependent communities are maintained or improved	29
3.2 Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation	31

2020 UPDATE FROM THE CERTIFICATION AND RATINGS COLLABORATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Since publishing this Framework in 2018, we have been pleased to see it adopted and referenced by many actors in the seafood sustainability movement as they incorporate social and economic considerations into their activities. The Framework has been used to inform our members' updates to their own standards, and is one of the core foundational documents used by Conservation International to develop the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool (the SRA) for the Seafood Sector. In 2021, FisheryProgress.org will incorporate the SRA into its reporting tools so that Fishery Improvement Projects (FIPs) can report publicly on their social performance in a standardized way. This will effectively promote the uptake of the components in the Framework in dozens of FIPs worldwide.

While we are satisfied with the impact that our work has had, we recognize that the landscape of initiatives aiming to address social and economic issues has greatly evolved, and that the Framework already needs updating. In just the two years since publication, many of the tools we reference here have changed to incorporate new components, or even in their entire approach. New tools have been launched, including benchmarking initiatives that map tools and standards against the social principles we include in our Framework. Rather than update the Framework to include these changes, the Certification and Ratings Collaboration decided to sunset this document, and keep it available as a record of the content that we feel is important to include in comprehensive approaches to social and economic sustainability in fisheries.

To future users of this Framework, we do note the following elements that should be further developed:

- 1. Include fisheries observers.** Fisheries observers are independent specialists authorized by fishery regulatory authorities to collect data to assist in the monitoring of commercial exploitation of marine resources, for instance the species caught and discarded, the area that is being fished, and the gear used. Observers generally work on board fishing vessels, but might also work on the dock or in processing facilities. At-sea observers join the vessel during fishing trips but do not normally engage in fishing activities, rather they observe fishing practices as a third party, and report scientific and regulatory enforcement information to the management authority.

Recent incidents of abuse of human rights of fisheries observers make it clear that they must be included in the scope of social responsibility efforts in the seafood sector. Because observers are not employed directly by the captain, the fishery itself is not directly responsible for implementing many of the labor rights in this Framework, for instance regarding recruitment, wages, and working hours. However, it is the responsibility of the captain to ensure safe working conditions, decent sleeping quarters, access to communications, freedom from harassment including attempted corruption, and physical safety. Observers should thus be included in the scope of components 1.1.2, 1.1.8, and 1.1.9. We recommend using Article IV of the Association for Professional Observers' "International Observer Bill of Rights" and Section IV ("Monitored Entity") from its "Code of Conduct for Responsible Observer Programmes – Stakeholder Responsibilities" as references.

- 2. Food Security.** While tools exist to assess and minimize the impacts of fish farm siting on food security for land-dependent local communities, little work has been done to help wild capture fisheries understand the potential impacts of their activities on coastal fishing communities. As the Framework indicates, sustainably-managed stocks should be able to maintain stable seafood resources for local people. However, more guidance needs to be developed to understand where industrial fisheries are likely to have an impact on coastal fisheries and communities, for instance where they are competing for the same stock or affecting bycatch which is target species for coastal fishers, or where catch is largely destined for distant markets and not retained for local consumption in food-insecure countries.

We have been working closely with Conservation International to include these topics in their update of the SRA, and will continue to do so in the future, as the Certification and Ratings Collaboration aims to remain involved in the governance and evolution of the SRA. However, it is important to note these as gaps in the 2018 Framework presented below.

In closing, while we will no longer be updating this Framework, the Certification and Ratings Collaboration will continue to work together to incorporate the issues presented here into our data tools and other joint efforts. We salute the efforts of the seafood sector to include social and economic factors in a holistic definition of sustainability, and we encourage seafood actors to use this Framework as a comprehensive mapping of performance targets for these critical issues.

Certifications & Ratings Collaboration

December, 2020



INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Established in 2015, the Certification and Ratings Collaboration is an effort among five global seafood certification and ratings programs to increase efficiency, address challenges, and help more fisheries and fish farms achieve environmental sustainability and social responsibility. The participating organizations are the Aquaculture Stewardship Council, Fair Trade USA, Marine Stewardship Council, Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch, and Sustainable Fisheries Partnership.

One of the main activities of the Collaboration has been the development of a framework to help the seafood industry define social responsibility in the seafood sector. While there is a good shared understanding of the core elements of environmental sustainability in seafood, the issues of human rights, working conditions, and socio-economic responsibility are relatively new for many stakeholders. As a first step in agreeing on a common framework, the Collaboration reviewed the main efforts and tools currently used to improve social performance in seafood supply chains and interviewed NGOs, buyers, and government agencies to better understand the issues and gaps that exist.

Recognizing during that first research phase that there are many other organizations around the world working on different elements of social responsibility in seafood, the Collaboration decided that a new standard was not needed. The group decided to use the high-level principles presented in the recent paper in *Science*, “Committing to socially responsible seafood,” by Kittinger et al. (June 2017), which were publicly adopted by more than two dozen businesses ahead of the UN Oceans conference, as a base, developing practical indicators for measuring performance on each principle.

A draft of the resulting Framework was presented in private and public consultations from July, 2017 through January, 2018, and a final version is presented in this paper. The framework presents a narrative of performance levels ranging from worst to best practice, and also indicates which tools and standards are relevant to assess performance at a particular level. The Collaboration hopes that the Framework can serve the needs of many different stakeholders, for instance:

- Certification and ratings bodies: to inform the development of their own standards.
- NGOs, governments, and inter-governmental organizations: to provide an overview of the issues, and highlight where there is a need for interventions and/or the development of tools.
- Producers and buyers: to help them understand the issues and point to currently available tools for both assessing and improving performance, as well as to identify where there is a need for interventions.

The Framework is not intended as a new standard or to be used for auditing purposes, but instead to provide a broad overview of the salient topics for social responsibility in seafood, and indicate what tools are available to assess or improve performance.

SCOPE OF THE FRAMEWORK

The Framework proposed in this paper focuses on the first production phase of seafood supply chains, namely wild capture fishing operations and fish farming. The members of the Seafood Certification and Ratings Collaboration recognized that social and economic sustainability has not yet been achieved in other steps in the supply chain, but felt that the production (fishing and farming steps) had the biggest immediate need for improvement. Processing and other steps are therefore not yet included in the Framework, although given that the principles are generic, the Framework could easily be adapted for those elements in the future.

