



SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR THE SEAFOOD SECTOR

**CONSERVATION
INTERNATIONAL**



SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR THE SEAFOOD SECTOR

A collaboration between Conservation International, the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions, and the Coalition for Socially Responsible Seafood.

Thank you to all those who provided input and feedback.

Prepared by Conservation International.

Conservation International. 2019 Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector: A Rapid Assessment Protocol. Available at: www.riseseafood.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
The “Monterey Framework”: From principles to practice	3
Conditionality of Scoring Performance Indicators	6
General Scoring Guidance	6
Determining Unit of Assessment (UoA)	7
PRINCIPLE 1	
Component 1.1	
Indicator 1.1.1: Abuse and harassment	10
Indicator 1.1.2: Human trafficking and forced labor; Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries	12
Indicator 1.1.2a: Human trafficking and forced labor	13
Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries	15
Indicator 1.1.3: Child Labor	16
Indicator 1.1.4: Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining	18
Indicator 1.1.5: Earnings and Benefits	20
Indicator 1.1.6: Working hours	22
Indicator 1.1.7: Access to basic services	23
Indicator 1.1.7a: Access to basic services (Live-aboard vessels/worker housing)	24
Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services (Small-scale fishing communities)	25
Indicator 1.1.8: Occupational safety	26
Indicator 1.1.9: Medical response	28
Component 1.2	
Indicator 1.2.1: Customary use rights	29
Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency	32

PRINCIPLE 2

Component 2.1

Indicator 2.1.1: Grievance reporting and access to remedy.....34

Indicator 2.1.2: Stakeholder Participation and Collaborative
Management.....37

Component 2.2

Indicator 2.2.1: Equitable opportunity to benefit.....39

Indicator 2.2.2: Discrimination.....41

PRINCIPLE 3

Component 3.1

Indicator 3.1.1: Food and Nutrition Security.....44

Indicator 3.1.3: Healthcare.....47

Indicator 3.1.4: Education.....48

Component 3.2

Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to and within community.....49

Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention.....51

Indicator 3.2.3: Long-term profitability and future workforce.....52

Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy.....53

Indicator 3.2.5: Livelihood security.....55

Indicator 3.2.6: Economic fuel efficiency.....57

GLOSSARY59

ANNEX 1: Guidance for Assessment Implementation.....65

ANNEX 2: Important Resources.....71



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector is useful as a diagnostic or rapid assessment tool – to assess risk of social issues, to identify areas in need of improvement, and to inform the development of a Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) workplan that includes a social element. However, the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool is not a certification. The Assessment Tool enumerates existing resources in social responsibility certification, in the case the FIP wants to proceed towards certification. This protocol is voluntary for the time being. A FIP implementer decides whether or not she/he would like to assess social responsibility principles. Whether or not this protocol will become compulsory merits further discussion. This protocol was co-produced, and thus is co-owned, by many stakeholders and organizations inside and outside of the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions. Three main documents inform most of the content and format of this protocol: Framework on Social Responsibility for the Seafood Sector (Opal 2018); FIP Rapid Assessment Protocol (OSMI 2018); Guidance for Incorporating Socioeconomic Factors into Fishery Improvement Projects (SFP 2018). This document begins with a brief introduction to the principles, components, and performance indicators of the Monterey Framework, and then gives guidance on scoring indicators and determining the Unit of Assessment. Thereafter, it outlines the complete protocol for assessing social responsibility in a FIP. The protocol is followed by an annex containing ethical considerations and best practices for doing human rights and conservation research, and guidance for incorporating social responsibility into each FIP phase. The document ends with a list of important resources on existing standards, tools, indicators, guidance, conventions, and protocols, as well as a glossary of relevant definitions.



INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, significant effort has been invested in determining the key elements for environmental sustainability in fisheries and aquaculture, informing the creation of globally recognized standards, such as the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). However, recent media revelations about human rights violations in the seafood sector in both developing and developed countries have placed social issues at the forefront of conversations around seafood production. In response, a coalition of academic institutions, industry, and nonprofit organizations (33 individuals from 21 institutions) co-created a framework encompassing a shared and comprehensive definition of social responsibility to align efforts in this space. This framework, referred to as the “Monterey Framework” for social responsibility (Kittinger et al. 2017), is supported by more than two-dozen businesses and over 25 non-profit organizations, and spans issues across human rights from labor rights, access to resources, equality and equity, and livelihood and food security. It was built on the UN FAO’s Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries, incorporating principles from these guidelines together with a substantive body of social science research from the fields of human rights, natural resource management, and development.

The “Monterey Framework”: From principles to practice



A key step in moving the “Monterey Framework” from principles to practice is the integration of a social responsibility framework into Fishery Improvement Projects (FIPs). This was identified as a strategic priority by the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions¹ (“Conservation Alliance”) and the Coalition for Socially Responsible Seafood² (“Coalition”) in 2016. In this context, Conservation International, partnering with organizations of the Conservation Alliance and Coalition, are co-developing a social responsibility assessment tool for the seafood sector. This tool, named as “Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector,” is built on the Monterey Framework, the UN FAO’s Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries and other relevant, existing protocols and frameworks. Two key resources used in the creation of this protocol include the Framework on Social Responsibility for the Seafood Sector developed by the Certification and Ratings Collaboration social sub-committee (Opal 2018) and the OSMI (Oceans Seafood and Markets Initiative) FIP Rapid Assessment Protocol (OSMI 2018). This protocol was also informed by stakeholders from environmental and human rights interests at a workshop in Seattle in April 2018 and has gone through a public revision process with input from NGOs, industry, and academia. Thus, the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool is being co-developed with input from a broad range of expertise, sectors, and interests. This diagnostic tool is salient across a diversity of contexts, from community oriented small-scale fisheries to industrial fleets recruiting migrant workers, and aquaculture farms. The Social Responsibility Assessment Tool includes three principles and six components from the Monterey Framework.

¹ Conservation Alliance for Sustainable Solutions is an alliance of conservation NGOs working with businesses along seafood supply chains globally to solve sustainable seafood’s biggest challenges: <https://solutionsforseafood.org>.

² Coalition for Socially Responsible Seafood is a consortium of stakeholders interested in advancing social responsibility and human rights issues in fisheries, representing conservation, human rights, and development NGOs, industry, and academia.

PRINCIPLE 1:

PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS, DIGNITY, AND ACCESS TO RESOURCES

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

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

PRINCIPLE 2:

ENSURE EQUALITY AND EQUITABLE OPPORTUNITY TO BENEFIT

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

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

PRINCIPLE 3:

IMPROVE FOOD, NUTRITION, AND LIVELIHOOD SECURITY

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

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

Each Social Responsibility principle comprises a set of Components, Performance Indicators (PIs) (Table 1) and Scoring Guideposts (SGs). The scoring guideposts incorporate all the scoring elements or scoring issues required at each guidepost. The hierarchy of Principles, Components, Performance Indicators and Scoring Guideposts is known as “Default Assessment Tree,” which is used as the basis for assessment of the fishery for compliance with the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool.

TABLE 1:

Principles, components, and performance indicators for the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool.

a = Score for industrial-scale

b = Score for small-scale

PRINCIPLE	COMPONENT	PI	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
1 Protect human rights, dignity, and access to resources	1.1 Human and labor rights	1.1.1	Abuse and harassment ^{a,b}
		1.1.2	Human trafficking and forced labor ^a ; Debt bondage ^b
		1.1.3	Child labor ^{a,b}
		1.1.4	Freedom of association and collective bargaining ^{a,b}
		1.1.5	Earnings and benefits ^a
		1.1.6	Working hours ^a
		1.1.7	Access to basic services ^{a,b}
		1.1.8	Occupational safety ^{a,b}
		1.1.9	Medical response ^{a,b}
	1.2 Access Rights	1.2.1	Customary resource use rights ^{a,b}
		1.2.2	Corporate responsibility and transparency ^{a,b}
2 Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit	2.1 Equality	2.1.1	Grievance reporting and access to remedy ^{a,b}
		2.1.2	Stakeholder participation and collaborative management ^{a,b}
	2.2 Equity	2.2.1	Equitable opportunity to benefit ^{a,b}
		2.2.2	Discrimination ^{a,b}
3 Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security	3.1 Food and nutrition security	3.1.1	Food and nutrition security ^b
		3.1.2	Healthcare ^b
		3.1.3	Education ^b
	3.2 Livelihood security	3.2.1	Benefits to and within community ^b
		3.2.2	Economic value retention ^{a,b}
		3.2.3	Long term profitability and future workforce ^{a,b}
		3.2.4	Economic flexibility and autonomy ^b
		3.2.5	Livelihood security ^b
		3.2.6	Fuel resource efficiency ^{a,b}

Conditionality of Scoring Performance Indicators

Recognizing that industrial and small-scale fisheries and farms face different social issues, some PIs and related SGs will not be relevant to certain fisheries and contexts. Similarly, this protocol is intended to be flexible and adaptable for a diversity of situations. As such, we provide a heuristic of potentially relevant indicators for assessing social risks in industrial versus small-scale production systems. Please note, that we are not suggesting to ignore any performance indicators 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.

General Scoring Guidance

Each of the performance indicators (PIs) of the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool must be scored following the guidance provided in this handbook, and the procedures described in the OSMI Rapid Assessment Protocol.

The assessment should be undertaken by an evaluation team with research experience in the social sciences, including human-rights and wellbeing protocols. The assessment of social responsibility principles, components, and indicators, will in some cases, require outsourcing or partnerships between environmental, development, and human-rights groups. The evaluation team should also strive to use a worker-driven approach to assessing labor conditions – workers/fishers/farmers and their representative organizations should be involved in the evaluation themselves and subsequently thereafter in the design of the FIP workplan (ILRF 2018).

