Executive Summary

The Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch® program has established itself as a trusted authority on fisheries and aquaculture within the global sustainable seafood movement. Over the past 18 years, our standards have set high thresholds for the environmental performance of fisheries and aquaculture and have encouraged producers to improve practices as well as governments to improve regulations and management; our ratings have guided the seafood purchases of businesses and consumers towards sustainable products and informed fisheries and aquaculture improvements; our digital platforms and program engagement activities have sustained consumer demand and issue salience for sustainable seafood; and our large network of the nation’s leading seafood buyers has provided a market incentive for producers to maintain or adopt more sustainable practices.

As the program grows, it is vital to look critically at the work we are doing, assess our effectiveness, and identify areas for improvement. The framework presented in this report will allow us to better understand and demonstrate the program’s contribution toward improving the sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture operations, leading to improved transparency and program credibility. The theory of change, results chains, and associated monitoring questions and indicators articulate how Seafood Watch believes each approach leads to the desired impacts, establish intermediate and long-term objectives, identify key assumptions, and formulate monitoring questions that help test these assumptions.

To this end, the Seafood Watch Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) team is creating a comprehensive data collection and management framework that will enable accurate and regular workstream tracking, demonstrate the impact the program is having, and inform improvements to our approaches. This framework includes tools such as detailed project tracking dashboards to ensure that each event, collaboration, improvement project, or government engagement effort has a clear and consistent outline of level of effort, goals, and outcomes. As a result, program leads will be better able to articulate Seafood Watch involvement with particular work streams and track the project’s progress towards desired results. Most importantly, monitoring and quantifying the effect of our actions will highlight where our assumptions are inaccurate and enable Seafood Watch to course correct and evolve with the constantly changing sustainable seafood landscape.
Scope

The Seafood Watch M&E system is comprised of two distinct efforts: performance monitoring and impact evaluation. Performance monitoring, as defined by the ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Assessing the Impacts of Social and Environmental Standard Systems, is the “systematic collection of data on specific indicators to provide indications of the extent to which outputs and short and medium-term results are being achieved.” Impact evaluation, on the other hand, is the “systematic, objective, in depth, ex-post assessment of the medium or long-term effects of the implementation of a standards system... and enable users to understand the extent to which an observed change can be attributed to the standard system”. In essence, the former is focused on tracking the progress towards achieving intended outcomes (activities) while the latter is focused on tracking the long-term effectiveness of the Seafood Watch program.

Performance Monitoring

Annually, the Monterey Bay Aquarium undertakes a strategic planning process which defines the goals for three impact areas: Inspire and Engage, Act for the Ocean, and Build our Capacity for the Future. The Seafood Watch program is within the Act for the Ocean Impact Area with the long-term goal of improving the sustainability of global fisheries and aquaculture. Performance monitoring is focused on tracking and reporting on the activities that support the Aquarium's annual objectives. In Annex 1, progress indicators are listed for each objective. Seafood Watch goals, outcomes and strategies are shown below.

---

Impact Evaluation

Impact evaluation is the second component of the Seafood Watch M&E system and it is the cornerstone of adaptive management. Impact evaluations will allow Seafood Watch to test and refine the approaches that are most effective at spreading Seafood Watch messaging and influencing businesses, producers, and policy makers. Detailed results chains display the expected outcomes and impacts of each approach and these chains informed the development of key questions that will be used to investigate the validity of those causal linkages.

Some results chains contain no questions as of yet. For example, the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Tool will not be the focus of our impact monitoring efforts since the goals of this project are still being refined and the web-based tool is still being developed. For other results chains, their effectiveness relies on questions that are being addressed elsewhere (e.g. the Chefs Engagement, Conservation Partner Engagement, and Outreach to the Media results chains depend on the question being addressed in the Outreach to the General Public results chain). Questions are listed after each result chain narrative.
Seafood Watch is a market-based incentives program that assesses the sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture by compiling relevant science-based information and evaluating that information against our standards. Our seafood ratings provide clear, practicable guidance to consumers and indicate preferred procurement options for businesses with commitments to source sustainable seafood. In recent years, the program has adapted to the evolving needs of the seafood sustainability movement. Seafood Watch is beginning to work directly with producers and governments to accelerate improvements in seafood production and management and catalyze change for healthier oceans. This engagement is informed by our objective, rigorous, globally-applicable, and science-based sustainability standards which are aligned with the requirements of the ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards. Seafood Watch also maintains over 1400 recommendations that demonstrate the current environmental performance of global fisheries and aquaculture and indicate deficiencies for producers and governments.

Over the last 18 years, the program has broadened its focus from the North American consumer to the global seafood industry. As a result of our ratings and business partnerships, governments and the seafood industry are seeking guidance from Seafood Watch in order to improve fishery and aquaculture production methods in an effort to obtain or maintain market access. This suite of strategies is supported by the program engagement, business, and science teams, as well by our policy and on-site and online visitor engagement teams.
Our Program Engagement approaches aim to sustain issue salience and demand for sustainable seafood by leveraging our extensive network of Conservation Partners, chefs, and media contacts to broadcast Seafood Watch information, messaging, and seafood ratings to consumers throughout North America. These activities harmonize sustainable seafood messaging, amplify consumer demand for sustainable products, incentivize buyers in the supply chain (major buyers, restaurants/retailers, suppliers) to shift to sourcing only sustainably fished or farmed seafood, and ultimately encourage environmentally responsible production practices.