Some criteria in the framework do concern buying practices on the local level, but trade relationships further down the supply chain – for instance buyers providing pre-financing or market access to artisanal fisheries, supporting suppliers to improve, or sharing more of the value chain – are not addressed in the Framework.

OVERVIEW OF THE FRAMEWORK

The tables in the Framework describe different performance levels for wild capture fisheries and fish farms on various socio-economic components. The Framework uses the principles presented in the Kittinger et al. (2017) paper:

- 1. Protect Human Rights, Dignity, and Access to Resources**
 - 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.
 - 1.2** Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights.
- 2. Ensure Equality and Equitable Opportunity to Benefit**
 - 2.1** Recognition (standing), voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status.
 - 2.2** Equal opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain.
- 3. Improve Food and Livelihood Security**
 - 3.1** Nutritional and sustenance needs of resource-dependent communities are maintained or improved.
 - 3.2** Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation.

Each of these principles includes a number of components, for which five levels of performance are described wherever possible:

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a high generic risk of irresponsible practices and no evidence of risk mitigation. ➤ There is evidence that performance must be greatly improved for the fishery or farm to be considered responsible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are medium-low generic risks of worst practices. ➤ In high-risk regions, management has assessed local risks but has not yet taken action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local and national legal requirements are followed. ➤ Major risks of worst practices are absent. ➤ Major risks of worst practices are present but are being addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policies and practices are in place to minimize risk of worst practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The fishery or farm supports policies and practices with training, targeted programs, and/or empowerment of workers and fishermen to support the implementation of good practice. ➤ Performance indicators (education, health, food security, etc.) are excellent.

Notes to the table:

- While not repeated in the table, the levels are additive, i.e. practices under Level Three are in addition to those described under Level Two, and Best Practices described under Level Four are additional to both Levels Two and Three, wherever relevant.
- “Management” can include an individual boat captain or farm manager, or group management structure such as a cooperative of artisanal fishermen.
- The first column is not intended to be an exhaustive list of the worst practices, but rather to highlight those current practices, many of which are unfortunately present in the industry, which represent the worst violations of the principles included in the Framework. There are of course practices which are even worse than those listed in this column; if these are present then the producer would fall into the ‘worst practices’ category for that topic.
- Similarly, the narrative descriptions are not intended to be exact, nor to imply that a producer is not performing at a particular level if it does not meet all of the indicators in the column. The intention is to provide examples of practical performance indicators for each level, along with existing tools and methodologies which can help producers determine and improve their performance on that topic.

The descriptions contained in the Framework are intended to be universal and generic to any size or scale of production in any country. However, some distinctions are made on certain topics:

- The Collaboration recognizes that small-scale artisanal fisheries and farms have different risk levels and needs than large-scale operations. The Framework makes distinctions regarding performance levels in some indicators; the implementer can also adapt the indicators to these various contexts.
- While most of the topics are relevant for both wild capture fisheries and fish farms, some distinctions are made for indicators which are only applicable in one sector or another, for instance having a radio on board a vessel, or the siting of a fish farm.
- The principles described in the Framework are based on fundamental human rights, and thus their application should not vary from place to place. However, the way that indicators are collected or assessed could vary according to the cultural context. Some themes, such as consideration of gender in participatory participatory processes, are therefore cross-cutting, even though they are not always repeated in each section.

Stakeholders are invited to suggest additional distinctions, topics, or details which they feel should be included in the Framework to reflect the different nature of farming vs. wild capture, the size of the economic actor, or a particular social context.

TOOLS TO ASSESS OR IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

For many components in the Framework, there are existing tools or standards that help assess a particular performance level, or that help a farm or fishery move from one level to the next. These are listed below the indicator and are mapped approximately to the level or levels where they are relevant. Note that listing the tool does not necessarily mean that it proves performance meets that level, just that it is relevant for assessing or improving performance at that level. It is beyond the scope of the Framework to include a complete benchmarking of the content aspects of each particular tool – it might therefore only cover some of the indicators for the level where it has been mapped. Nor is there space to indicate quality of the audit or certification methodologies of a particular third-party standard. The intent of listing the tools is rather to help buyers and producers find resources to help improve performance, and highlight gaps to NGOs, donors, standards-setters, governments, and inter-governmental organizations where new tools need to be developed.

The tools, programs, and methodologies referenced in this paper are listed below.

Third-party standards

(Note that these standards vary in applicability to species, country of catch/production, or size of vessel/farm.)

ASC: Aquaculture Stewardship Council Salmon Standard. www.asc-aqua.org

BAP: Global Aquaculture Alliance's Best Aquaculture Practices standards for salmon farms. www.bapcertification.org

BSCI: Business Social Compliance Initiative, Code of Conduct. www.amfori.org

Clearview: Clearview Global Labour Provider Certification Scheme. www.clearviewassurance.com

FOTS: Friend of the Sea, Wild Sustainable Fishing Requirements. www.friendofthesea.org

FTUSA: Capture Fisheries Standard. www.fairtradecertified.org

GRASP: Global GAP Integrated Farm Assurance Aquaculture Model and Risk Assessment on Social Practice (GRASP) add-on. www.globalgap.org

IFFO: Global Standard for Responsible Supply of Marine Ingredients. www.iffo.org

MSC: Fishery Standard. www.msc.org

Naturland: Standards for Organic Aquaculture. www.naturland.de

RFS: Seafish Responsible Fishing Scheme. www.seafish.org

SFW: Monterey Bay Aquarium, Seafood Watch Standard for Fisheries. www.seafoodwatch.org

Thai GAP: "[Good Aquaculture Practices for Marine Shrimp Farm](#)" as defined by the Thai National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives.

Risk-assessment tools

FishSource: Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) tool which includes a human rights risk index.

SSRT: Seafood Slavery Risk Tool (developed by Monterey Bay Aquarium, Seafish, Liberty Asia and SFP). <http://www.seafoodslaveryrisk.org/>

Stakeholder feedback and consultation tools

ClearVoice worker grievance hotline, <http://www.thecahngroup.com/clear-voice.html>

GALS: Gender Action Learning for Sustainability (participatory assessment method), www.galsatscale.net.