After the evaluation team has compiled and analyzed the relevant information available (including primary and secondary sources), they shall score the Unit of Assessment (UoA) against the Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts (PISGs). Each PI is scored on a graded scale consistent with the MSC scoring method, with levels 60, 80 and 100 defining key sustainability thresholds. These thresholds correspond to levels of quality and certainty of fishing management practices and their probability of generating sustainability and social responsibility.

This methodology uses the following scoring categories, consistent with those used on FisheryProgress.org:

<60	High Risk	Red
60-79	Medium Risk	Yellow
80+	Low Risk	Green

Within the scoring categories for each indicator, there may be multiple bullet points or ‘guideposts’. By default, these bullet points are to be treated as ‘AND’ clauses, where all bullets within a category must be met to achieve that score. Otherwise the lower scoring (high risk) category should be applied. When bullets are to be treated as ‘OR’ clauses, the OR will be explicitly mentioned in the scoring category text. For all indicators a written rationale for the score must be provided. We do not suggest giving any specific indicators disproportionate weight, as all human rights are fundamentally regarded as indivisible, and one human right must never be compromised to advance another human right. Rather, all high-risk categories should seek immediate attention, and when/if criminal activity is detected, the appropriate remediation channels should be activated immediately (see ANNEX).

Determining Unit of Assessment (UoA)

In a FIP (based on MSC Principles 1,2,3) the following pieces of information are used to describe the fishery and determine the Unit of Assessment (UoA). The UoA is defined by the target stock(s) combined with the fishing method/gear and practice (including vessel type/s) pursuing that stock, and any fleets, or groups of vessels, or individual fishing operators or other eligible fishers that are included in this assessment. In some fisheries, the UoA may be further defined based on the specific fishing seasons and/or areas that are included.

- Target species scientific name and common name
- Fishery location
- Gear type(s)
- Catch quantity (weight)
- Vessel type and size
- Number of registered vessels
- Management authority (the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur)

When evaluating a FIP using social principles, the UoA may be different than used in a “traditional” (environmental) FIP, as it will need to be based on social levels or scales of organization relevant to the fishery or supply chain. Depending on what is being evaluated, the UoA will vary accordingly.

First, the UoA will vary depending on what aspect of the supply chain is being considered. This could include 1) the production sector, 2) pre-processing sector, 3) processing sector, 4) distribution sector, or any combination. Recognizing that the UoA may need to be bounded for feasibility and practical reasons (i.e., just looking at the production sector), it is still important to consider the FIP UoA in the context of the larger supply chain, where other human rights abuses may occur. As such, it should be noted that this tool can only elucidate social risks for the specific UoA within its respective supply chain, unless the entire supply chain is assessed for the whole sector or commodity. Buyers or consumers should not equate low risk scores produced by this assessment as a supply chain free of human rights abuses. Second, as the UoA is the scale at which the data are retrieved, the UoA may also vary by performance indicator. For example, within this protocol, social data may need to be collected at the scale of household, vessel, fishery, farm, community, or processing facility. In the case of some indicators (i.e., food security, health care, education) indicators may even exist at regional or country levels.

A high-angle photograph of a person in a wooden boat on a body of water. The person is seen from behind, wearing a light-colored, long-sleeved shirt and dark shorts. They are carrying a large, bulky bundle of white, fibrous material (possibly cotton or wool) on their back. The boat is a simple wooden hull with a pointed prow and stern. Inside the boat, there are two more large bundles of similar white material, a wooden paddle, and a small orange container. The water is a calm, greenish-brown color with some ripples. The overall scene suggests a person engaged in a traditional or manual labor activity, possibly related to textile production or transport.

PRINCIPLE 1:

PROTECT HUMAN
RIGHTS, DIGNITY,
AND ACCESS TO
RESOURCES



PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

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

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

Indicator 1.1.1: Abuse and harassment³

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Sexual harassment: Behavior, including gestures, language, and physical contact, that is sexually intimidating, abusive, or exploitative.

Gender-based violence: Violence directed against a person because of their gender. Both men and women experience gender-based violence, but the majority of victims are women and girls as it is rooted in power inequality between women and men.

³ For more information on abuse and harassment standards see: SSRT, FTUSA, ASC, Clearview, RFS.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migrant status is used as a threat or tool of coercion, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, verbal abuse, gender-based violence, sexual harassment, or any other form of harassment, including excessive or abusive disciplinary action, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers' families or community members are threatened by employers, buyers, labor brokers, or organized crime, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is forced drug use, or labor and/or product is compensated for with drugs.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migrant status is not used as a threat or tool of coercion, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, verbal abuse, gender-based violence, sexual harassment, or any other form of harassment, including excessive or abusive disciplinary action, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers' families or community members are not threatened by employers, buyers, labor brokers, or organized crime, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no forced drug use, or labor and/or product is not compensated for with drugs.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a written policy publicly disclosed, posted in all languages with special accommodations for illiteracy that prohibits physical abuse, bullying, and sexual harassment, with a disciplinary procedure in place to address cases of harassment, and discipline commensurate to the actions. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers and workers/fishers/farmers are aware of and trained on the harassment policy. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers have grievance procedures to report harassment and do not face retaliation for using them.

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

Indicator 1.1.2a: Human trafficking and forced labor

Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries⁴

Question: *Is the fishery/farm industrial or medium scale with labor recruitment from other countries or contracts with employers likely?*

If YES: Score Indicator 1.1.2a: Human trafficking and forced labor

If NO: Score Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Human trafficking: The recruitment, transportation, 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 (UNODC 2013).

Forced 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) (ILO C29).

Debt Bondage: Status or condition arising from a pledge by a debtor of their personal services or of those of a person under their control as security for a debt if the value of those services as reasonably assessed is not applied toward the liquidation of the debt or the length and nature of those services are not respectively limited and defined (HRW).

⁴ For more information on human trafficking and forced labor see: SSRT, FishSource, ILO C29, ILO C105, International Organization for Migration’s IRIS Tool, Verite’s Fair Hiring Toolkit, FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview.

Indicator 1.1.2a: Human trafficking and forced labor

Score for industrial-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are indicators of forced labor violations or evidence of debt bondage in the fishery/farm, for instance: excessive overtime earnings are paid more than 30 days after work is performed, deductions are paid to labor brokers, passport retention, non-payment of wages, high cost deductions for onboard provisions, or coercive recruitment, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers are not permitted to leave the farm or the vessel when in port, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers are required to pay a deposit at the beginning of employment to prevent them absconding, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers do not have the legal right to work or proper documentation/visas, and when applicable, the fishery/farm is not using legally registered recruiters, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• According to SSRT or FishSource risk ratings, there is a medium to critical risk of forced labor, and the fishery or farm has no labor recruitment policy or labor risk mitigation policy in place, or no implementation plan to carry out policies.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no indicators of forced labor violations or evidence of debt bondage in the fishery/farm, for instance: excessive overtime, earnings are paid more than 30 days after work is performed, deductions are paid to labor brokers, passport retention, non-payment of wages, high cost deductions for onboard provisions, or coercive recruitment, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers are permitted to leave the farm or the vessel when in port, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers are not required to pay a deposit at the beginning of employment to prevent them absconding, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers have the legal right to work and proper documentation/visas, and when applicable, the fishery/farm is only using legally registered recruiters,

Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to SSRT or FishSource risk ratings, there is a medium to high risk of forced labor, but the fishery or farm has a mitigation policy in place, and decent systems to monitor its own performance, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to SSRT or FishSource risk ratings, there is a low risk of forced labor, and the fishery or farm has adopted a relevant policy.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers are paid at least monthly, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overtime hours are voluntary and follow relevant legal requirements, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The farm/fishery has a robust system in place to monitor both its own performance on recruitment and labor practice, and when applicable, the performance and compliance of labor recruiters, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When applicable, prior to migration, workers/fishers/farmers have written contracts in a language they understand, with extra provisions made for illiterate workers, so that their rights and terms of recruitment and employment are clearly understood, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers do not pay any recruitment fees (document/visa/passport fees excluded).

Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries

Score for small-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), and all or most of their income is used to pay back their debts, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), and their debt has increased over time proportional to their income, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is not allowed to witness the product being weighed or graded to calculate their income.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), but most of their income is kept and a smaller percentage is used to pay back their debts, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), and their debt has remained stable or decreased over time proportional to their income, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is allowed to witness the product being weighed or graded to calculate their income.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder (for equipment, permit fees, fuel costs, ice, etc.), but a minimal percentage of their income is used to pay back their debts, and their debt has decreased over time proportional to their income, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fisher/farmer is NOT paying off debt to the cooperative, association, buyer, or permit holder.

Indicator 1.1.3: Child Labor⁵

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

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).

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 (ILO C190).

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 (ILO C188).

⁵ For more information on child labor see: ILO C182, ILO C138, SSRT, FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview, FOTS, IFFO RS, GRASP.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of hazardous child labor, including alongside family members, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children below the legal age of employment are employed as waged workers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment of children below the legal age of employment, even if working alongside family members, interferes with schooling, and harms their health, safety or morals, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a medium to critical systemic risk (e.g., SSRT) of child labor and the fishery or farm has no mitigation policy in place, or no implementation plan to carry out mitigation policy.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of hazardous child labor, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children below the legal age of employment are not employed as waged workers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children below the legal age of employment work alongside family members only if this does not interfere with schooling, and on tasks which do not harm their health, safety or morals, and do not work at night, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a low sectoral risk of child labor (e.g., SSRT) and the fishery/farm has adopted a relevant policy, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a medium to high sectoral risk of child labor (e.g., SSRT) and the fishery/farm has adopted relevant policies and has systems to monitor its own performance.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<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, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a sectoral risk of child labor (e.g., SSRT) and the fisher/farm is taking measures to address the root causes (e.g., supporting educational programs, increasing adult wages).



Indicator 1.1.4: Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining⁶

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Freedom of Association: The right to establish and join organizations of one's own choosing without previous authorization, and to draw up constitutions and rules, to elect representatives in full freedom, to organize administration and activities, and to formulate programs, without interference (ILO C87 & C98).