Our Business Team has forged partnerships with the US’s leading retailers, distributors, and foodservice companies - including Whole Foods Market, ARAMARK, and Compass Group. Through collaboration with Seafood Watch in our Corporate Partner program, these businesses have made robust, measurable, and time-bound sustainable seafood commitments which send clear market signals that the North American and European business sectors expects seafood from sources, whether fished or farmed, that can maintain or increase production without jeopardizing the structure and function of affected ecosystems. Seafood Watch is harnessing the purchasing power and global influence of our partners to activate a shift towards sustainability throughout the supply chain, improve management practices, and motivate meaningful reforms in national and international fisheries and aquaculture legislation.

Seafood Watch also works with an extensive network of retail and restaurant business partners (Business Partner program) and producers and suppliers (Industry Collaborator program) across the US. These business partners are committed to both buying responsibly-sourced products and spreading Seafood Watch messaging to raise issue salience with consumers. Seafood Watch industry collaborator engagement is focused directly on increasing the availability of data on seafood products through partnerships with producers and suppliers. This information can also raise issue salience within the seafood supply chain and, as more collaborators are brought onboard, opportunities are often identified with their customers, leading to new corporate or business partnerships.

These market-based approaches have been the core of Seafood Watch work for nearly two decades; however, in recent years, Seafood Watch has been increasingly engaged directly with producers and governments to drive improvements. The standards themselves can be leveraged to influence production practices and environmental laws and regulations around the world and our detailed assessments highlight high-performing producers and pinpoint the problems for low-performing fisheries and aquaculture operations in order to guide progress towards sustainability. Whether through market-based approaches or policy and improvement work, Seafood Watch is leveraging its credibility and influence to reduce unsustainable production practices and ultimately elevate the sustainability of global fisheries and aquaculture.
Supporting the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals

On January 1, 2016, 193 countries including the United States adopted the United Nation’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which aim to address poverty and inequality while ensuring economic growth and environmental protection. Further, at the Our Oceans Conference in June, 2017, a call for action was issued that included raising issue salience about ocean conservation issues; encouraging multi-stakeholder partnerships inclusive of local communities, government, business, scientists, and industry; advancing scientific understanding of environmental stressors; improving sustainable fisheries and aquaculture management; developing a global catch documentation and traceability system; and ending illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing. Seafood Watch is encouraged to see that ocean conservation and the wise use of ocean resources are at the forefront the the UN’s sustainable development agenda and equally proud that our work directly supports these global goals.

SDG 14 is focused on conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas, and marine resources. The planet’s health, the livelihoods of more than 3 billion people, and global food security depend on marine and coastal biodiversity and the sustainable management of fisheries and aquaculture. One of SDG 14’s specific targets is to eliminate overfishing, destructive fishing practices, and restore fish stocks to levels that reach maximum sustainable yield. Seafood Watch work directly supports this goal by creating and supporting a market for sustainable seafood and motivating improvements to practices and policies. Programs like Seafood Watch are integral to the success of this goal as our markets-based approach is helping to accelerate change faster than policy alone. Seafood Watch also in engaged in improvement projects in regions that are most affected by unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices, a lack of management, and IUU activity, including human rights abuses.
Mapping the Intended Impact

This section contains an overview of the theories of change for core Seafood Watch strategies. Each approach has been outlined in a results chain diagram along with a corresponding text narrative and monitoring questions. The following figure is an annotated example of a results chain that provides a key to the diagrams in this report.
The development and continual refinement of the Seafood Watch fisheries and aquaculture standards establishes the sustainability bar for industry, government, and ratings and eco-certification organizations. In response to these standards and our efforts to benchmark eco-certifications against them, some of these entities will raise or change their own standards and practices (Path A, top). If a rating or eco-certification standard is improved to a level that is equivalent to at least a Seafood Watch yellow rating, Seafood Watch may be able to
recognize fisheries or aquaculture farms already rated or certified by the standard as equivalent to a yellow or green rating, rendering a Seafood Watch assessment unnecessary. This results in a reduced workload for Seafood Watch and the ability to generate assessments on other seafood products.

Path B (middle) represents the influence of the Seafood Watch standards and the program’s engagement with industry and government directly. The standards specifically detail the expectations for environmental sustainability in fisheries and aquaculture which motivates industry to improve to new best practices and government to support and implement policies and programs based on the Seafood Watch criteria for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture.

Conducting outreach to other NGOs, industry, and governments promotes Seafood Watch standards and methodology, builds relationships and collaboration opportunities, amplifying the overall program impact (Path C, bottom). This outreach maintains the program’s prominence in the sustainable seafood community and fosters collective impact and strategic alignment among sustainable seafood NGOs. Outreach to these groups also helps Seafood Watch identify and correct misinterpretations of the standards or missing information from specific ratings. Improvements to the standards and individual ratings help Seafood Watch maintain and improve its reputation as a rigorous, science-based, and unbiased source of seafood sustainability information.

Questions:

2B.III-A-Q1. Does outreach around the Seafood Watch standards influence industry, government or other NGO ratings/eco-certification programs?
   2B.III-A-Q1A. Does outreach around the Seafood Watch standards influence industry, government or other ratings and eco-certification programs to improve their standard/regulations?
   2B.III-A-Q1B. How much engagement did it take to trigger change? Who was most amenable to our influence? What type of engagement is most effective?
1.2 Seafood Assessments

Seafood Watch ratings demonstrate the current environmental performance of global fisheries and aquaculture and indicate areas for improvement for producers and governments. Seafood Watch maintains over 1,400 recommendations that encompass approximately 85% of the seafood products on the U.S. market by volume. Considering that 90% of the seafood sold in the U.S. is imported, these recommendations can affect fishing and aquaculture practices globally.