Issara Institute Migrant Worker Hotline, Thailand. www.issarainstitute.org

Indicators and guidance

- Harvard University's Gender Action Portal. <http://gap.hks.harvard.edu/>
- Human Rights at Sea (2015). "Gender Briefing Note: Gender and its application in the maritime environment." <https://www.humanrightsatsea.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/20151114-HRAS-GENDER-AND-HUMAN-RIGHTS-AT-SEA-LOCKED1.pdf>
- ILO: International Labour Office (2012). "Hard to see, harder to count: Survey guidelines to estimate forced labour of adults and children." Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_182096.pdf
- ILO (2007). "Eliminating Child Labour: Guides for Employers." http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/actemp/downloads/projects/child_guide2_en.pdf
- ILO (2010). GEMS (Gender Mainstreaming) Toolkit, http://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2010/110B09_193_engl.pdf
- ILO Help Desk (2009). "Factsheet No. 6: Worker housing." Available at: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---multi/documents/publication/wcms_116344.pdf
- International Organization for Migration (IOM). International Recruitment Integrity System (IRIS). <https://iris.iom.int/>
- IPNLF: International Pole & Line Foundation (2015). "Socio-economic assessment of the tuna fisheries in the Maldives." <http://ipnlf.org/resources/ipnlf-documents/document/technical-report-5-a-socio-economic-assessment-of-the-tuna-fisheries-in-the-maldives>
- Living Income Community of Practice. <https://www.living-income.com/>
- RSB: Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (2012). "Food Security Guidelines." <http://rsb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/RSB-GUI-01-006-01-v.2.2-RSB-Food-Security-Guidelines.pdf>
- RSB (2017). "Screening Tool." http://rsb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/RSB-GUI-01-002-02_Screening-Tool.pdf
- SFP (2016). "A Method for Measuring Social and Economic Performance of Fisheries."
- US Department of Labor's "Comply Chain: Business Tools for Labor Compliance in Global Supply Chains." <https://www.dol.gov/dol/apps/ilab-comply-chain.htm>
- Verité. Fair Hiring Toolkit. <http://helpwanted.verite.org/helpwanted/toolkit>
- Verité. Responsible Sourcing Tool (Seafood Industry section). <http://responsiblesourcingtool.org/>

RELEVANT CONVENTIONS, PROTOCOLS, AND GUIDANCE

The international conventions and protocols listed below were used to develop the principles and the Framework presented in this paper. In some instances, the exact definitions and phrasing from these internationally-agreed documents is used. However, because many of these documents are addressed to governments, some transfer of the concept to the producer context was needed in certain cases.

- ILO core conventions (Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work):
 - Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)
 - Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)
 - Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)
 - Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)
 - Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)
 - Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)
 - Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)
 - Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)

- ILO General principles & operational guidelines for fair recruitment, 2016
- ILO Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (No. 188)
- ILO Maritime Labour Convention 2006 (No. 186)
- ILO Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143)
- ILO Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (P029)
- ILO Recommendation Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action For the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour, 1999 (No. 190)
- ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, 2017
- International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, 1990
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966
- FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, 1995
- UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1979
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1990
- UN Declaration on the Right to Development, 1986
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious, and Linguistic Minorities, 1992
- UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, 2011
- UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948
- UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children, 2003

In addition, several research and guidance papers were consulted, including:

- CGIAR: Consultative Group for International Agriculture Research, Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems
- FAO Goodfish Code
- FAO Voluntary guidelines for securing sustainable small-scale fisheries in the context of food security and poverty eradication, 2015
- FAO Voluntary guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security, 2012
- FAO Voluntary guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, 2004
- FAO & WHO Rome Declaration on Nutrition, 2014
- Oxfam (2016). "Identifying Gender Inequalities and Possibilities for Change in Shrimp Value Chains in Indonesia and Vietnam."
- SOMO (Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations). "Human rights and grievance mechanisms." www.griveancemechanisms.org
- United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC, 2013). "Human Trafficking."

KEY TERMS USED IN THE FRAMEWORK

Blacklisting: Denying people employment for a particular reason, such as political affiliation, involvement in trade union activity, or a history of whistle-blowing.

Child: Any person under the age of 18. (Source: UN).

Child labor: Work that is inappropriate for a child's age, affects their education, or, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children (e.g. heavy lifting disproportionate to a person's body size, operating heavy machinery, using dangerous equipment, night work).

Co-management: A partnership arrangement in which government, the community of fishermen, external agents (non-governmental organizations, research institutions), and sometimes other fisheries and coastal resource stakeholders (vessel owners, fish traders, credit agencies or money lenders, tourism industry, etc.) share the responsibility and authority for decision-making over the management of a fishery. (Source: FTUSA).

Contract substitution: When workers are obliged to accept different and worse contract conditions on arrival in the destination country to what they had been promised before departure. (Source: ILO).

Discrimination: Any distinction, exclusion, or preference made on the basis of race, color, sex, 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.

Employed: Working for another party for payment of any kind, including indirect employment, for instance helping an employed worker to contribute to productivity earnings, and working for in-kind (non-cash) payment. A child working (paid or unpaid) alongside her relative is indirectly employed if that relative is employed. If the relative is not employed, for instance is working on their own farm or boat, a child working alongside that relative not considered employed.

Fish: A collective term that includes any species or sub-species of aquatic (marine, freshwater and estuarine) animal or plant. Does not include mammals, seabirds, or reptiles. (Source: FTUSA).

Food insecure country: A country with a Serious, Alarming, or Extremely Alarming rating on the [International Food Policy Research Institute's Global Health Index](#).

Forced (Compulsory) labor: All work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty for which a person has not offered themselves voluntarily or for which such work or service is demanded as a repayment of debt. "Penalty" can imply monetary sanctions, physical punishment, intimidation or punishment of family members, or the loss of rights and privileges or restriction of movement (e.g. withholding of identity documents).

Gender transformative: An approach or practice where gender equality—the shared control of resources and decision-making—and women's empowerment are central to the intervention.

Grievance mechanism: A formal, legal or non-legal (or 'judicial/non-judicial') complaint process that can be used by individuals, workers, communities and/or civil society organizations that are being negatively affected by certain business activities and operations. (Source: [SOMO](#)).

Hazardous child labor: Work which exposes children to physical, psychological or sexual abuse; work underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces; work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads; work in an unhealthy environment which may, for example, expose children to hazardous substances, agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels, or vibrations damaging to their health; work under particularly difficult conditions such as work for long hours or during the night or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer. (Source: ILO R190).

Human trafficking: The recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation (Source: UNODC 2013).