Collective Bargaining: All negotiations which take place between an employer, a group of employers or one or more employers' organizations, on the one hand, and one or more workers' organizations, on the other, for, determining working conditions and terms of employment; and/or regulating relations between employers and workers; and/or regulating relations between employers or their organizations and a workers' organization or workers' organizations (ILO C154).

⁶ For more information on freedom of association and collective bargaining see: ILO C87, ILO C98, ILO C154, FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of management or buyer interference in workers/fishers/farmers' rights to form organizations and bargain collectively, or worker/fisher/farmer representatives are unable to access employer facilities to speak with union members, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country with jurisdiction over workers/fishers/farmers restricts union rights and the employer has not provided for another way for workers/fishers/farmers to organize or express grievances, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human rights defenders are actively suppressed or there is a recent record of litigation by employers or the government against human rights defenders, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is discrimination against workers/fishers/farmers who are members or leaders of organizations, unions or cooperatives, including blacklisting, or worker/fishers/farmers are dismissed for exercising their right to strike.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers are free to form worker organizations, including trade unions, to advocate for and protect their rights, and have the right to decide their own structure, policies, programs, priorities, etc. without employer interference. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are national laws protecting collective workers' rights (including cooperatives) which are upheld and respected, or the country restricts trade union rights but the company/fishery/farm has provided a way for workers/fishers/farmers to organize and express grievances, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human rights defenders are not actively suppressed and there is no recent record of litigation by employers against human rights defenders, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no discrimination against workers/fishers/farmers who are members or leaders of organizations, unions or cooperatives, and workers/fishers/farmers are not dismissed for exercising their right to strike.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer or association has a written policy or by-laws (shared with workers/fishers/farmers in relevant languages and with provisions for illiteracy) that they respect the rights of workers/fishers/farmers to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers are trained by workers' organizations on their rights to organize and bargain collectively, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women participate in unions or cooperatives commensurate with their representation in the workforce.

Indicator 1.1.5: Earnings and Benefits⁷

Score for industrial-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

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.

Equal remuneration: Equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value refers to rates of remuneration established without discrimination based on gender, where remuneration refers to the ordinary, basic or minimum wage or salary and any additional emoluments whatsoever payable directly or indirectly, whether in cash or in kind, by the employer to the worker and arising out of the worker's employment (ILO C100).

**Red:
High Risk
(<60)**

- There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers,
- OR
- Minimum legal requirements for income or benefits are not properly defined in domestic labor law,
- OR
- Domestic law does not recognize equal remuneration for work of equal value for men and women, and wages paid to workers/fishers/farmers do not reflect equal remuneration,
- OR
- Wages or benefits are below minimum legal requirements, according to domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel,
- OR
- Overtime wages are not paid in accordance with minimum legal requirements, based on domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel,
- OR
- Wages paid to workers/fishers/farmers are not what was promised at the time of employment, are withheld as a form of discipline, contain illegal deductions, are not paid on time or directly to the worker/fisher/farmer, or workers/fishers/farmers go longer than one month without being paid,
- OR
- Employers use temporary laborers to avoid contracting employees and providing necessary legal benefits and salaries,
- OR

⁷ For more information on earnings and benefits see: ILO C188, ILO C100, FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview, FOTS, IFFO RS, GRASP.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers are unaware of how their earnings or deductions are calculated or their rights to benefits, or are asked to sign contracts they don't understand based on language barriers or illiteracy. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers do not receive wage slips with deductions itemized or written receipts.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum legal requirements for income and benefits are properly defined in domestic labor law, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic law may not recognize equal remuneration for work of equal value for men and women, however, wages paid to workers/fishers/farmers do reflect equal remuneration, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wage levels and benefits meet the minimum legal requirements according to domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overtime wages are paid in accordance with minimum legal requirements, based on domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wages paid to workers/fishers/farmers are what was promised at the time of employment, are not withheld as a form of discipline, do not contain illegal deductions, are paid on time or directly to the worker/fisher/farmer, and workers/fishers/farmers do not go longer than one month without being paid, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers legally contract employees, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers are aware of how their earnings or deductions are calculated and their rights to benefits, are allowed to witness procedures used to determine earnings (weighing, grading), and only sign contracts they understand with provisions for different languages or illiteracy, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers receive wage slips with deductions itemized or written receipts.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wages or earnings are higher than minimum legal wages or meet living wage levels (includes being able to provide for family, save, or invest), and benefits are provided beyond legal minimums, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both domestic law and practices and policies of the fishery/farm uphold the principles of equal remuneration for men and women, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The employer and workers discuss how they can improve wages and productivity in mutually beneficial ways, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are written contracts between employer and employees in a language employees understand with provisions for illiterate workers.

Indicator 1.1.6: Working hours⁸

Score for industrial-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mechanism in place for workers/fishers/farmers to record hours worked, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working hours exceed domestic legal limits and workers regularly work > 48 hours/week, and overtime hours are not paid at a premium as required by law, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rest periods are less than 10 hours in a 24-hour period, 77 hours in a 7 day period, or legal requirements for breaks are not followed, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is forced overtime,
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a mechanism in place for workers/fishers/farmers to record hours worked, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working hours meet the domestic legal minimum requirements, and overtime hours are paid at a premium as required by law, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers have at least 10 hours of rest in a 24 hour period and at least 77 hours in a 7 day period, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overtime is voluntary.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an independent, third party oversight mechanism for verification of working hours, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onshore workers do not work more than 48 hours/week even if the law permits more, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onshore workers do not work more than 6 days/week, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplace/farm/fishery has systems in place to anticipate peak production needs and seasonal variation to ensure that excessive overtime is not required, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplace/fishery/farm has paid pre- and post-natal maternity/paternity leave with adequate compensation.

⁸ For more information on working hours see: FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview, GRASP, ILO C188, ILRF 2018.

Indicator 1.1.7: Access to basic services⁹

Indicator 1.1.7a: Access to basic services (Live-aboard vessels/ worker housing)

Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services (Small-scale fishing communities)

Question: *Does the fishery/farm provide worker housing or require live-aboard vessel time?*

If YES: Score Indicator 1.1.7a: Access to basic services (Live-aboard vessels/ worker housing)

If NO: Score Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services (Small-scale fishing communities)

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Basic standards: Accommodation on board fishing vessels that fly its flag shall be of sufficient size and quality and appropriately equipped for the service of the vessel and the length of time fishers live on board. In particular, such measures shall address, as appropriate, the following issues: (a) approval of plans for the construction or modification of fishing vessels in respect of accommodation; (b) maintenance of accommodation and galley spaces with due regard to hygiene and overall safe, healthy and comfortable conditions; (c) ventilation, heating, cooling and lighting; (d) mitigation of excessive noise and vibration; (e) location, size, construction materials, furnishing and equipping of sleeping rooms, mess rooms and other accommodation spaces; (f) sanitary facilities, including toilets and washing facilities with adequate privacy, and supply of sufficient hot and cold water; and (g) procedures for responding to complaints concerning accommodation that does not meet the requirements of this Convention (ILO 2007).

⁹ For more information on access to basic services see: FTUSA, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview, GRASP, ILO C188, ILO 2009.

Indicator 1.1.7a: Access to basic services (Live-aboard vessels/ worker housing)

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing or sleeping quarters do not meet basic standards for space, comfort, safety, or cleanliness, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanitary facilities (appropriate to vessel size) with adequate privacy are not provided, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potable water is not accessible to workers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate food is not provided, or food provided is unsanitary.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing and sleeping quarters have adequate fire prevention and air ventilation, meet legal requirements, and meet reasonable levels of safety, decency, hygiene, and comfort, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanitary facilities (appropriate to vessel size) with adequate privacy are provided, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potable water is accessible to workers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers living on site or on board have access to adequate and sanitary food at fair prices.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are separate sanitary facilities for men and women, or sanitary facilities can be locked from the inside, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are separate sleeping quarters for men and women, or if there is one sleeping space, men and women have separate bunks, or share same bunk during different shifts, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sleeping quarters or sanitation facilities cannot be locked from the outside (restriction of movement is prevented), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers'/fishers' representatives and management meet regularly to discuss vessel or housing improvements, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplace/fishery/farm provides childcare.

Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services (Small-scale fishing communities)

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no access to potable water, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no access to electricity, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no access to sewage disposal (i.e., outhouse), OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no access to waste disposal (i.e., trash is burned at home).
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to potable water in the community, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to electricity intermittently, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to sewage disposal (i.e., sewage containers), AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to waste disposal (i.e., community dump).
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to potable water in each household, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is continuous access to electricity, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to sewage treatment (i.e., community treatment systems) AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is access to waste management (i.e., garbage collection and sorting of recycled materials).



Indicator 1.1.8: Occupational safety¹⁰

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Personal Protective Equipment: 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).

**Red:
High Risk
(<60)**

- There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers,
- OR
- Workers/fishers/farmers do not have access to communication equipment, or there is no radio on board (vessels over 24 meters),
- OR
- Adequate personal protective equipment (PPE) (i.e., lifejackets) is not provided on board or in the workplace/farm,

¹⁰ For more information on occupational safety see: FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Naturland, RFS, Clearview, GRASP, FOTS, IFFO RS, ILO 2007 (No. 188).