Ratings are generated through Seafood Watch assessments, which evaluate the environmental sustainability of seafood products against our standards. Seafood Watch defines sustainable seafood as seafood from sources, whether fished or farmed, that can maintain or increase production without jeopardizing the structure and function of affected ecosystems. The standards (available on our website) consist of defined guiding principles, science-based performance criteria and a robust and objective scoring methodology that results in a transparent assessment of a fishery or aquaculture operation against the respective criteria.

The standard is reviewed every four years to ensure we take into account developments in the scientific understanding of the impacts of fisheries and aquaculture operations, as well as in our understanding of what producers and managers can do to mitigate those impacts.

To create a rating, the Seafood Watch Science team compiles all relevant scientific information from journal articles, government reports, white papers, and industry data and evaluates this information against the standard. Prior to publication, each assessment is peer-reviewed by a minimum of three external experts from the academic, government, industry, and NGO communities. These assessments result in a red, yellow, or green rating – each of which has its own theory of change (below) describing how Seafood Watch expects the rating to ultimately contribute to a reduction in unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices. In response to market pressure generated through our business partnerships and consumer outreach, fisheries and aquaculture operations that supply the North American market work to perform at a level of at least a Seafood Watch yellow rating or equivalent standard.
a. Red Rating

Our Corporate Partner Engagement, Business Partner Engagement, and Program Engagement approaches ask businesses and consumers to preferentially buy green, yellow and eco-certified seafood and avoid purchasing Seafood Watch red rated items (with the exception of B2B advice around sourcing from credible fishery improvement projects). As a result, we theorize that red rated fisheries and aquaculture operations face a number of disadvantages in the US market, including: lower price, as compared to green or yellow rated fisheries or farms; restricted market access and/or loss of competitive edge; pressure from public campaigns and/or NGOs; perceived reputational risk (blemish); and/or reduced access to government or private sector investment funding. We further assume that, reacting to one or more of these factors, a red rated fishery or aquaculture operation will choose one of three paths to work to perform at a level of at least a Seafood Watch yellow rating or equivalent standard (see labels Path A, B, and C in above figure):

Path A represents direct engagement with producers. Once red rated, stakeholders (a fishery, aquaculture operation, NGO, and/or government) come to Seafood Watch for guidance on how to improve the red rating. Even with guidance, some actors will still fail to improve (Path A2), perhaps due to a lack of capacity or ability to make necessary changes. Seafood Watch is particularly interested in understanding and overcoming these roadblocks to improvement. However, we expect many who come to Seafood Watch will pursue the recommended changes (Path A1),

---

2 Seafood Watch defers only to those fisheries and aquaculture operations certified to a Standard that has been found equivalent to at least a yellow rating per our Benchmarking Study.
improving the aquaculture or fisheries practices and/or management, maintaining these improvements, and subsequently improving the Seafood Watch rating.

**Path B** represents indirect engagement with producers through our public-facing Seafood Watch platforms. In this path, a Seafood Watch assessment provides adequate information on the sustainability issues facing a fishery or aquaculture operation, and the appropriate stakeholder (producer, seafood industry, NGO, and/or government) develops an improvement plan independent of Seafood Watch. In this case, we expect a similar outcome to that described in Path A1 – the stakeholder will make changes to reduce unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.

**Path C** represents an undesired result – a fishery, farm, or government chooses not to make any changes and remains red. In these cases, Seafood Watch is particularly interested in understanding the cause of the lack of motivation for a stakeholder to improve the rating.

**Questions:**

2B.III-B-Q1. Does a yellow or red rating influence fisheries and aquaculture operations to improve?
   2B.III-B-Q1A. Do yellow or red rated fisheries and aquaculture operations improve over time?
   2B.III-B-Q1B. What type / amount of engagement was needed to trigger change?
   2B.III-B-Q1C. What is the primary motivation(s) for yellow or red rated fisheries and aquaculture operations to improve?
   2B.III-B-Q1D. What obstacles prevent stakeholders from improving? (Path C)
Our Corporate Partner Engagement, Business Partner Engagement, and Program Engagement approaches ask these audiences to preferentially buy green, yellow and eco-certified seafood and avoid purchasing Seafood Watch red rated items (with the exception of B2B advice around sourcing from credible fishery improvement projects). Similar to the red rating result chain above, we theorize that yellow rated fisheries and aquaculture operations face a number of disadvantages in the U.S. market, including: lower price, as compared to green rated fisheries or farms; restricted market access and/or loss of competitive edge; pressure from public campaigns and/or NGOs; perceived reputational risk (blemish); and/or reduced access to government or private sector investment funding. We further assume that, reacting to one or more of these factors, a yellow rated fishery or aquaculture operation will choose one of three paths to work to perform at a level of at least a Seafood Watch green rating (see labels Path A, B, and C in above figure):

**Path A** represents direct engagement with producers. Once yellow rated, stakeholders (a fishery, aquaculture operation, NGO, government) come to Seafood Watch for guidance on how improve the yellow rating. Even with guidance, some actors will still fail to improve (Path A2), perhaps due to a lack of capacity or ability to make necessary changes. Seafood Watch is particularly interested in understanding and overcoming these roadblocks to improvement. However, we expect many who come to Seafood Watch will pursue the recommended changes
(Path A1), improving the aquaculture or fisheries practices and/or management, maintaining these improvements, and subsequently improving the Seafood Watch rating.

Path B represents indirect engagement with producers through our public-facing Seafood Watch platforms. In this path, a Seafood Watch assessment provides adequate information on the sustainability issues facing a fishery or aquaculture operation, and the appropriate stakeholder (producer, seafood industry, NGO, government) develops an improvement plan independent of Seafood Watch. In this case, we expect a similar outcome to that described in Path A1 – the stakeholder will make changes to reduce unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.