Living wage: Remuneration received for a standard work week by a worker in a particular place sufficient to afford a decent standard of living for the worker and their family. Elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, health care, transport, clothing, and other essential needs, including provision for unexpected events. The Global Living Wage Coalition has developed a widely-accepted methodology for calculating living wage: https://www.isealalliance.org/sites/default/files/Global_Living_Wage_Coalition_Anker_Methodology.pdf

Minimum age for employment:

On-shore: 15 years of age, unless local minimum age law stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling, in which case the higher age would apply. If, however, local minimum age law is set at 14 years of age in accordance with developing country exceptions under ILO convention 138, the lower age applies.

Off-shore: The minimum age for work on board a fishing vessel is 16 years of age, unless the competent authority has authorized a minimum age of 15 for persons who are (a) no longer subject to compulsory schooling as provided by national legislation, and who are engaged in vocational training in fishing or (b) performing light work during school holidays. (Source: ILO C188).

Operating profit margin: Ratio of operating profit to turnover. Operating profit is defined as the difference between the turnover and all operating costs. (Source: SFP).

Personal Protective Equipment (PPE): Equipment worn to minimize exposure to workplace injuries and illnesses that may result from contact with chemical, radiological, physical, electrical, mechanical, or other workplace hazards (Source: US Department of Labor). It includes any item a worker needs to wear for their own protection. PPE may include but is not limited to clothing, footwear, eye protection, ear protection, gloves, masks, and personal flotation devices. (Source: FTUSA).

Small-scale fishery/farm: A broad category characterized by low-capital, low-technology, labor-intensive harvesting methods. In wild capture, trips are typically close to shore, with up to 5-6 crew members. In farms, family ownership with no permanent workforce is characteristic.

Worker: Any permanent, part-time, and temporary/seasonal personnel employed on a farm or vessel, including directly contracted workers, subcontracted workers, and those earning based on a share of production or catch.

Young worker: Any person who has attained the minimum age for employment, as defined above, but is younger than 18 (or the age of legal adulthood as defined by national law, if higher).

1. PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS, DIGNITY, AND ACCESS TO RESOURCES

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.

COMPONENT 1.1.1: THERE IS NO DISCRIMINATION.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is discrimination in recruitment, promotion, access to training, remuneration, allocation of work, termination of employment, retirement, ability to join unions, or other activities. ➤ There is discrimination in access to benefits, e.g. health care, savings accounts, or insurance. ➤ There is pregnancy testing for female workers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are different rates of pay for people in the same positions or in job advertisements, based on e.g. ethnicity, sex, or religious affiliation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no discrimination against workers in recruitment, promotion, access to training, remuneration, allocation of work, termination of employment, retirement, or other activities. ➤ Workers receive equal pay for work of equal value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ On large farms and boats, there is a comprehensive and proactive anti-discrimination policy. The policy is implemented through procedures and practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Managers and workers are trained on the anti-discrimination policy.

FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.2: THERE IS NO ABUSE OR HARASSMENT.

<i>Level Zero: Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, verbal abuse, sexual harassment, or any other form of harassment. ➤ Workers' families or communities are threatened by employers or labor brokers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Immigration status is used as a threat or tool of coercion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, verbal abuse, or any other form of harassment. ➤ There is no behavior, including gestures, language, and physical contact, that is sexually intimidating, abusive, or exploitative. ➤ There is no excessive or abusive disciplinary action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a written policy that prohibits physical abuse, bullying, and sexual harassment. ➤ There is a policy and disciplinary procedure in place to address cases of harassment, and discipline commensurate to the actions, e.g. immediate termination or other sanctions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Managers and workers are trained on the sexual harassment policy. ➤ Workers have access to grievance procedures to report harassment, and do not face retaliation for using them. ➤ Grievance procedures include access to third-parties beyond direct employers, and ensure equality of access and voice.

SSRT provides risk ratings on these topics.

FTUSA, ASC, Clearview, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.3: THERE IS NO HUMAN TRAFFICKING OR FORCED LABOR. RECRUITMENT IS ETHICAL, AND NO FEES ARE CHARGED TO WORKERS.

Level Zero Worst Practice	Level One	Level Two Legal Minimums	Level Three	Level Four Best Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is evidence of severe forced labor violations or debt bondage in the fishery or farm, for instance: passport retention, non-payment of wages, high-cost deductions for on-board provisions, or coercive recruitment (abduction, confinement during the recruitment process). ➤ Workers are not permitted to leave the farm/the vessel when in port (except where it is illegal for workers to come ashore, for instance if they do not have the required visa). ➤ There is a critical or high risk of forced labor and the fishery or farm has not taken any measures to mitigate this risk. ➤ Workers are required to pay a deposit at the beginning of employment to prevent them absconding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is moderate evidence of forced labor or debt bondage, for instance earnings are paid more than 30 days after work is performed, or deductions are paid to labor brokers. ➤ There is a medium or high risk of forced labor and the fishery or farm has adopted a relevant policy but does not have a robust implementation plan. (Implementation plan could include participating in a country-level program). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers have the legal right to work and proper documentation/visas. ➤ Worker recruitment fees do not represent more than one month's wages. ➤ The fishery/farm is using only legally-registered recruiters. ➤ There is a medium-high risk of forced labor and the fishery/farm has a policy and decent systems to monitor its own performance. ➤ There is a low risk of forced labor and the fishery/farm has adopted a relevant policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wild only: Before sailing, the vessel submits a crew list with family member contact details to a central database and/or legal authority. ➤ Workers are paid at least monthly, and wages can be transferred to family members. ➤ The farm/fishery has a robust system in place to monitor both its own performance and the performance of labor recruiters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Prior to migration, workers have written contracts, in a language they understand, with extra provisions made for illiterate workers. ➤ Workers do not pay any recruitment fees. ➤ The farm/fishery monitoring system includes workers.

SSRT and FishSource provide risk ratings on these topics. Example risk indicators could include: critical or high rating in SSRT and no country-level response or program to combat (or fishery is not participating in the program if it exists).

ILO (2012) pages 23-25 include several indicators of forced labor.

The IOM's IRIS tool helps assess labor recruiters' compliance with ethical recruitment principles.

Verité's Fair Hiring Toolkit provides guidance on policies and implementation plans to fight forced labor.

ILO (2016) provides guidance on fair recruitment.

ASC, BSCI, Naturland, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

FTUSA and Clearview standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.4: THERE IS NO CHILD LABOR. WORK DONE BY CHILDREN IS LEGAL AND APPROPRIATE FOR THEIR DEVELOPMENT.