Red: High Risk (<60)	<p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers are required to pay for PPE (unless self-employed), <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers and managers are not trained in health and safety procedures, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel/farm/workplace does not comply with local/national safety and health regulations.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers have access to communication equipment, or there is a radio on board for vessels over 24 meters, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate personal protective equipment (PPE) (i.e., lifejackets) is provided on board or in the workplace/farm at no cost (unless self-employed), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers and managers are trained in health and safety procedures and on proper use of PPE and safe operation of any equipment they use (unless self-employed), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel/farm/workplace complies with local/national safety and health regulations.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On small vessels (<24 meters), there is a working radio on board, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers/fishers/farmers and managers are trained in health and safety procedures and on proper use of PPE and safe operation of any equipment they use, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workplace risks and risk areas are identified in relevant languages with provisions for illiteracy, and workplace accidents are recorded, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workplace/fishery/farm has a written health and safety policy, properly implemented, and workers/fishers/farmers are engaged in reviewing and implementing policy, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workplace/fishery/farm has a structure or mechanism in place (i.e., occupational health and safety committee), with formal channels of communications established, to discuss and implement protection of workplace health and safety, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are special protections for young, pregnant, or other vulnerable workers/fishers/farmers.

Indicator 1.1.9: Medical response¹¹

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Large vessels: Vessels equal to, or greater than 24 meters (ILO 2007).

Long Trips: Trips at sea for more than three days (ILO 2007).

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Medical supplies are inadequate or unavailable (i.e., there is no first aid kit), OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In factories, farms, or large vessels, there is no one trained in first aid.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adequate medical supplies are available (i.e., there is a first aid kit), AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In factories, farms, or large vessels, there is a trained first aid responder, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• On large vessels, making long trips, fishers have a valid medical certificate attesting to their fitness to work, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers are provided with medical care for workplace injuries and are repatriated if necessary at employer's expense.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<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, if not by law, then by employer, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers are trained in emergency response and first aid.

¹¹ For more information on medical response see: FTUSA, RFS, GRASP, ILO C188.



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

Indicator 1.2.1: Customary use rights¹²

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

Question: *Does the fishery or farm in question operate within, or adjacent to, a customary use area?*

If NO: Skip Indicator 1.2.1: Customary use rights

If YES: Score Indicator 1.2.1: Customary use rights

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Free, Prior, and Informed Consent:

(Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007)

Free: There is no coercion, duress, fraud, bribery, intimidation or manipulation.

¹² For more information on customary use rights see: FTUSA, ASC, MSC, BAP, Thai GAP, UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007.

Prior: Consent is to be sought sufficiently in advance of any significant planning, authorization or commencement of activities, and each decision making stage, and respect is shown to time requirements of indigenous consultation/consensus processes.

Informed: Information is provided, in appropriate language and format, that covers a range of aspects, including the nature, size, pace, reversibility and scope of any proposed project or activity; the purpose of the project as well as its duration; locality and areas affected; a preliminary assessment of the likely economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, including potential risks; personnel likely to be involved in the execution of the project; procedures the project may entail; and indigenous rights under domestic and national law. All information must be provided free from external manipulation and with sufficient time for review and decision-making in accordance with the laws and customs of the affected indigenous people. This process may include the option of withholding consent. **Communities must be allowed to withhold consent.** Consultation and participation are crucial components of a consent process.

**Red:
High Risk
(<60)**

- There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers,
- OR
- Resource use rights have been established by custom (informal) or by law (formal) for certain peoples or communities, but these are not respected by the fishery or farm,
- OR
- Resource use rights have been allocated to others (foreign enterprises, politically connected entities, etc.) at the expense of customary users,
- OR
- Fishers are denied fishing rights, or their fishing rights are revoked, due to discrimination (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, political affiliation) by authorities and/or other communities or entities,
- OR
- The farm or fishery is designated in an area legitimately claimed by communities without their documented Free, Prior, and Informed Consent,
- OR
- The farm or fishery's activities negatively impact adjacent communities, land, and/or water, or restrict access to vital community resources without community approval.

Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customary use rights have been mapped out using a participatory stakeholder process, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fishery or farm observes the legal and customary rights of local people, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers are not denied or revoked of fishing rights due to discrimination (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, political affiliation) by authorities and/or other communities or entities, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The farm or fishery is not designated in an area legitimately claimed by communities without their documented Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The farm or fishery understands its impact on customary access to resources, and does not negatively impact adjacent communities, land, and/or water, or restrict access to vital community resources without community approval.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an active process to establish a protocol agreement, or there is a protocol agreement in place, with indigenous communities, or communities with customary use rights, using Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customary resource users are aware of their rights, and are protected under law and can seek recourse within the legal system, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fishery or farm is actively mitigating any impacts or conflicts on access to resources for customary users, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities or people with claims to the resource are strongly involved in management of the resource, and traditional practices and knowledge are incorporated into resource management, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special attention is paid to ensure women and disadvantaged groups are included in consultation.

Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency¹³

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

Question: Does the fishery or farm in question operate primarily for subsistence purposes?

If YES: Skip Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency

If NO: Score Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Farm or fishery does not pay taxes, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Owners, managers, fishers or farmers pay bribes to public servants to gain access to resources or to avoid compliance with local regulations.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no evidence that owners, managers, fishers or farmers pay bribes to public servants to gain access to resources or to avoid compliance with local regulations.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Farm or fishery publicly discloses their social, economic, and environmental performance, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Farm or fishery is engaged in multi-stakeholder, worker-centered initiatives aiming to improve social performance across the industry, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Financial accounts are regularly reviewed by independent third-party auditors, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Farm or fishery has published social responsibility and environmental policies.

¹³ For more information on corporate responsibility and transparency see: BSCI, IFFO RS, ASC.

A fisherman wearing a traditional conical hat stands in a small boat, casting a large, bright yellow fishing net into the water. The net is spread wide, creating a large, glowing canopy. The background is a dense, lush green forest. The scene is captured in a way that emphasizes the vibrant yellow of the net against the dark green foliage.

PRINCIPLE 2:

ENSURE EQUALITY
AND EQUITABLE
OPPORTUNITY TO
BENEFIT



PRINCIPLE 2: Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit

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

Indicator 2.1.1: Grievance reporting and access to remedy¹⁴

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Grievance: A circumstance or condition that constitutes an injustice to the sufferer and gives just ground for complaint.

Grievance mechanisms: 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

¹⁴ For more information on grievance reporting and access to remedy see: UN Guiding Principles on Businesses and Human Rights, Articles 25-31, ILRF 2018, IFFO RS, ASC, GRASP, Clearview, and for worker hotline and grievance reporting services see: Issara Institute and Clear Voice.

operations (SOMO). In order to ensure their effectiveness, grievance mechanisms must be legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, rights-compatible, a source of continuous learning, and based on engagement and dialogue. A grievance mechanism can only serve its purpose if the people it is intended to serve, know about it, trust it, and are able to use it (*For detailed information see UN Guiding Principles on Businesses and Human Rights, Articles 25-31).

- Legitimate: enabling trust from the stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended, and being accountable for the fair conduct of grievance processes.
- Accessible: being known to all stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended, and providing adequate assistance for those who may face particular barriers to access.
- Predictable: providing a clear and known procedure with an indicative time frame for each stage, and clarity on the types of process and outcome available and means of monitoring implementation.
- Equitable: seeking to ensure that aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice, and expertise necessary to engage in a grievance process on fair, informed, and respectful terms.
- Transparent: keeping parties to a grievance informed about its progress, and providing sufficient information about the mechanism's performance to build confidence in its effectiveness and meet any public interest at stake.
- Rights-compatible: ensuring that outcomes and remedies accord with internationally recognized human rights.
- As source of continuous learning: drawing on relevant measures to identify lessons for improving the mechanism and preventing future grievances and harms.
- Based on engagement and dialogue: consulting the stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended on their design and performance, and focusing on dialogue as the means to address and resolve grievances.

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

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers do not have knowledge of or access to effective, fair, and confidential grievance mechanisms, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers are punished for reporting workplace violations of human or labor rights, or corruption by public officials. This could include, for instance, physical punishment, gender-based retaliation, intimidation, wage deduction or withholding, job loss, and/or blacklisting.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers that pertain to a business have knowledge of and access to effective, fair, and confidential grievance mechanisms, or if workers/ fisher/farmers are part of a cooperative, association, or customary group, they have knowledge and access to effective and fair grievance mechanisms (according to established protocols and by-laws of transparency, democracy, and equal representation), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no retaliation or prejudice against workers/fishers/farmers who submit grievances, including gender-based prejudice or retaliation.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grievance mechanisms are both procedurally and substantively effective at remediation of conflicts and complaints in a time-bound manner with no reoccurring grievances, and these remediation processes (corrective action plans) are publicly disclosed, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grievance procedure includes special consideration for vulnerable populations (e.g., migrant workers, women, ethnic minorities), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers/fishers/farmers have access to third party independent organizations or local/customary governance body that can address grievances and ensure effective representation.

Indicator 2.1.2: Stakeholder Participation and Collaborative Management¹⁵

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Stakeholder participation: The process by which an organization involves all men and women who may be affected by the decisions it makes or in all other governance activities (decision making, monitoring, enforcement, conflict resolution). *An affected stakeholder is someone who will experience consequences by the decision made (fisher/worker/farmer, community member, women, minorities). A relevant stakeholder is anyone who has a stake in the decision made (government, businesses, NGOs).

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no mechanism for stakeholder participation in the fishery/farm management unit, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a mechanism for stakeholder participation, but it is not representative of all affected and relevant stakeholders or some stakeholder groups are excluded from the participation mechanism (i.e., women, ethnic minorities, lower economic class).
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a mechanism for stakeholder participation or in the fishery/farm management unit, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All affected and relevant stakeholders are represented and no stakeholder groups are excluded based on status, class, gender, ethnicity, etc., AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholder input is considered and integrated into decision-making.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decisions are publicly communicated, promoted, and transparent, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decision-making processes have special consideration provided for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups (i.e., migrant workers, women, ethnic minorities), so that decisions are made by affected stakeholders on equal terms,

¹⁵ For more information on stakeholder participation and collaborative management see: SFW, ASC, MSC, Thai GAP, IFFO RS, BAP, FishSource, FTUSA, GALS.