Path C represents an undesired result – a fishery, farm, or government chooses not to make any changes and remains yellow. In these cases, Seafood Watch is particularly interested in understanding the cause of the lack of motivation for a stakeholder to improve the rating.

Questions:

2B.III-B-Q1. Does a yellow or red rating influence fisheries and aquaculture operations to improve?
   2B.III-B-Q1A. Do yellow or red rated fisheries and aquaculture operations improve over time?
   2B.III-B-Q1B. What type / amount of engagement was needed to trigger change?
   2B.III-B-Q1C. What is the primary motivation(s) for yellow or red rated fisheries and aquaculture operations to improve?
   2B.III-B-Q1D. What obstacles prevent stakeholders from improving? (Path C)
c. Green Rating

Our Corporate Partner Engagement, Business Partner Engagement, and Program Engagement approaches ask these audiences to preferentially buy green, yellow and eco-certified seafood and avoid purchasing Seafood Watch red rated items (with the exception of B2B advice around sourcing from credible fishery improvement projects). As a result, we theorize that green rated fisheries and aquaculture operations experience a number of advantages in the US market, including: a higher price for their products; wide market access and a competitive edge; strengthened or maintained good reputation within the industry; and/or the prestige of being a high-performing, environmentally responsible producer. These reputation and market benefits provided by a Seafood Watch green rating motivate fisheries or aquaculture operations to maintain sustainable practices.

The reliable supply of green rated products allows Seafood Watch corporate, restaurant and retail partners to follow through on their sustainable seafood sourcing commitments which puts steady pressure on the supply chain to deliver environmentally responsible products and ultimately leads to a reduction in unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.

Further, the presence of a green rating raises the sustainability ceiling for best practices in wild-caught fisheries and aquaculture and results in continual improvement throughout the industry. Yellow and red rated product competitors are motivated to improve production practices or management policies to receive market benefits, which results in more green rated products on the market and a further reduction of unsustainable practices.
Our Corporate Partner Engagement, Business Partner Engagement, and Program Engagement approaches ask these audiences to preferentially buy green, yellow and eco-certified seafood and avoid purchasing Seafood Watch red rated items (with the exception of B2B advice around sourcing from credible fishery improvement projects). As a result, we theorize that unassessed fisheries and aquaculture operations face a number of disadvantages in the U.S. market, including: lower price, as compared to green or yellow rated fisheries or farms and restricted market access. These disadvantages result from the strength of the Seafood Watch brand in the global market and our business partners’ sustainable seafood sourcing policies. Groups may also seek out a new assessment if the existing Seafood Watch assessment does not accurately represent a higher performing subset (e.g. a specific sector within a fishery or a farm or group of farms in a particular country). An assessment will result in a red, yellow, or green rating – each of which has its own theory of change describing how Seafood Watch expects the rating to ultimately contribute to a reduction in unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.
The accumulation of greenhouse gases (GHG) in the Earth’s atmosphere and water drives ocean acidification, contributes to sea level rise, affects air and sea temperatures and accelerates climate change. GHG emissions from food production account for roughly 15-30% of global greenhouse gas emissions. Wild-capture fisheries represent approximately 0.4% of global GHG emissions and aquaculture emissions represent an unknown percentage.

Over the years, Seafood Watch has received multiple requests from scientific advisors, business partners and NGOs to help them understand the GHG emissions associated with seafood production. Seafood Watch is addressing this knowledge gap by building a web-based application to effectively communicate what is known about GHG emissions associated with seafood production and add to this limited knowledge base via data collection. The tool will enable users to visualize data on the GHG emissions of seafood products up to the dock/farmgate and compare them alongside land-based agricultural protein products. With this information, consumers and businesses may choose to purchase seafood options with a smaller GHG footprint. In response to this market pressure, industry and governments may be motivated to reduce GHG emissions in current fishery and aquaculture operations (Path A). This tool serves as a supplement to Seafood Watch assessments of fisheries and aquaculture operations’ direct impacts to species, habitats, and ecosystems.

Via collating this information on GHG emissions associated with seafood production, the tool will highlight gaps in knowledge and data uncertainties. Over time, as new data is collected and incorporated into the tool, the ability to evaluate the impacts of GHG emissions relative to...
other environmental impacts will increase. Ultimately, this tool will improve our understanding of the GHG impacts of the seafood industry and improve the methodology used to evaluate those impacts (Path B).

Seafood Watch is globally recognized for delivering reliable, scientifically-robust, data-driven environmental sustainability ratings along with clear guidance for businesses and consumers (buy green rated seafood first, yellow rated seafood second, and avoid red rated seafood). Given that greenhouse gas emission data for the seafood sector are less available and less reliable, the results from the tool will not be at the same specificity level as Seafood Watch ratings and will not be incorporated into the ratings at this time. However, the information will be publically available and there is concern that some audiences may select less sustainable seafood (e.g. a yellow or red rated seafood with less GHG emissions as opposed to a green rated seafood with high emissions), or ultimately disengage from seafood sustainability altogether due to this conflicting information (Path C, undesired outcome).
In the past three years, investigative reporting by The Guardian, the Associated Press, and others has exposed the prevalence of human rights abuses in the global seafood industry. Non-governmental organizations working on issues of environmental sustainability in seafood recognize that sustainability encompasses environmental, economic, and human rights concerns. Unfortunately, companies lack a clear source of information they can use to identify and evaluate risks of human rights abuses within their supply chains. Varied sources of documentation make it difficult to compare the extent of the risk across regions or fisheries. Recognizing this information need and in response to the expanded definition of seafood sustainability, Seafood Watch, Seafish, and Sustainable Fisheries Partnership partnered together to create a Seafood Slavery Risk Tool.
Slavery Risk Tool to provide information and actionable advice on risk in the seafood supply chain. This tool is now jointly run with Sustainable Fisheries Partnership and Liberty Asia. This information will allow seafood buyers to constructively address forced labor in the global seafood supply by identifying potential risks of human rights abuses in their supply chains (Path A). If risks in a supply chain are identified, Seafood Watch encourages businesses to stay engaged with that actor and help implement better practices to resolve issues. As a result of this engagement, industry and/or government will be motivated to adopt or modify best practices and regulations. Implementation of new best practices reduces human rights abuses, leading to a decrease in unsustainable fisheries and aquaculture practices.