Level Zero Worst Practice	Level One	Level Two Legal Minimums	Level Three	Level Four Best Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is evidence of any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hazardous child labor, including alongside family members. ➤ Employment of children younger than the minimum age for employment (as wage workers or indirectly through employment of family members – see definition of ‘employed’). This includes children under 16 employed on boats. ➤ There is a critical or high systemic risk of child labor and the fishery or farm has not taken any measures to mitigate this risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a medium or high risk of child labor and the fishery/farm has adopted a relevant policy but does not have a robust implementation plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no evidence of child labor. ➤ There is a low sectoral risk of child labor and the fishery/farm has adopted a relevant policy. ➤ There is a medium-high sectoral risk of child labor and the fishery/farm has systems to monitor its own performance (e.g. maintaining documentation, training). ➤ Children below the legal age of employment are not employed (as waged workers or indirectly through employment of family members – see definition). ➤ 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. ➤ Tasks undertaken by children are adapted to their age and psychological needs. ➤ Children do not work at night. ➤ Work on boats is only allowed after age 16. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If child labor is found, the farm or fishery implements a child labor remediation policy that ensures the best interests of the child and that the child does not end up in a worse form of employment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a high level of school attendance or high literacy rate among children of fishermen/workers. ➤ There is a medium-high sectoral risk of child labor and the fishery/farm is taking measures to address the root causes (e.g. supporting educational programs, increasing adult wages).

SSRT provides risk ratings on these topics.

FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, FOTS, IFFO, GRASP, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics. ILO (2007) pages 18-28 give guidance to employers for how to remedy child labor when it is found and how to address root causes of child labor.

COMPONENT 1.1.5: FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND THE RIGHT TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ARE RESPECTED.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Human rights defenders are actively suppressed. ➤ Employers demonstrate a recent record of litigating against human rights defenders. ➤ There is discrimination against workers who are members or leaders of worker organizations. ➤ Union members and activists are blacklisted. ➤ Employers replace striking workers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is evidence of management interference in workers' rights to form organizations and bargain collectively, for instance by favoring one organization over another or attempting to influence an election. ➤ Worker representatives are unable to access employer facilities to speak with union members. ➤ The country with jurisdiction over workers (i.e. flag country of vessel) restricts trade union rights and the employer has not provided for another way for workers to organize or express grievances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers are free to form worker organizations, including trade unions, to advocate for and protect their rights. ➤ In establishing their organization, workers have the right to decide their own structure, policies, programs, priorities, etc. without employer interference of any kind. ➤ The country restricts trade union rights but the company has provided a way for workers to organize and express grievances. ➤ National laws that protect collective worker rights (including for cooperatives) are respected. ➤ Workers are not dismissed or discriminated against for exercising their right to strike. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The employer has a policy that they respect the rights of workers to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining. ➤ The employer negotiates in good faith with worker organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers are trained on their rights to organize and bargain collectively. ➤ Women participate in unions commensurate with their representation in the workforce. ➤ There is a freely-negotiated Collective Bargaining Agreement.

FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.6: EARNINGS AND BENEFITS ARE DECENT, TRANSPARENT, AND STABLE.

Level Zero Worst Practice	Level One	Level Two Legal Minimums	Level Three:	Level Four Best Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wages are below minimum legal levels and management is taking no action to increase them. ➤ Workers and fishermen go longer than one month without being paid. ➤ Wages are withheld as a form of workplace discipline. ➤ Employers have control over workers' bank accounts (for instance requiring co-signing). ➤ The employer levies illegal deductions from wages. ➤ Workers are made to sign blank contracts, or contracts written in a language they do not understand. ➤ Contract substitution is practiced. ➤ The employer provides loans, room, and/or board at unfair rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wages are below minimum legal levels but management is taking action to increase them. ➤ Wages paid to workers are not what was promised at time of recruitment or stated in employment contract. ➤ Wages are not paid on-time or directly to the worker. ➤ In-kind payments to workers surpass legal limits. ➤ Earnings for small-scale fishermen are decreasing over time. ➤ Employers use day laborers/short-term contracts or other arrangements to avoid contracting employees and providing necessary legal benefits and salaries. ➤ Workers are unaware of how their earnings or deductions are calculated, or their rights to benefits and annual leave. ➤ There are illegal provisions in contracts (e.g. denying workers the ability to terminate employment with appropriate notice). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wage levels meet the minimum legal requirements. ➤ Social security, health insurance, workers' compensation insurance, vacation, sick leave, and pension benefits meet legal requirements. ➤ Wages and earnings are regularly paid directly to workers/fishermen. ➤ Workers are aware of: how earnings will be calculated, when they will be paid, benefits, and work schedules (verbal contracts if small-scale; written contracts if medium-large). ➤ Where fishermen are paid as a share of the catch, fishermen understand how and when they will be paid, and are allowed to witness procedures used to determine earnings (i.e. weighing and grading of catch as applicable). ➤ Workers receive wage slips with deductions itemized; fishermen receive written receipts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wages are higher than the minimum legal wages. ➤ The employer and worker representatives discuss how they can improve wages and productivity in mutually beneficial ways, including generating ideas for how to move towards living wages over time. ➤ For small-scale employers, there are written contracts with employees in a language they understand, with provisions made for illiterate workers. ➤ Self-employed small-scale fishermen and farmers are earning more than the minimum wage equivalent. ➤ Self-employed small-scale fishermen and farmers understand their costs and are undertaking efforts to make their businesses more efficient so as to increase their earnings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wages meet living wage levels. ➤ Social security, health insurance, workers' compensation insurance, vacation, sick leave, and pension benefits are provided beyond legal minimums. ➤ Small-scale fishermen and farmers are earning a level of income that affords a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. This includes being able to save and/or invest in their businesses.

FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, FOTS, IFFO, GRASP, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

Living Income Community of Practice has several resources on measuring and improving smallholder farmers' income, which are also generally relevant for artisanal fishermen.

Annex 2 of ILO C188 describes minimum contract requirements.

COMPONENT 1.1.7: WORKING HOURS ARE NOT EXCESSIVE.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Working hours exceed legal limits and workers regularly work more than 60 hours/week. ➤ There is forced overtime. ➤ Legal requirements for breaks are not followed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Working hours exceed legal limits and workers regularly work 48-60 hours/week. ➤ Rest periods are less than 10 hours in a 24-hour period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Working hours meet the legal minimum requirements. ➤ Workers have at least 10 hours of rest every day. ➤ Overtime is voluntary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Onshore workers do not work more than 48 hours of regular hours per week even if law permits more. ➤ Onshore workers do not work more than six days per week. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Onshore workers are given 15 minutes of paid rest time for every four hours worked. ➤ The farm/factory has systems in place to anticipate peak production needs and seasonal variation to ensure that excessive overtime is not required.

FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, GRASP, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.8: WORKER HOUSING AND SLEEPING QUARTERS ON VESSELS ARE DECENT. WORKERS HAVE ACCESS TO POTABLE WATER, HEALTHY FOOD, AND SANITARY FACILITIES.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potable water is not accessible to workers. ➤ On long trips, adequate food is not provided. ➤ Food provided is unhealthy. ➤ Sanitary facilities are not adequate. ➤ Worker housing is not structurally safe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Housing or sleeping quarters do not meet basic standards for space, comfort, safety and/or cleanliness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potable water is labeled and accessible to workers. ➤ Workers living on site or on board have access to healthy food at fair prices. ➤ Sanitary facilities (appropriate to the size of the vessel) with adequate privacy are provided. ➤ There are at least two means of escape from sleeping quarters to an open deck area. ➤ Sleeping facilities have adequate fire prevention and air ventilation. ➤ Worker housing meets legal requirements. ➤ Housing is structurally safe. ➤ Housing and sleeping quarters meet reasonable levels of decency, hygiene and comfort. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are separate sanitary facilities for men and women. ➤ There are separate sleeping quarters for men and women. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Housing and boats are inspected by third parties and/or the relevant authorities. ➤ Workers' representatives and management meet at least annually to discuss improvements to housing.

Title 3 of ILO's Maritime Labour Convention describes standards for on-board accommodation.
ILO Help Desk (2009) provides details on minimum standards for on-shore worker housing.

FTUSA, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, GRASP, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.9: THE WORKING ENVIRONMENT IS SAFE.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no radio on board (wild only). ➤ Adequate personal protective equipment (PPE) is not provided. ➤ Workers are required to pay for PPE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PPE is provided but not used correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ On large boats, there is a working radio on board. ➤ Workers and management are trained in health and safety procedures. ➤ Workers use PPE correctly. ➤ There are protections for young workers, pregnant workers, and other vulnerable workers. ➤ Vessels and farms comply with local/national health and safety regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For medium- and large-scale employers, there is a written health and safety policy that includes consideration of the types of emergencies that may affect their workforce (e.g. chemical poisoning/contamination, fire, extreme weather). ➤ Workplace risk areas are signaled in relevant languages. ➤ Workplace accidents are recorded. ➤ Workers are trained on proper use of PPE. ➤ Workers are trained on usage of safety equipment and safe operation of any equipment they use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The health and safety policy and procedures are updated to incorporate analysis of accident records. ➤ Workers are involved in reviewing and implementing the health and safety policy. ➤ There is a worker-led Health and Safety Committee. ➤ On small boats, there is a working radio on board.

FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, FOTS, IFFO, GRASP, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.1.10: THERE IS AN ADEQUATE MEDICAL RESPONSE FOR WORKPLACE INJURIES.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No medical supplies are available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Medical supplies are inadequate. ➤ On large vessels, there is no one trained in first aid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adequate medical supplies are available. ➤ On large vessels, there is a trained first aid responder on board. ➤ Workers are provided with acute medical care for workplace injuries. ➤ Injured or sick workers are repatriated if necessary, at employer's expense. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ On long trips, fishermen have a valid medical certificate attesting to their fitness to work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Injuries sustained in the course of work are subject to worker's compensation, lost time pay and payment of medical expenses. ➤ Workers and small-scale fishermen are trained in emergency response and first aid.

FTUSA, GRASP, and RFS standards include criteria on these topics.

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

COMPONENT 1.2.1: CUSTOMARY RESOURCE USE RIGHTS ARE RESPECTED.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Resource use rights have been established in law for certain peoples or communities but these are not respected. ➤ A farm is set up on land legitimately claimed by communities, without their Free, Prior, and Informed Consent. ➤ The farm restricts access to vital community resources without community approval. ➤ Fishermen are denied fishing rights due to discrimination (for example: gender, religion, ethnicity, legal status) by authorities and/or communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Resource use rights have been established by custom for certain peoples or communities but these are not respected. ➤ Resources use rights have been allocated to newcomers (foreign companies, politically connected entities, etc.) to the detriment of customary users. ➤ The farm's activities negatively impact adjacent community lands, and/or water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The farm has proof of legal land use rights. ➤ The farm has proof of legal water use rights. ➤ Customary use rights have been mapped out using a participatory stakeholder process. ➤ The management system observes the legal and customary rights of local people. ➤ The company understands its impact on access to resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is an active process to establish a protocol agreement with indigenous communities. ➤ The company is mitigating any negative impacts on access to resources. ➤ Customary resource users are protected under law and can seek recourse within the legal system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Communities or people with claims to the resource are involved in management of the fishery. ➤ Traditional practices and knowledge are incorporated into resource management. ➤ There is a protocol agreement with indigenous communities. ➤ Customary users are aware of their use rights and mechanisms for seeking recourse (e.g. legal systems, IFC/ MIGA Office of the Compliance Officer/ Ombudsman). ➤ Special attention is paid to ensure women and disadvantaged groups are included in consultation.

BAP and Thai GAP standards include criteria on these topics.

FTUSA, ASC, and MSC standards include criteria on these topics.

COMPONENT 1.2.2: FARM MANAGERS AND FISHERMEN ARE RESPONSIBLE AND TRANSPARENT CORPORATE CITIZENS.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Farms/fishermen pay bribes to public servants to gain access to resources or to avoid compliance with local regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Farms and fisheries do not pay their taxes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Farms and fishermen respond to requests for indicators of social and environmentally sustainable performance. ➤ Financial accounts are regularly reviewed by independent third-party auditors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Firms have published social responsibility and environmental policies. ➤ Firms publicly disclose their social and economic performance, including e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Their performance against this Framework ➤ Percentage of workers on short-term contracts ➤ Gender wage gap ➤ Ratio of lowest to highest-paid worker. ➤ Firms are engaged in multi-stakeholder initiatives aiming to improve social performance across the industry.
<p>BSCI and IFFO standards include criteria on these topics.</p>		<p>ASC standard includes criteria on this topic.</p>		

2. ENSURE EQUALITY AND EQUITABLE OPPORTUNITY TO BENEFIT

2.1 Recognition (standing), voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status.

COMPONENT 2.1.1: WORKERS ARE ABLE TO FREELY REPORT ANY LABOR OR HUMAN RIGHTS OR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ABUSES WITHOUT FEAR OF RETALIATION, AND HAVE ACCESS TO REMEDY AS NEEDED.