**Green:
Low Risk
(80+)**

AND

- All affected and relevant stakeholders are free to engage in all aspects of fishery/aquaculture governance including decision-making, monitoring, enforcement, and conflict resolution,

AND

- Participation and collaborative management between local stakeholders and government is fostered and reinforced by civil society organizations working to protect the interests of relevant stakeholders.



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

Indicator 2.2.1: Equitable opportunity to benefit¹⁶

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Benefits: Benefits in fisheries or aquaculture supply chains may include access to fishing rights, profits, medical care, social security, markets, loans, credits, subsidies, and social protection measures, among other things.

Marginalized group: A group relegated to an unimportant or powerless position within a society (i.e., migrant workers, women and girls, ethnic or religious minorities, etc.).

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.

¹⁶ For more information on social equity and equal opportunity to benefit see: FTUSA, Human Rights at Sea 2015, ILO 2010 GEMS.

Equality: The same status, rights, and responsibilities for all members of a society, group, or family; giving everyone the same resources regardless of their relative ability to benefit.

Equity: An equal opportunity to benefit; giving everyone the resources they need to derive the same benefits, dependent on their relative ability to benefit.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/farm based on gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, class, migrant status, political affiliation, etc.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/farm regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, class, migrant status, political affiliation, etc., <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/farm, but a strategy or policy to address inequity is in place.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/farm, and marginalized groups are in leadership positions or positions of power, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender transformative policies and research programs are in place (i.e., routine data collection of gender disaggregated data).

Indicator 2.2.2: Discrimination¹⁷

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Discrimination: Any distinction, exclusion, or preference made on the basis of race, color, gender, religion, political opinion, immigration status, national extraction, disability, family responsibilities, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, trade union membership, trade union activities, or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are different rates of pay for people in the same positions, based on e.g., ethnicity, sex, religious affiliation, etc., OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is discrimination in recruitment, promotion, access to training, access to permits, remuneration, allocation of work, termination of employment, retirement, ability to join unions or cooperatives, or other activities, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is discrimination in access to benefits e.g., health care, savings accounts, insurance, etc., OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is pregnancy testing for female workers/fishers/farmers.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workers/fishers/farmers receive equal pay for work of equal value, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no discrimination in recruitment promotion, access to training, access to permits, remuneration, allocation of work, termination of employment, retirement, ability to join unions or cooperatives, or other activities. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no discrimination in access to benefits e.g., health care, savings accounts, insurance, etc., AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no compulsory pregnancy testing for female workers/fishers/farmers.

¹⁷ For more information on discrimination see: FTUSA, ASC, BSCI, Clearview, Naturland, RFS, ILO C111.

**Green:
Low Risk
(80+)**

- There is a comprehensive and proactive anti-discrimination policy for the fishery or farm. The policy is implemented through procedures and practices, posted in all languages and visible to all workers,
- AND
- Managers and workers/fishers/farmers are aware of and trained on the anti-discrimination policy.

A photograph of a person carrying a large, deep, woven basket on their back. The basket is made of dark brown, woven material and has a rope handle. The person is wearing a brown skirt and a yellow sash. In the foreground, there is a pile of purple eggplants. The background is blurred, showing other people and market stalls.

PRINCIPLE 3:

IMPROVE FOOD,
NUTRITION, AND
LIVELIHOOD
SECURITY



PRINCIPLE 3: Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security

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

Indicator 3.1.1: Food and Nutrition Security¹⁸

Score for small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Food and nutrition security: When all people at all times have physical, social, and economic access to food, which is consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food preferences, and is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care, allowing for a healthy and active life (FAO 2013), in consideration of differences in nutritional requirements for women and children.

¹⁸ For more information on food security see: FTUSA, RSB 2012, RSB 2017, relevant links above.

Suggested indicators used to complete this assessment:

Country-level food and nutrition insecurity indicator: Undernourishment Indicator – measures the share of the population which has a caloric (dietary energy) intake which is insufficient to meet the minimum energy requirements defined as necessary for a given population (UN FAO State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World: www.fao.org/state-of-food-security-nutrition/en/).

Community-level food and nutrition insecurity indicator: Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) – a list of eight questions referring to the experiences of an individual or household associated with increasing difficulties in accessing food due to resource constraints (UN FAO: www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/fies/en/)

During the last 12 months, was there a time when, because of lack of money or other resources:

1. You were worried you would not have enough food to eat?
2. You were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food?
3. You ate only a few kinds of foods?
4. You had to skip a meal?
5. You ate less than you thought you should?
6. Your household ran out of food?
7. You were hungry but did not eat?
8. You went without eating for a whole day?

Gender-specific food and nutrition insecurity indicator: Minimum Dietary Diversity Indicator for Women of Reproductive Age (MDDI-W) – a food group diversity indicator that has been shown to reflect micronutrient adequacy, summarized across 11 micronutrients, for women of reproductive age who are often nutritionally vulnerable because of the physiological demands of pregnancy and lactation (UN FAO: www.fao.org/3/a-i5486e.pdf)

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In food/nutrition insecure countries (i.e., based on % undernourished), a participatory local food and nutrition security assessment has been done and food/nutrition insecurity has been identified, but risk mitigation has not yet occurred, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community is food/nutrition insecure (i.e., based on FIES) and the fishery/farm/buyer has not undertaken any actions to assess or reduce risk of their practices affecting local food and nutrition security, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International or export trade agreements with the fishery/farm have resulted in food/nutrition insecurity for the workers/fishers/farmers, their families, or community members.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country is food/nutrition secure (i.e., based on % undernourished), or a participatory local food and nutrition security assessment has found low to moderate risk of food/nutrition insecurity, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International or export trade agreements with the fishery/farm have not resulted in food/nutrition insecurity for the workers/fishers/farmers, their families, or community members, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A participatory local food and nutrition security assessment (i.e., FIES or MDDI-W) has found food/nutrition insecurity impacts due to the fishery/farm (i.e., lack of access to marine resources for subsistence purposes) but active measures are being taken to address these impacts.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no food/nutrition insecurity among workers/fishers/farmers and their families, nor among community members adjacent to a fishery/farm (i.e., based on FIES or MDDI-W), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are programs in place to ensure international or export trade agreements with the fishery/farm do not result in food/nutrition insecurity for the workers/fishers/farmers, their families, or community members, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where food/nutrition insecurity has been found among seafood-dependent communities (i.e., based on FIES or MDDI-W), local data shows improving food/nutrition security factors (i.e., increasing access to marine resources for subsistence purposes).

Indicator 3.1.3: Healthcare¹⁹

Score for small-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The country or region has poor health indicators (e.g., life expectancy at birth; under-five mortality – see WHO) and no local assessment of healthcare needs has been done, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local assessment of healthcare needs reveals poor health indicators, but the farm/fishery has not taken any action to improve healthcare.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community's (adjacent to fishery/farm) healthcare needs have been assessed, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community's (adjacent to fishery/farm) healthcare needs are not of concern.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community's (adjacent to fishery/farm) healthcare needs have been assessed and there are resources being invested to address any needs uncovered, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women have adequate access to reproductive healthcare including family planning, pre- and post-natal, and maternal care, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local data shows improving healthcare.

¹⁹ For more information on healthcare see: FTUSA, SFP, WHO.

Indicator 3.1.4: Education²⁰

Score for small-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <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, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A local assessment of education needs reveals poor education indicators, but the farm/fishery has not taken any action to improve education, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Girls and boys have different rates of educational attainment.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community's (adjacent to fishery/farm) education needs have been assessed, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community (adjacent to fishery/farm) has adequate literacy (literacy rate among youth aged 15-24 is 90% or more), and schooling rates (less than 10% of primary school-age children are out of school) (see SFP 2016), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Girls and boys do not have different rates of educational attainment.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community's educational needs have been assessed and there are resources being invested to address any needs uncovered, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is universal access to education through a secondary school level, via remote learning where relevant, or access to a technical school, or university.

²⁰ For more information on education see: FTUSA, SFP, UNESCO Education Indicators.



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

Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to and within community²¹

Score for small-scale.

Question: *Can the fishery or farm in question be characterized as related to/operating in a specific community?*

If NO: Skip Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to community

If YES: Score Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to community

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Community: In this context, community is not necessarily only a spatially bound, homogeneous and organized social unit, as many fishing-dependent communities are migrant, nomadic, or temporary. Likewise, we recognize the complexity occurring *within* communities across gender, ethnicity, class, political, and religious status, resulting in differential access to benefits from fishing/farming.

²¹ For more information on benefits to community see: FTUSA, Thai GAP, IPNLF.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from within the community do not hold resource access rights or permits <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the harvesting workforce is comprised of temporary migrant workers and no consideration has been given to hiring local workers.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from within the community hold resource access rights or permits, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration is paid to hiring a local workforce.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the harvesting workforce is comprised of local residents, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from within the community hold the majority of resource access rights or permits, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of livelihoods and economic benefits from fishery/farm are distributed and retained locally, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High employment rates of women in local jobs created by fishery/farm.

Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention²²

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

Question: *Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?*

If NO: Score Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention

If YES: Skip Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Ratio of gross value added to turnover: A metric useful for understanding the economic value retained by the vessel owner, worker, fisher, or farmer. This metric is calculated by dividing gross added value by income (GAV/Income). Gross Added Value is defined as the grand total of all revenues, from final sales and (net) subsidies in a business, which is then used to cover expenses (wages & salaries, dividends), savings (profits, depreciation), and (indirect) taxes (SFP 2016).

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">The ratio of gross value added to turnover is below 47%.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">The ratio of gross value added to turnover is between 47-57%.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The ratio of gross value added to turnover is above 57%, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">Formalized training is provided to fishers/farmers in how to add value to their product.

²² For more information on economic value retention see: SFP.

Indicator 3.2.3: Long-term profitability and future workforce²³

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Operating profit margin: Ratio of operating profit to turnover. Operating profit is defined as the difference between the turnover and all operating costs (SFP 2016).