Collecting this information may also highlight deficits in our knowledge of human rights risks in the seafood supply chain. If these deficits are surfaced, new information may be introduced which would improve our understanding of human rights risks in the seafood sector and allow the issue to be addressed more effectively. These human rights risk profiles may be utilized by other NGOs or organizations active in this area, identifying new champions and resources to tackle human rights issues (Path B).

Several possible undesired outcomes may also occur when this tool is implemented. Seafood Watch is globally recognized for delivering reliable, scientifically-robust, data-driven environmental sustainability ratings with clear guidance for businesses and consumers (buy green and yellow rated seafood, avoid red rated seafood). Given that risk information on human rights abuses in the seafood sector is less available, the tool will not be incorporated into Seafood Watch ratings at this time. However, the risk information will be publically available and there is concern that some audiences may receive conflicting information with this broader definition of sustainability (for example, a yellow rated seafood item with a high risk rating).

There is also concern that businesses may not receive adequate guidance or support to act upon the information they receive. If this occurs, human rights improvements may stall or worsen as businesses choose to no longer source from high risk fisheries or farms. Human rights issues are best addressed when they are brought to the surface and a business encourages reform; if a business simply switches suppliers without pressuring for improvement, the bad actor is likely to sell their seafood to less reputable businesses, not change practices, and exacerbate the problem.

While the tool encourages businesses to stay engaged with actors and help implement better practices when risks are identified, some businesses may choose to drop high risk seafood products upon learning of the risk or after receiving negative responses from consumers. Finally, the Seafood Slavery risk tool may not motivate businesses to engage in improvement work, leading to business practices remaining the same.

Questions:

2B.III-C-Q1. How useful is the Seafood Slavery Risk Tool?

2B.III-C-Q1A. Does the Seafood Slavery Risk Tool meet business partner needs?
2B.III-C.Q1B. Does the information about human rights abuses in the seafood sector motivate businesses and other NGOs to engage in improvement work in high-risk/critical fisheries?

Business Program Results Chains

2.1 Corporate Partner Engagement
Through our corporate partner engagement, Seafood Watch works closely with a select group of strategically significant businesses that, through their buying power or place in the market, are positioned to exert substantial pressure on policymakers, seafood suppliers, and seafood producers in order to positively affect the management and sustainability of production practices. The corporate engagement approach guides top U.S. retailers and foodservice companies through all six steps of the Common Vision for Sustainable Seafood which are: 1) making a comprehensive, time-bound, public commitment to sustainable seafood; 2) supporting sustainable and improving seafood sources through purchasing decisions; 3) monitoring the sustainability of seafood products through data collection; 4) being transparent about the environmental performance of seafood products and on progress towards sustainability commitment; 5) educating employees, customers, and 6) suppliers about sustainable seafood; and engaging in policy and management reform that leads to positive social, economic and environmental outcomes. These activities incentivize on-the-water fisheries and aquaculture improvement, provide market access to better performers, and support policy reform, ultimately leading to a reduction of unsustainable fisheries and aquaculture.

There are five components of the corporate engagement approach: 1) applying producer pressure through seafood sourcing; 2) influencing other businesses through public communication of sustainability commitment; 3) engaging consumers; 4) leveraging business partners for policy reform; and 5) the proliferation of seafood sourcing information throughout the supply chain.

The sustainable seafood sourcing component of the approach requires corporate partners make a time-bound commitment to purchase only yellow, green rated, or equivalent certified or Fishery Improvement products, and to preferentially buy green rated and drop red rated products. This commitment provides market rewards for environmentally responsible, green rated producers and create incentives for yellow and red rated producers to adopt better practices. Red or yellow rated producers may work directly with Seafood Watch to develop improvement plans or work independently to improve practices. As improvements in key fisheries and aquaculture operations are made, there is an overall reduction in unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.

Corporate partners are also required to make their sustainability commitment public. Media coverage of these commitments often leads to new business partnerships and the development of additional sustainable seafood sourcing commitments, spreading the reach of the program and amplifying its on-the-water impact through business-to-business communication.

Corporate partners also spread sustainable seafood messaging directly to consumers through public announcements of their commitments to sustainability and point of sale messaging, and indirectly through education of staff and suppliers. This results in more buy-in within the company, an understanding throughout the seafood supply chain of the importance of addressing environmental issues, and expanded outreach which gives consumers the information necessary to allow them to choose sustainable seafood. The latter directly supports our Outreach to the General Public approach.

When appropriate, Seafood Watch engages with select corporate partners to advocate for policy reform and legislative initiatives aimed at improving the environmental performance of the seafood industry. Seafood Watch works with other Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions
members to convene large groups of business partners to collectively leverage buying power and supply chain relationships in order to aggregate influence and reach key influencers.

Lastly, when corporate partners commit to a responsible seafood sourcing policy, they alert their suppliers to their new need to know where and how their products are fished or farmed. The supply chain responds by collecting and delivering these key data elements (species, location, and method of catch/production) for seafood products. This ultimately results in the provision of these data becoming the expectation throughout the seafood industry. Further, exposure to the Seafood Watch program also leads to certain high-performing suppliers becoming Seafood Watch partners through the industry collaborator program. More data results in a clearer picture of the U.S. seafood market which not only allows corporate partners to meet their responsible sourcing commitments, but also allows Seafood Watch to properly prioritize its future assessments and identify gaps in Seafood Watch ratings.