Level Zero Worst Practice	Level One	Level Two Legal Minimums	Level Three	Level Four Best Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers are punished for reporting workplace violations of human or labor rights. This could include, for instance physical punishment, intimidation, wage deduction or withholding, job loss, and/or blacklisting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers are not aware of their rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers have access to effective, fair, and confidential grievance procedures. ➤ There is no retaliation or prejudice against workers who submit grievances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workers are trained on their rights and the available grievance procedures. ➤ The grievance policy tracks conflicts and complaints, and resulting responses and remedy. ➤ Grievances are addressed within three months. ➤ The employer coordinates remediation with local authorities, where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The grievance procedure includes special consideration for vulnerable populations, e.g. migrant workers. ➤ There is a conciliation mechanism, for instance voluntary arbitration, to assist in the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes between employers and workers. It includes equal representation of employers and workers. ➤ Workers have access to independent organizations that could assess complaints.

ASC, IFFO, GRASP, and Clearview standards include criteria on this topic.

Clear Voice and Issara Institute provide worker hotline and grievance reporting services.

COMPONENT 2.1.2: THERE IS A CONTINUOUS PARTICIPATORY STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS WITH COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY THE FISHERY OR FARM, AND RISKS OF NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES ARE MITIGATED.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is evidence of community conflict with the farm or fishermen and there is no participatory stakeholder consultation process. ➤ There is no assessment of the impact of fisheries or fish farms on communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no evidence of community conflict, but there is no stakeholder consultation or remediation process to avoid future conflicts. ➤ The impact of fisheries and fish farms is assessed, but not in a participatory way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The farm or fishery consults with affected stakeholders on an ad-hoc (not regular) basis. ➤ The impact of fisheries and fish farms is assessed in a participatory way. ➤ Actions to mitigate risks are implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ When new fishponds are sited, there is a participatory social impact assessment that includes a robust risk assessment, is gender-aware, and includes risk mitigation activities. ➤ There is regular and meaningful consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations. ➤ There is an effective policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations. ➤ Women and other disadvantaged groups are regularly included in consultations. ➤ A risk mitigation action plan is jointly developed with the communities, and actions are implemented. ➤ Contributions are made to local communities for environmental protection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The farm posts notice during times of therapeutic treatments and has communicated with communities about potential health risks from treatments. ➤ There are good relationships with the local community. ➤ There is an effective and constructive relationship between managers, scientists, and fishermen. ➤ Community-based monitoring and evaluation programs are in place to measure long-term impacts on poverty and the environment. Results are made public and the community participates in programs to address identified needs/ areas of concern. ➤ Risk mitigation action plans are monitored jointly by management and the community.

SFW includes criteria on these topics.

ASC, MSC, Thai GAP, IFFO, and BAP standards include criteria on these topics.

GALS provides a gender-aware participatory impact assessment methodology.

COMPONENT 2.1.3: IN WILD CAPTURE FISHERIES, THERE ARE PROCESSES THAT SUPPORT COLLABORATIVE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fishermen do not have a voice in the management of their resource. ➤ The resource is not managed sustainably. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Decisions about fisheries management are not made transparently. ➤ Stakeholders are not included in decision-making. ➤ The fisheries management organization has a process to consult fishermen but it is not inclusive or accessible to all types of fishermen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fishermen are organized into a group that represents their collective interests. ➤ The management process is transparent and includes some stakeholder input, but not all major user groups are consulted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Annual meetings are held with fishermen and other impacted parties to discuss fishery resource issues and potential management solutions. ➤ Annual stakeholder meetings are held to discuss changing fishery conditions and communicate fishermen’s concerns and recommendations to fishery management agencies. ➤ There is a procedure for resolving conflicts between fishermen and management agency. ➤ The management process is transparent and includes stakeholder input from all major user groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All parties have signed a commitment agreeing to work towards collaborative resolution of conflicts between management bodies and resource users. ➤ An action plan has been co-developed to address the issues identified in stakeholder meetings, with activities and responsible parties identified. ➤ There is a complaints mechanism in place to address objections and complaints and identify corrective actions.

SFW and FishSource include criteria on sustainable fisheries management.

MSC and FTUSA standards include criteria on these topics.

2.2 Equal opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain.

COMPONENT 2.2.1: THERE IS GENDER EQUITY AND EQUALITY OF ACCESS TO BENEFITS FROM THE FISHERY OR FARM.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is evidence of inequality in access to benefits from the farm or fishery. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Both men and women contribute to the management and development of the capture fishery. ➤ The value of unpaid work (especially from women) in the value chain is recognized. ➤ All workers are included in consultation processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Special attention is paid to women with respect to resource tenure rights. ➤ Gender is incorporated into CSR policies and there is a gender focal point-person. ➤ The percentage of management and worker leadership positions held by women is tracked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Measures are taken to increase leadership opportunities for women. ➤ Women participate in trainings. ➤ Women are represented in worker leadership positions commensurate with their representation in the workforce. ➤ Gender transformative practices are instituted.
		<p>FTUSA standard includes criteria on this topic.</p>	<p>Human Rights at Sea (2015) provides guidance on developing gender-aware policies.</p>	<p>The Gender Action Portal and GEMS Toolkit detail many gender transformative practices.</p>

3. IMPROVE FOOD AND LIVELIHOOD SECURITY

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

COMPONENT 3.1.1: COMMUNITIES DEPENDENT ON SEAFOOD PRODUCTION ARE FOOD SECURE.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The community is food insecure and the farm/fishery has not undertaken any actions to assess or reduce risks of their practices affecting local food security. ➤ The seafood-dependent community is food insecure and the resource is not managed sustainably (stocks are decreasing). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In food-insecure countries, a participatory local food security assessment has been done and food insecurity has been identified, but necessary risk mitigation has not occurred. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The country is food secure, or a participatory local food security assessment has found little risk of food insecurity. ➤ A participatory local food security assessment has found food security impacts due to the fishery practices or farm siting, and active measures are being taken to address these impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Where food insecurity has been found among seafood-dependent communities, local data shows improving food security indicators. ➤ Families impacted by the fishery have diverse incomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no food insecurity among workers, fishermen and their families, nor among community members affected by a farm's siting.
<p>RSB (2017) pages 8-11 provide regional risk indicators for food security.</p>				
<p>RSB (2012) provides a methodology for assessing food security.</p>				
<p>SFW and FishSource include criteria on sustainable fisheries management.</p>		<p>FTUSA standard includes criteria on this topic.</p>		

COMPONENT 3.1.2: COMMUNITIES HAVE IMPROVING HEALTHCARE.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The country or region has poor health indicators (e.g. under-5 mortality) and farm/fishery management has not taken any action to improve them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The country or region has poor health indicators and no local assessment of healthcare needs has been done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The community's healthcare needs have been assessed. > The community's health indicators are not of concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The community's healthcare needs have been assessed and the farm/fishery is investing resources to address the needs, appropriate to their means. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Local data collection shows improving health indicators.