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Long-term average operating profit margin is below 11%, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The average age of workers/fishers/farmers is closer to retirement age than the average age in the country, and new workers/fishers/farmers are not joining the workforce.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Long-term average operating profit margin is between 11%-18%, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The average age of workers/fishers/farmers is close to the average age in the country, and new workers/fishers/farmers are joining the workforce.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Long-term average operating profit margin is above 18%, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New workers/fishers/farmers including women are being recruited into the workforce, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Women are increasingly taking leadership roles in the supply chain and fishing/farming communities.

²³ For more information on economic value retention see: SFP.

Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy²⁴

Score for small-scale.

Question: *In this context are fishers/farmers selling their own product?*

If NO: Skip Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy

If YES: Score Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If applicable, interest rates charged to fishers/farmers are not transparent or are exorbitant/predatory, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fishers/farmers do not have access to multiple buyers or are not free to sell to whomever they choose, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is price collusion among local buyers, OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fishers/farmers do not know the quality expected of the product, how the price is calculated, or when they will be paid.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If applicable, interest rates charged to fishers/farmers are transparent and agreed upon in advance with fishers/farmers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is more than one local fish buyer, and harvesters are free to sell to whomever they wish without retribution, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no price collusion among local buyers, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fishers/farmers know the quality expected of the product, how the price is calculated, and when they will be paid via verbal contract with buyers.

²⁴ For more information on economic flexibility and autonomy see: FTUSA.

**Green:
Low Risk
(80+)**

- If applicable, fishers/farmers can access loans from at least two types of lenders at interest rates not exceeding government rates or lender's borrowing rate,
- AND
- Fishers/farmers are organized into groups to better negotiate with buyers and may be price setters,
- AND
- Fishers/farmers know the quality expected of the product, how the price is calculated, and when they will be paid via written contract with buyers (in a language understood or with provisions for illiteracy),
- AND
- When applicable, buyers support fishers/farmers through sharing costs of certification and training,
- AND
- Fishers/farmers have access to competitive credit markets or are recipients of investment opportunities.



Indicator 3.2.5: Livelihood security

Score for small-scale.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

Livelihood: A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. It is considered sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resources base on which it relies.

Livelihoods security: Livelihood security refers to the absence of objective threats to livelihood preservation and/or subjective fears that livelihood preservation may be undermined. It requires maintaining the conditions under which each livelihood group can live from their activities.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers do not have an active license or are not recognized as part of the legal work force, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers only have harvesting access (formally or informally) to only one species/species group, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers have no resources to access fishing/farming gear needed to fulfill livelihood responsibilities (engines, boats, gear, fuel, etc.), <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers have no alternative livelihood outside of the fishery or farm, nor does anyone in their household.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers work under a license(s) or are recognized as part of the legal work force, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers have harvesting access (formally or informally) to more than one species/species group, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers have access to fishing/farming gear needed to fulfill livelihood responsibilities (ice, engines, boats, gear, fuel, bait etc.), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/farmers/workers, or someone in their household, have alternative livelihoods outside of the fishery or farm.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male and female fishers/farmers/workers have formal (legal) access to a portfolio of species/species groups and gear types, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male and female fishers/farmers/workers have ownership over the fishing/farming gear needed to fulfill livelihood responsibilities (ice, engines, boats, gear, fuel, bait etc.), <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male and female fishers/farmers/workers have access to professional development training or capacity building either inside the fishery/farm, or outside (in alternative livelihoods).



Indicator 3.2.6: Economic fuel efficiency²⁵

Score for industrial-scale or small-scale.

Red: High Risk (<60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no reliable or transparent data available, or the assessment team is not able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, or interviews in a manner safe for assessment team or affected workers/fishers, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of true vessel fuel costs (including subsidy) / fish sales is higher than 18%.
Yellow: Med Risk (60-79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reliable and transparent data available, or the assessment team is able to collect primary data through observation, surveys, and interviews in a manner safe for the assessment team and affected workers/fishers, <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of true vessel fuel costs (including subsidy) / fish sales is between 13%-18%.
Green: Low Risk (80+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of true vessel fuel costs (including subsidy) / fish sales is under 13%.

²⁵ For more information on resource efficiency see SFP, IPNLF.



GLOSSARY

Basic standards: Accommodation on board fishing vessels that fly its flag shall be of sufficient size and quality and appropriately equipped for the service of the vessel and the length of time fishers live on board. In particular, such measures shall address, as appropriate, the following issues: (a) approval of plans for the construction or modification of fishing vessels in respect of accommodation; (b) maintenance of accommodation and galley spaces with due regard to hygiene and overall safe, healthy and comfortable conditions; (c) ventilation, heating, cooling and lighting; (d) mitigation of excessive noise and vibration; (e) location, size, construction materials, furnishing and equipping of sleeping rooms, mess rooms and other accommodation spaces; (f) sanitary facilities, including toilets and washing facilities, and supply of sufficient hot and cold water; and (g) procedures for responding to complaints concerning accommodation that does not meet the requirements of this Convention (ILO C188).

Benefits: Benefits in fisheries or aquaculture supply chains may include access to rights, profits, medical care, social security, markets, loans, credits, subsidies, and social protection measures, among other things.

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 (UN). Definition of child may vary from country to country.

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).

Collective Bargaining: All negotiations which take place between an employer, a group of employers or one or more employers' organizations, on the one hand, and one or more workers' organizations, on the other, for determining working conditions

and terms of employment; and/or regulating relations between employers and workers; and/or regulating relations between employers or their organizations and a workers' organization or workers' organizations (ILO C154).

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 (FTUSA).

Community: In this context, community is not necessarily only a spatially bound, homogenous and organized social unit, as many fishing-dependent communities are migrant, nomadic, or temporary. Likewise, we recognize the complexity occurring within communities across gender, ethnicity, class, political, and religious status, resulting in differential access to benefits from fishing/farming.

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 (ILO).

Debt Bondage: Status or condition arising from a pledge by a debtor of their personal services or of those of a person under their control as security for a debt if the value of those services as reasonably assessed is not applied toward the liquidation of the debt or the length and nature of those services are not respectively limited and defined (HRW).

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.

Equal remuneration: Equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value refers to rates of remuneration established without discrimination based on gender, where remuneration refers to the ordinary, basic or minimum wage or salary and any additional emoluments whatsoever payable directly or indirectly, whether in cash or in kind, by the employer to the worker and arising out of the worker's employment (ILO C100).

Equality: The same status, rights, and responsibilities for all members of a society, group, or family; giving everyone the same resources regardless of their relative ability to benefit.

Equity: An equal opportunity to benefit; giving everyone the resources they need to derive the same benefits, dependent on their relative ability to benefit.

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 (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.

Food and nutrition security: when all people at all times have physical, social and economic access to food, which is consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food preferences, and is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care, allowing for a healthy and active life (FAO 2013), in consideration of differences in nutritional requirements for women and children.

Suggested indicators used to complete this assessment:

Country-level food and nutrition insecurity indicator: Undernourishment Indicator – measures the share of the population which has a caloric (dietary energy) intake which is insufficient to meet the minimum energy requirements defined as necessary for a given population (UN FAO State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World: <http://www.fao.org/state-of-food-security-nutrition/en/>).

Community-level food and nutrition insecurity indicator: Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) – a list of eight questions referring to the experiences of an individual or household associated with increasing difficulties in accessing food due to resource constraints (UN FAO: <http://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/fies/en/>)

During the last 12 months, was there a time when, because of lack of money or other resources:

1. You were worried you would not have enough food to eat?
2. You were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food?
3. You ate only a few kinds of foods?
4. You had to skip a meal?
5. You ate less than you thought you should?
6. Your household ran out of food?
7. You were hungry but did not eat?
8. You went without eating for a whole day?

Gender-specific food and nutrition insecurity indicator: Minimum Dietary Diversity Indicator for Women of Reproductive Age (MDDI-W) – a food group diversity indicator that has been shown to reflect micronutrient adequacy, summarized across 11 micronutrients, for women of reproductive age who are often nutritionally vulnerable because of the physiological demands of pregnancy and lactation (UN FAO: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5486e.pdf>)

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) (ILO C29).

Freedom of Association: The right to establish and join organizations of one's own choosing without previous authorization, and to draw up constitutions and rules, to elect representatives in full freedom, to organise administration and activities, and to formulate programmes, without interference (ILO C87 & C98).

Gender-based violence: Violence directed against a person because of their gender. Both men and women experience gender-based violence, but the majority of victims are women and girls as it is rooted in power inequality between women and men.

Gender transformative: An approach or practice where gender equality—equal rights, opportunities and possibilities in life for both men and women—and women's empowerment are central to the intervention, e.g., the shared control of resources and decision-making.

Grievance: A circumstance or condition that constitutes an injustice to the sufferer and gives just ground for complaint.

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 (SOMO). In order to ensure their effectiveness, grievance mechanisms must be legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, rights-compatible, a source of continuous learning, and based on engagement and dialogue. A grievance mechanism can only serve its purpose if the people it is intended to serve, know about it, trust it, and are able to use it (*For detailed information see UN Guiding Principles on Businesses and Human Rights, Articles 25-31).

- Legitimate: enabling trust from the stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended, and being accountable for the fair conduct of grievance processes
- Accessible: being known to all stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended, and providing adequate assistance for those who may face particular barriers to access
- Predictable: providing a clear and known procedure with an indicative time frame

for each stage, and clarity on the types of process and outcome available and means of monitoring implementation

- Equitable: seeking to ensure that aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice, and expertise necessary to engage in a grievance process on fair, informed, and respectful terms
- Transparent: keeping parties to a grievance informed about its progress, and providing sufficient information about the mechanism's performance to build confidence in its effectiveness and meet any public interest at stake
- Rights-compatible: ensuring that outcomes and remedies accord with internationally recognized human rights
- As source of continuous learning: drawing on relevant measures to identify lessons for improving the mechanism and preventing future grievances and harms
- Based on engagement and dialogue: consulting the stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended on their design and performance, and focusing on dialogue as the means to address and resolve grievances

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 (ILO C190).