Questions:

2B.II-A-Q1. What motivates businesses to develop sustainable seafood policies?

2B.II-A-Q2. Are there any unintended consequences of our seafood sourcing asks?
   2B.II-A-Q2A. Are we undermining fishery or aquaculture improvement efforts?
   2B.II-A-Q2B. Are we pushing the problem to other markets?
   2B.II-A-Q2C. What are the other unintended consequences we need to be aware of / research?
Seafood Watch has an extensive network of retail and restaurant business partners across the US. These business partners are committed to both buying responsibly-sourced products and spreading Seafood Watch messaging to raise issue salience with consumers. Business partner engagement has three components to advance seafood sustainability: 1) leveraging business partners as hubs for sustainable seafood
messaging; 2) applying producer pressure through seafood sourcing; and 3) the proliferation of seafood sourcing information throughout the supply chain.

The first component of the approach uses business partners to connect to new audiences and spread sustainable seafood messaging. This is achieved through public announcements of a business’s commitment to sustainable seafood and through point of sale messaging and direct education of staff and consumers. This expanded outreach results in more of Seafood Watch messaging in the media, in the hands of consumers, and an increased number of engaged spokespeople. These business partners magnify Seafood Watch Program Engagement approaches and deepen the public’s understanding of sustainable seafood issues. Similarly, an increased number of engaged spokespeople helps Seafood Watch spread its messaging and influence both the public and public policy when necessary.

The sourcing component of the approach requires business partners make a time-bound commitment to purchase only yellow, green rated, or equivalent products, preferentially buy green, and drop red products. These buying practices provide market rewards for environmentally responsible, green rated producers and create incentives for yellow and red rated producers to adopt better practices. Red or yellow rated producers may work directly with Seafood Watch to develop improvement plans or work independently to improve practices. As improvements in key fisheries and aquaculture operations are made, there is an overall reduction in unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.

The final aspect of the business partner program involves the collection of data on seafood products. When businesses commit to a responsible seafood sourcing policy, they alert their suppliers to their new need to know where and how their products are fished or farmed. The supply chain responds by collecting and delivering these key data elements (species, location and method of catch/production) for seafood products. This ultimately results in the provision of these data becoming the expectation throughout the seafood industry. Further, exposure to the Seafood Watch program also leads to certain high-performing suppliers becoming Seafood Watch partners through the industry collaborator program. More data results in a clearer picture of the U.S. seafood market which not only allows business partners to meet their responsible sourcing commitments, but also Seafood Watch to properly prioritize its seafood assessments and identify gaps in Seafood Watch ratings.

Questions:

2B.II-A-Q3. How effective are business partners at spreading sustainable seafood messaging to consumers?
   2B.II-A-Q3A. What is the reach of business partners?
   2B.II-A-Q3A. Do business partners influence consumer awareness or behavior?
2.3 Industry Collaborator Engagement

Seafood Watch industry collaborator engagement is focused directly on increasing the availability of data on seafood products through partnerships with producers and suppliers. The collaborator program requires all partners to include the relevant key data elements (species, location, and method of production/catch) on their products so that Seafood Watch ratings may be accurately conveyed in outside communications with buyers. As these data become increasingly common, suppliers are able to communicate the Seafood Watch ratings of their products which, in turn, allows Seafood Watch corporate and business partners to choose environmentally responsible seafood and fulfill their sustainability commitments.

This information can also raise issue salience within the seafood supply chain and, as more collaborators are brought onboard, opportunities are often identified with their customers, leading to new corporate or business partnerships. Similarly, as more data on seafood products becomes available, strategic opportunities can be identified for Seafood Watch to engage in improvement work or with particular policy issues. Lastly, increased data on seafood products allows for a better understanding of the U.S. seafood market, allowing Seafood Watch to identify gaps in current Seafood Watch ratings and prioritize future seafood assessments.

These data are the key to the sustainable seafood sourcing commitments of Seafood Watch corporate and business partners. More data on the origin and method of seafood production allows our partners to purchase sustainable products which provides market rewards for environmentally responsible, green rated producers and create incentives for yellow and red rated producers to adopt better practices. Red or yellow rated producers may work directly with Seafood Watch to develop improvement plans or work independently to improve practices. As improvements are made, the ultimate goal to reduce unsustainable fisheries and aquaculture is reached.
Questions:

2B.II-A-Q4. Do industry collaborator sales shift as a result of including sustainability rating information?
   2B.II-A-Q4A. Do sales of green and yellow rated products increase and/or sales of red rated products decrease? Are these changes seen with a particular buyer audience (Seafood Watch partners versus non-partners)?
   2B.II-A-Q4B. Does including sustainability information provide any other benefits to the collaborator (overall sales, credibility, access to new markets)?
2.4 Pre-competitive Business Engagement

Our extensive network of affiliated NGOs and corporate and business partners allows us to convene influential coalitions of seafood businesses (including non-partners) to work pre-competitively on sustainability issues. Through this approach, businesses are able to share challenges (such as traceability or identification of seafood sourcing data) and, more importantly, work together as an industry to develop practicable, impactful solutions.

Seafood Watch is able to leverage this group to develop collective industry asks and apply aggregated policy pressure for sustainability reforms. Additionally, working pre-competitively helps to reduce actual or perceived confusion surrounding NGO sustainability asks and ensures that the sustainable seafood movement is providing clear, consistent advice to its business partners.