SFP provides a methodology for these indicators.

FTUSA standard includes criteria on this topic.

COMPONENT 3.1.3: COMMUNITIES HAVE IMPROVING EDUCATION.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The country or region has poor literacy and/or schooling rates and farm/fishery management has not taken any action to improve them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The country or region has poor literacy and/or schooling rates and no local assessment of educational needs has been done. > Girls and boys have different rates of educational attainment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The community has adequate literacy and schooling rates. > The community has poor literacy and/or schooling rates and its educational needs have been assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The community's educational needs have been assessed and the farm/fishery are investing resources to address the needs, appropriate to their means. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > There is universal access to education through a secondary school level, via remote learning where relevant.

SFP provides a methodology for these indicators.

FTUSA standard includes criteria on this topic.

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

COMPONENT 3.2.1: FISH FARMS AND FISHERIES PROVIDE BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most of the harvesting workforce are temporary migrant workers and no consideration has been given to hiring local workers. ➤ Harvesters do not have a choice of buyers to whom to sell. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A low number of jobs is created relative to dollar level of vessel investment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The farm sources inputs and equipment locally. ➤ Harvesters are free to sell to whomever they wish without retribution. ➤ Consideration is paid to hiring locally-resident workers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The majority of the harvesting workforce is comprised of local residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Buyers pay premium prices to small-scale fishermen. ➤ A high number of jobs is created relative to dollar level of vessel investment.
<p>FTUSA standard includes criteria related to these topics.</p>				
<p>Thai-GAP standard includes criteria related to this topic.</p>				
<p>IPNLF provides a methodology for some of these indicators.</p>				

COMPONENT 3.2.2: VESSEL OWNERS AND WORKERS RETAIN A DECENT SHARE OF THE PRE-TAX ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE CATCH.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The ratio of gross value added to turnover is below 47%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The ratio of gross value added to turnover is between 47-57%. ➤ Income from the fishery raises families out of poverty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The ratio of gross value added to turnover is above 57%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Formalized training is provided to harvesters in how to add value to their landings.
<p>SFP provides a methodology for some of these indicators.</p>				

COMPONENT 3.2.3: THE FISHERY OR FARM IS PROFITABLE OVER THE LONG TERM.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term average operating profit margin is below 11%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term average operating profit margin is between 11% and 18%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term average operating profit margin is above 18%. 	

SFP provides a methodology for some of these indicators.

COMPONENT 3.2.4: FARMS AND FISHERIES ARE RESOURCE-EFFICIENT.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ratio of vessel fuel is higher than 18%. Vessel fuel use intensity (volume of fuel used per ton of catch) is high relative to size of vessel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel fuel costs/ fish sales is between 13-18%. Average fuel use intensity (adapted to size of vessel.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel fuel costs/fish sales is below 13%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel fuel use intensity is low.

SFP and IPNLF provide methodologies for these indicators.

COMPONENT 3.2.5: FISHERMEN HAVE ACCESS TO COMPETITIVE BUYING AND CREDIT MARKETS.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where buyers provide pre-financing, the interest is exorbitant/predatory. There is evidence that fishermen are not free to sell to whomever they choose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest rates charged to farmers or fishermen are not transparent. Farms and fishermen do not have access to competitive credit markets. Farms and fishermen do not have access to multiple buyers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is more than one local buyer for fish. Harvesters are free to sell to whomever they wish without retribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest rates are transparent and agreed on in advance with fishermen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harvesters can access loans from at least two types of lenders at interest rates not exceeding the government rate. Interest rates charged to artisanal fishermen are not higher than the lender's cost of borrowing.

FTUSA standard includes criteria related to this topic.

COMPONENT 3.2.6: SMALL-SCALE SUPPLIERS ARE DEALT WITH FAIRLY BY THEIR LOCAL BUYERS.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where buyers provide inputs, the pricing is unclear and/or unfair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishermen and supplier farms do not know the quality expected by buyers. Fishermen and supplier farms do not know when they will be paid or how the price is calculated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input pricing is fair but not transparent to fishermen or supplier farms. There is a verbal contract between buyer and supplier regarding expected quality and payment terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a fair engagement between large fish farms and their contracted small-scale supplier ponds. There is a signed (written) contract between small-scale fishermen/fish farmers and their buyers covering how prices will be calculated and paid and how inputs are priced. The contract is in a language understood by the supplier and special arrangements are made for illiterate suppliers. Aggregators are transparent with small-scale fishermen or farmers regarding credit terms, costs of inputs provided, and payment methods and frequency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small-scale fishermen and fish farmers are organized into groups to better negotiate with buyers. Buyers support small-scale fishermen and fish farmers through sharing costs of certification and training.

FTUSA standard includes criteria related to this topic

COMPONENT 3.2.7: THE FUTURE WORKFORCE FOR THE FISHERY IS SECURE.

<i>Level Zero Worst Practice</i>	<i>Level One</i>	<i>Level Two Legal Minimums</i>	<i>Level Three</i>	<i>Level Four Best Practice</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The average age of fishermen or farmers is closer to the retirement age than the average age in the country, and new fishermen and workers are not joining the workforce. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Harvesters/workers from a range of age classes are represented. ➤ The average age of fishermen or farmers is close to the average age in the country. ➤ If the average age of the workforce is close to retirement, new fishermen are joining the workforce. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ New fishermen and workers, including women, are being recruited into the fishery or fish farming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Women are increasingly taking leadership roles in the supply chain and fishing communities.

No tools were found that addressed these topics



CERTIFICATION AND RATINGS **COLLABORATION**



certificationandratings.org



info@certificationandratings.org