Human trafficking: The recruitment, transportation, 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 (UNODC 2013).

Large vessels: Vessels equal to, or greater than 24 meters (ILO C188).

Livelihood: A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. It is considered sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resources base on which it relies.

Livelihoods Security: Livelihood security refers to the absence of objective threats to livelihood preservation and/or subjective fears that livelihood preservation may be undermined. It requires maintaining the conditions under which each livelihood group can live from their activities.

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

Long Trips: Trips at sea for more than three days (ILO C188).

Marginalized group: A group relegated to an unimportant or powerless position within a society (i.e., migrant workers, women and girls, ethnic or religious minorities, etc.).

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 (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 (SFP 2016).

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 (FTUSA).

Ratio of gross value added to turnover: A metric useful for understanding the economic value retained by the vessel owner, worker, fisher, or farmer. This metric is calculated by dividing gross added value by income (GAV/Income). Gross Added Value is defined as the grand total of all revenues, from final sales and (net) subsidies in a business, which is then used to cover expenses (wages & salaries, dividends), savings (profits, depreciation), and (indirect) taxes (SFP 2016).

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. "The small-scale fisheries sector tends to be firmly rooted in local communities, traditions, and values. Many small-scale fishers are self-employed and usually provide fish for direct consumption within their households or communities. Women are significant participants in the sector, particularly in post-harvest and processing activities. It is estimated that about 90% of all people directly dependent on capture fisheries work in the small-scale sector. As such, small-scale fisheries serve as an economic and social engine, providing food and nutrition security, employment and other multiplier effects to local economies while underpinning the livelihoods of riparian communities" (Def. from UN FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable

Small-Scale Fisheries). Exact definitions of small-scale fisheries vary based on country.

Sexual harassment: Behavior, including gestures, language, and physical contact, that is sexually intimidating, abusive, or exploitative.

Stakeholder participation: the process by which an organization involves all people who may be affected by the decisions it makes.

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).



ANNEX 1: Guidance for Assessment Implementation

Conservation Ethics and Best Practices for Human Rights and Conservation Research and Implementation

Here we provide important ethical considerations and best practices for engaging in human rights and conservation research and interventions. Careful attention to social impact and adverse consequences must be paid in the case of every FIP design and implementation, whether or not the Social Responsibility Assessment Tool is used, or social indicators are scored. This pertains to every phase of the FIP, including in undertaking the assessment, designing the workplan through participatory inclusion of stakeholders, and in public reporting of risk ratings and progress. In particular, we focus on the guidance provided from the following critical resources:

1. CDA's "Do No Harm Approach"
2. Free, Prior, and Informed Consent
3. The Conservation and Human Rights Framework
4. [ILRF Four Essential Elements](#)
5. [SFP's Guidance for Incorporating Socioeconomic Dimensions into FIPs](#)

Do No Harm Approach

The very first step necessary in the ethical implementation of any FIP (environmental or social) is to take the **"do no harm approach."** This approach, first defined by the CDA Collaborative, recognizes that any intervention (i.e., conservation, development, aid, humanitarian assistance) has the potential to support either conflict or peace. Thus, using a "do no harm approach" emphasizes understanding the local context in which the proposed FIP intends to operate, understanding the interaction between the intervention (FIP assessment, workplan, activities, reporting, etc.) and the local context, and acting upon that understanding as to avoid negative impacts and unintended consequences and maximize positive impacts. Negative impacts or unintended consequences can arise at any stage of the FIP, thus critical thought needs to be allocated to recognizing any trade-offs or

conflicts that can occur as a result of the FIP, and all actions must be designed around trying to avoid these consequences. In some cases, it may not be possible to proceed with a FIP without causing unnecessary harm or hardship to local communities.

Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

A second critical protocol in this context is Free, Prior, and Informed Consent as defined by the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007. In this case, "free" refers to the absence of coercion, intimidation or manipulation. "Prior" refers to when consent is sought sufficiently in advance of any authorization or commencement of FIP activities and respect is shown to time requirements of indigenous consultation/consensus processes. "Informed" refers to the provision of information that covers a range of aspects, including the nature, size, pace, reversibility and scope of any proposed project or activity; the purpose of the project as well as its duration; locality and areas affected; a preliminary assessment of the likely economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, including potential risks; personnel likely to be involved in the execution of the project; and procedures the project may entail. **Communities must be allowed to withhold consent.** Consultation and participation are crucial components of a consent process.

The Conservation and Human Rights Framework

A third critical protocol informing ethical guidance of FIP implementation is the Conservation and Human Rights Framework - a set of agreed upon principles that seeks to protect human rights while conducting conservation research and implementing conservation interventions, adopted in 2010 by a consortium of conservation organizations is called the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights. While we hope that the inclusion of social responsibility in FIPs will further the protection of human rights and wellbeing in global fisheries, FIP implementers should ensure that any FIP activity undertaken is in accordance with the following principles from the Conservation and Human Rights Framework:

1. **Respect human rights** - Respect internationally proclaimed human rights and make sure that we do not contribute to infringements of human rights while pursuing our mission
2. **Promote human rights within conservation programs** - Support and promote the protection and realization of human rights within the scope of our conservation programs
3. **Protect the vulnerable** - Make special efforts to avoid harm to those who are vulnerable to infringements of their rights and to support the protection and fulfillment of their rights within the scope of our conservation programs
4. **Encourage good governance** - Support the improvement of governance systems that can secure the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the context of our work on conservation and sustainable natural resource use, including elements such as legal, policy, and institutional frameworks, and procedures for equitable participation and accountability

ILRF Four Essential Elements

In 2018, International Labor Rights Forum published a report - Taking Stock: Labor exploitation, illegal fishing, and brand responsibility in the seafood Industry. The report outlines four “essential elements” for transitioning the seafood sector to social responsibility: 1) **Genuine worker representation**; 2) **Comprehensive and transparent risk assessment and verification of workplace compliance**; 3) **Legally-binding and enforceable agreements**; and 4) **Change brand purchasing practices**. While all four are critical for achieving socially responsibility, the first two are especially important during the implementation of this rapid assessment protocol.

In order to achieve genuine worker representation, it is imperative that a FIP under evaluation for social responsibility, includes a fisher/farmer/worker committee (depending on position in supply chain, or UoA) as part of the stakeholder group that informs the workplan and future FIP objectives and activities. To achieve comprehensive and transparent risk assessment and verification of workplace compliance, the rapid assessment protocol should include the

collection of primary data (interviews and surveys with stakeholders) and secondary data (reviews of legal documents, white papers, published research). Using multiple sources of data will help in triangulation and increase the reliability and validity of the data. Importantly, interviews and surveys with workers/fishers/farmers are likely to give the researcher the most reliable and trustworthy account of social conditions on the water or in processing plants. When a FIP implementer is collecting primary data, she/he should have prior experience doing social science research or partner with an individual or organization (i.e., human rights organization) that has sufficient experience.

The report also makes several directed recommendations to the FIP community of practice on the integration of human rights and social responsibility principles:

“As industry actors, environmental organizations, and human rights organizations develop the tools and plans needed to pilot ‘socially responsible FIPs,’ it is vital that they place corporate respect for fishers’ human rights at the top of the agenda. To ensure these FIPs are indeed socially responsible and actually benefit fishers, local communities, and the environment, the Essential Elements must be incorporated...”

“As part of this harmonization process, global union federations such as the ITF and IUF must be invited to join ongoing socially responsible FIPs discussions and local labor union affiliates or other grassroots worker organizations representing fishers should be involved in all decisions affecting their constituency.”

Guidelines for Incorporating Social Responsibility Dimensions into FIPs*

*Most of this text is adopted from a report prepared by Sustainable Fisheries Partnership 2018

Phase 0 – FIP Identification

Re(define) the Unit of Assessment in terms of people

The concept of a ‘fishery’ needs to be broadened beyond what a FIP would traditionally consider. A fishery is no longer defined by stock, ecosystem and fisheries management alone and should be extended to explicitly include people, that is, fishers, skippers, boat owners, and other local actors that are dependent upon the fishery. Their welfare is part of the fishery and must be considered when assessing performance, setting objectives, and working on improvements. For more considerations, see Defining the Unit of Assessment (above).

Identify FIP participants and seek out stakeholders with a social focus

Stakeholders should be identified using a stakeholder mapping exercise that employs wider search parameters than those typically used by FIPs. The pool of stakeholders with the potential to act as FIP participants or informal stakeholders should include those with a social or economic interest in the fishery and post-harvest activities, for instance, women and other vulnerable or marginalized groups, community leaders, community groups concerned with employment, government representatives (i.e., those responsible for the national economy, labor laws, health and/or education), local human rights and social welfare NGOs, and social and economic scientists.

Adopt the FIP budget and scope opportunities for new funding partnerships

Including socioeconomic issues in a FIP will affect resource requirements and must be recognized in the FIP budget. It should be noted that acute social issues such as labor abuses can have serious financial and reputational impacts on business and the seafood sector as a whole, and therefore businesses have an incentive to collaboratively finance improvement efforts. Given the potential for increased costs, FIPs should take the opportunity to seek out funds from a wider range of funding partners, donors, grant bodies or international development agencies with a people-centric focus.

Phase 1 – FIP Development

Conduct a fishery evaluation that also assesses social factors

This rapid assessment protocol is designed for this stage of a FIP. Multiple data types are necessary for using this assessment, and may include the collection of primary data (interviews and surveys with stakeholders) and secondary data (reviews of legal documents, white papers, published research). Using multiple sources of data will help in triangulation and increase the reliability and validity of the data. Importantly, interviews and surveys with workers/fishers/farmers are likely to give the researcher the most reliable and trustworthy account of social conditions on the water or in processing plants, helping to achieve comprehensive and transparent risk assessment and verification of workplace compliance (ILRF 2018). When a FIP assessor is collecting primary data, she/he should have prior experience doing social science research or partner with an individual or organization (i.e., human rights organization) that has sufficient experience.