Lastly, pre-competitive engagement strengthens existing partners’ commitments and generates new partnerships. After collaborating with their competitors, many businesses come away with renewed enthusiasm and determination to meet or exceed current sustainability commitments or to become a Seafood Watch partner.
Questions:

2B.II-A-Q5. Do businesses engaged in pre-competitive activities influence policy?
   2B.II-A-Q5A. Once provided with a call to action, do businesses take the requested action? Was the action taken individually or pre-competitively?
   2B.II-A-Q5B. Did pressure from this group lead to the targeted outcome (policy, government, sourcing strategy)? If so, what were the driving motivators (individuals participating, the target action, other)?
Over the past 18 years, Seafood Watch has helped lead a market transformation toward sustainable seafood, which is driving more sustainable fisheries and aquaculture operations around the world. Outreach to the general public has been the foundation of this effort since the beginning and it ensures that issue salience and demand for sustainable seafood is maintained. As sustainability becomes the expectation of consumers, businesses are driven to make meaningful sustainable seafood commitments and source only environmentally responsible products. This buyer demand, in turn, leads to producers shifting to more environmentally responsible practices which reduces unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.
Outreach to the general public generates demand for sustainable seafood by changing people’s behavior through improving their knowledge and informing their beliefs. Specifically, Seafood Watch messaging conveys that the environment and our seafood supply are threatened by current production methods and consumption patterns, that Seafood Watch is the source for seafood sustainability information, and that our partners are reliable sources for sustainable seafood information and products.

Some who hear this messaging will believe that seafood should, in fact, be sustainable because seafood sustainability is a key to environmental health. However, in order for consumers to change the seafood they purchase and the businesses they patronize, they must also believe that their personal action can affect change.

In the end, the desired consumer behaviors include asking for sustainable seafood, buying only green and yellow rated products, and choosing to support Seafood Watch partner businesses and retailers. The key to the success of this approach is an understanding of which message(s) resonates most with which audiences and what ultimately motivates consumers to act (moving from knowledge to belief to behavior change).

This theory of change recognizes that businesses may be motivated by actual demand for sustainable seafood (purchases by the general public) or by the perception of demand for sustainable seafood (issue salience and buzz). This approach aims to increase both real and perceived demand; however, as we learn more about business motivations (Question 2B.11-A-Q1 in Corporate Partner Engagement), the focus of our outreach efforts may shift in order for Seafood Watch to maximize it’s per-dollar market impact.
3.2 Chef Engagement

Seafood Watch Chef Engagement involves cultivating a network of leading culinary professionals including national and regionally important chefs, culinary instructors and writers who lend their time and expertise to actively promote sustainable seafood to media, consumers, businesses, peers, and the seafood supply chain. Chefs are invaluable advocates for ocean health. Their influence is substantial and their passionate and outspoken work on behalf of sustainable fisheries and farming raises public awareness and amplifies our efforts to advance the commitments of businesses to sustainable seafood.

The first step in this approach to impart our messaging and deepen our impact is to ensure that chefs understand that the future of seafood depends on sustainable practices, that Seafood Watch is the source for seafood sustainability information, and how to source, promote and prepare sustainable seafood.

Once this understanding is established, Seafood Watch expects that chefs will become proponents for sustainably-sourced seafood because they believe that sustainability is important to humanity’s future food security and a key to overall environmental health. Chefs must also believe that
personal action at one end of the supply chain can meaningfully affect on-the-water change at the other and that sustainability is appealing enough to their audiences to induce behavioral shifts.

Chefs can also directly influence the supply chain by communicating their sustainable seafood commitments to their suppliers and by only buying green or yellow rated products for their restaurants. Chefs also conduct outreach to other culinarians, restaurateurs, and their own customers in order to educate them about and promote seafood sustainability. Sharing Seafood Watch messaging with other chefs is particularly valuable in expanding knowledge about seafood sustainability issues within the industry and creating a groundswell of market support for sustainable seafood products. Their commitments to not only purchase sustainable seafood products but also share Seafood Watch messaging will increase market demand for sustainable products.

Seafood Watch also supports chefs who are engaged in policy advocacy - pressuring industry and governments to advance sustainability in the seafood sector. Their policy advocacy will lead to new, improved, or properly enforced regulations that will further reduce unsustainable practices. This key combination of market and policy pressure will encourage producers and governments to shift to more environmentally responsible seafood production practices and lead to a reduction in unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices.
3.3 Conservation Partner Engagement

Conservation Partner engagement allows Seafood Watch to expand our reach to a much larger audience by funnelling our message through a network of zoos, aquariums, science museums, nature centers and other non-profits. After becoming partners, they distribute pocket guides and/or promote the Seafood Watch app to more than 100 million annual visitors, promote Seafood Watch partner businesses and influence local restaurants and businesses to either partner with Seafood Watch or source only sustainable seafood independent of a formal partnership.

Outreach to prospective conservation partners is centered on five main messages: 1) the environment and our seafood supply are threatened by current production methods and consumption habits; 2) Seafood Watch is the source for seafood sustainability information; 3) sharing sustainable seafood messaging is vital to their mission and business model; 4) affiliation with the Monterey Bay Aquarium increases their own credibility; and 5) the Seafood Watch program has great messaging and materials ready to share with the conservation partners’ visitors.