Free, Prior, and Informed Consent is also an important best practice (and requirement by many universities’ Institutional Review Boards) in conducting social science and human subjects research. Thus, consent is critical when collecting any type of primary data (interviews, surveys, etc.) during the FIP assessment phase, not only for indigenous people but all affected parties. Many universities and NGOs have specific requirements for obtaining consent during primary research. Such requirements often include that the researcher fully discloses scope, objective, and funding sources of research, any potential risks/costs and benefits associated with involvement in the research, and contact information for further inquiries about the research or if a participant needs to report a grievance and seek remediation from a cost they incurred as a result of the study. The consent process also usually involves an explanation of how the data will be stored or disseminated as to protect anonymity and confidentiality of participants (this aspect is critical for the public reporting phase of a FIP). Thereafter, consent can either be obtained verbally or in writing, contingent on the research.

Review environmental strategies for social impacts and opportunities

Environmental strategies should be supported

during the planning stages with methods to minimize and mitigate adverse socioeconomic impacts, in accordance with the Do No Harm Approach, Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, and Conservation and Human Rights Framework. It is recommended that FIPs assess the impact of the existing or planned environmental objectives and actions on socioeconomic performance in the fishery and vice versa. Recognizing firstly, that environmental strategies that have a negative socioeconomic impact on fishers may be undermined by limited implementation and should be supported by methods to minimize and mitigate adverse impacts, e.g., , by providing financial support to fishers. And secondly, that strategies used to address environmental issues such as IUU fishing may also be used to leverage social or economic improvements such as forced labor.

Make social improvement needs and recommendations public

The publication of improvement needs and recommendations should incorporate socioeconomic needs and recommendations as identified by the formal fishery evaluation.

Phase 2 – FIP Launch

Engage relevant participants in meetings

In order to achieve genuine worker representation (ILRF 2018), it is imperative for a FIP under evaluation for social responsibility to include a fisher/farmer/worker committee (depending on position in supply chain, or UoA) as part of the stakeholder group that informs the workplan and future FIP objectives and activities.

Ensure all stakeholders can have a say in the participatory process

The stakeholder participation process should be inclusive. FIP coordinators should be aware of factors such as accessibility, local power dynamics, local languages, and literacy levels. Where necessary, support should be provided to stakeholders to enable them to participate. For example, additional support should be given to commonly socially excluded groups such as women or migrant workers, whose voices may not typically be heard. In addition, the identities of workers that make claims over abusive or discriminatory working conditions should be protected.

Integrate social objectives into FIP workplan

Setting social objectives should not be completed without prior engagement with stakeholders and a public fishery evaluation. Pre-existing FIPs should review their current workplan alongside the results of the social component of the fishery evaluation to determine where and how social issues can be incorporated. New FIPs should evaluate their environmental and social performance indicators together, to determine integrated and complementary desired objectives for the workplan. Where little is known about the social performance of the fishery, resources may first need to be invested into the establishment of data collection and sharing systems.

Phase 3 – FIP Implementation

Continue to engage with stakeholders

The FIP coordinator should maintain relationships with social stakeholders and continue to engage them in relevant FIP activities. Activities that require consultations or meetings must include groups relevant to the social issues being discussed. For instance, labor rights discussions should include workers' unions. Communications should be made available in the local language.

Implement workplan activities with support from an expert on social issues

Employ the right expertise to facilitate implementation, including facilitation of meetings on social issues. Typically, marine fisheries experts lead FIPs because of their expertise in fisheries science and management, however, to address social issues, FIP coordinators will need to be supported by professionals or organizations with social expertise such as ---- human rights experts, social scientists, fishery economists or social auditors that understand the implications of fishery policy to workers and society.

Collate data to support the implementation and tracking of other activities and inform decision-making

Types of data gathering systems and exercises used will be dependent on the needs of the fishery.

Act to address human rights risks

Human rights abuses need to be addressed with urgent priority given the ethical, legal and reputational implications. Firstly, FIPs should

prioritize the establishment of a framework where human rights and labor abuses can be reported and acted on safely for all parties involved. This framework must be universally agreed by FIP participants so that remediation activities can be conducted without disadvantaging the affected workers. An example of useful systems upon which a framework could be based is the Issara Institute's free 24-hour telephone hotline, established in Thailand to provide migrant workers with information on labor rights, government registration, processes, and enable them to report labor abuses or request assistance. Where evidence of actual or potential labor abuses or extreme working conditions are uncovered within the fishery, remediation processes shall be enabled immediately through effective complaint processes (also referred to as grievance mechanisms), and victims of labor or human rights abuses should be referred to the appropriate support services.

Track and report progress on social performance

Work towards the social activities must be tracked and outcomes must be reported regularly to stakeholders. Progress reporting for each social and economic activity should be incorporated into existing FIP reporting templates, such as the FIP progress tracking website (fisheryprogress.org).

A critical aspect of public reporting is the need to balance anonymity and confidentiality of sensitive information (i.e., human rights abuses) and follow human subjects research protocols, while maintaining commitments to transparency and public reporting. fisheryprogress.org is an important resource and online platform for public access of FIP performance and information. The fact that FIP reporting is transparent and accessible is a key feature to increasing accountability in the supply chain. Uploading social responsibility performance and risk ratings of participating FIPs to fisheryprogress.org, will be equally if not more important for driving improvements and maintaining accountability. However, this cannot be done at the expense of violating human subjects research protocols on anonymity and confidentiality. If public reporting of social information can put an individual, community, or other form of social organization at risk, careful measures need to be taken to avoid this. All interview and survey data should be disaggregated from any identifying information at the level of the individual to

protect anonymity. Beyond this, the stakeholder committee (comprised of fishers/farmers/workers) for each FIP may have a say on the degree of public reporting, based on any associated risk. Other solutions include, reporting on a coarser scale than that of the indicator (i.e., at the scale of component or principle), or risk ratings are detached from specific indicators and represented as percentages or proportions (similar to the summary page of existing FIPs on fisheryprogress.org).

Phase 4 – Improvements in Fishing Practices or Fisheries Management

Deliver improvements in social policy and/or practice

FIPs may be designated as reaching Phase 4 if they can show public evidence of an improvement in policy or practice that links to at least one improvement need identified by the fishery evaluation. Improvements could include, for example, a collective agreement to raise fishers' wages, an increase in the number of fishers and vessels registered by authorities, or the publication of a labor code of conduct.

Phase 5 – Improvements on the Water

Deliver quantitative improvements for people in the fishery

To reach Phase 5, public evidence must show that a positive change has occurred in the socioeconomic performance of the fishery, which supports ecological improvements. For example, increased availability of microloans for sustainable fishing gear, a tangible increase in fishers' earnings, or introducing a written contract with buyers and small-scale fishers.

Phase 6 – Obtain Social Certification

Arrange for an independent audit

To reach Stage 6, a FIP must obtain certification against an independent standard such as Fair Trade or the Responsible Fishing Scheme. FIPs should plan for and arrange an independent audit of activities and progress, by an auditor with demonstrated experience of the relevant certification standard.

If a third party certification or audit is desired and completed, this does not necessarily guarantee indefinite social improvements in

the FIP, or even preclude social abuses from happening in the future. Thus, despite obtaining a certification or audit, this does not mean that responsibilities and commitments to the FIP are absolved. It is important that social abuses and human rights violations are not just identified for retailers to avoid sourcing from the supply chain to reduce their risk. This may push social abuse underground, exacerbating human rights violations. Thus, a FIP must demonstrate a commitment to addressing and resolving social abuses, driving both environmental and social improvements in the supply chain.

ANNEX 2: Important Resources

Third Party Standards

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 RS: Global Standard for Responsible Supply of Marine Ingredients. www.iffors.com

International Organization for Migration (IOM). International Recruitment Integrity System (IRIS). <https://iris.iom.int/>

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/>

Verifik8: Monitoring and verification app for seafood supply chains (developed by FairAgora) <http://www.verifik8.com>

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

FAO 2013 Food and Nutrition Security http://www.unscn.org/files/Annual_Sessions/UNSCN_Meetings_2013/Wustefeld_Final_MoM_FNS_concept.pdf

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>

Human Rights Watch (HRW) https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/thailand0118_report_web.pdf

ILO: International Labour Office (2012). “Hard to see, harder to count: survey guidelines to estimate forced labour of adults and children.” http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_182096.pdf

ILO (2007). “Eliminating Child Labour: Guide 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.” http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---multi/documents/publication/wcms_116344.pdf

ILRF (2018). “Taking Stock: Labor exploitation, illegal fishing, and brand responsibility in the seafood Industry.”

IPNLF: International Pole and 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>

IPNLF: International Pole and Line Foundation (2018). “Social Sustainability Manifesto for One-by-One Tuna Fisheries.” <http://ipnlf.org/perch/resources/ipnlf-social-sustainability-manifesto-final.compressed.pdf>

Living Income Community of Practice. <https://www.living-income.com/>

Opal (2018). Framework on Social Responsibility for the Seafood Sector. Prepared for the Certification and Ratings Collaboration.

OSMI (2018) FIP Rapid Assessment Protocol.

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.”

SFP (2018). “Guidance for Incorporating Socio-Economic Dimensions into FIPs.”

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Education Indicators. http://uis.unesco.org/en/home#tabs-0-uis_home_top_menus-2

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/>

World Health Organization (WHO). Global Health Indicators. http://www.who.int/gho/publications/world_health_statistics/EN_WHS2015_Part2.pdf

Conventions, Protocols, and Guidance

International Labour Organization Conventions (ILO)

Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)

- Right to Organise and Non-Discrimination of Unions, 1949 (No. 98)
- Collective Bargaining Convention (No. 154)
- 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 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
- 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."