The Conservation Partner program also helps to establish the program as a leader in the sustainable seafood movement, builds strong relationships with other conservation organizations, highlights collaboration opportunities with partners, and increases the credibility of the program which all help to increase the effectiveness of our engagement with businesses, producers, and governments.
3.4 Outreach to the Media

Outreach to the media allows us to broadcast its messaging to a much larger audience in order to broaden its influence and amplify its impact. This involves developing relationships with respected media outlets to advance sustainable seafood priority messaging and initiatives. Outreach to key media outlets focuses on four main messages: 1) the environment and the seafood supply are threatened by unsustainable seafood production methods and our consumption patterns; 2) Seafood Watch, its affiliated chefs, and its business partners are reliable sources for sustainable seafood information and products; 3) sustainable seafood is newsworthy; and 4) seafood sustainability is key to environmental health and humanity’s food security.

Once these messages are conveyed, the media can leverage Seafood Watch scientific and content expertise to create on-point sustainable seafood stories that raise issue salience and lead to an increase in demand for sustainable seafood products. As with all our strategies, this demand will encourage businesses to purchase more sustainably-sourced products and producers to shift to more sustainable production practices, ultimately leading to change on the water and healthier oceans.
There are persistent political challenges that threaten both long-standing fishery conservation policies as well as new sustainable seafood and anti-IUU measures and the Monterey Bay Aquarium is well-positioned to respond to these challenges and strategically advance ocean conservation globally. Through the Seafood Watch program, we have built a body of science that underpins our consumer outreach work and is driving sustainable seafood commitments with major U.S. seafood buyers and retailers. This policy engagement leverages our reputation as one of the most trusted ocean authorities and our growing influence in the U.S. market to advance policies to improve fisheries and aquaculture management, enhance the traceability of the global seafood supply chain, and increase U.S. leadership in the global fight against illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing.

The policy engagement approach will be tailored for the specific policy or program that is being targeted; however, the basic framework is outlined in the result chain above. The approach begins with the Monterey Bay Aquarium taking an official policy position and/or engaging with a target audience to build a coalition to apply policy pressure. In some cases, the Aquarium’s policy position is sufficient to drive the development of new laws or regulations, strengthen existing laws, or build government capacity (Path A). In other instances, we will continue to engage with target audiences, foster media coverage, and cultivate champions to take the lead on these issues. In so doing, we continue to apply pressure to key decision makers in order to affect regulatory or management changes (Path B).
Seafood Watch standards are globally-applicable, transparent, and science-based. Our ratings demonstrate the current environmental performance of global fisheries and aquaculture and identify where deficiencies lie for producers and governments. This information underpins the activity of many other stakeholders in the landscape of sustainable seafood globally. Our ratings are used by other NGOs to advise and guide major buyers’ responsible seafood sourcing and fulfillment of commitments. Ratings are increasingly seen as a source of baseline information with the potential to be used by investment entities, policy makers, producers, and buyers in their decision-making. As a result, red ratings may influence producers and/or government to engage with our policy work to improve existing practices, regulations, or management (Path C).

For other policy initiatives, Seafood Watch leverages successful test projects to demonstrate real-world solutions, develop champions, and drive media attention to a particular issue (Path D). For example, Seafood Watch is working with Oceans and Fisheries Partnership (USAID Oceans) on the Catch Documentation and Traceability Program to develop an electronic catch documentation and traceability system to combat IUU fishing and seafood fraud in Asia. Successful examples of globally interoperable traceability technology in Asia amplify our traceability policy efforts and position Seafood Watch as a unique and practical voice in this space.
Data Management

Implementation of the M&E system described in the previous sections ultimately requires collecting, managing, analyzing, and reporting on the data needed to assess objectives and answer monitoring questions. To this end, Seafood Watch went through a process of identifying the data needs for all the objectives and monitoring questions and then analyzed both the business workflows that generate these data as well as the current and potential new IT systems for storing and managing these data. Details of this analysis are available in our Proposed Data Management Approach document.

Certainly, there is not one single data system that will accommodate the entire M&E system. Instead, as shown in the diagram below, Seafood Watch will create an integrated IT ecosystem that interconnects the appropriate data storage tools and allows flow of key information between them. Wherever possible, we will use existing, commercially available data systems rather than building costly, proprietary systems. Finally, it is important to incorporate the M&E data systems into business workflows so that data collection and management is not an ex-post activity.

High-Level Schema of Overall Integrated IT Ecosystem

Data flows from transactional systems to reporting and analysis database.
**Transparency and Stakeholder Engagement**

Seafood Watch aims to be as transparent about our work as possible. We undertake extensive stakeholder review during the development of our sustainability standards, and the fisheries and aquaculture standards, seafood assessments, and the process for developing Seafood Watch recommendations are publically available on the Seafood Watch website.

The standard revision process is guided by the [ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards](https://www.isealcoalition.org/) and happens every 4 years unless triggered early by major scientific developments or changes in legislation, management, or the fishery and aquaculture industries. Any interested party is encouraged to contact Seafood Watch with any information that will help improve our seafood sustainability standards. This information will be catalogued for the next round of standard revisions. All reasonable recommendations are explored by staff to ensure our standards are robust and reflect the latest developments in fisheries and aquaculture science and management.

As part of the process, we convene a Fisheries Technical Advisory Committee, an Aquaculture Technical Advisory Committee, various Expert Working Groups, and a Multi Stakeholder Group (MSG) for approving changes. The list of participants in these groups is available on our website. The technical advisory committees include fisheries and aquaculture experts qualified to tackle substantive technical issues and help in developing and adapting our seafood sustainability standards. The Multi Stakeholder Group is the final approval body for new standards or changes to existing standards. The MSG also advises Seafood Watch on its overarching and programmatic strategies. It includes representatives from the seafood industry, seafood businesses, academia, NGOs, organizations focused on fisheries and aquaculture improvement, and international ratings organizations.

Assessments are conducted by consulting researchers who are trained in the Seafood Watch methodology and who have, or are working towards, a Masters or PhD in fisheries science, aquaculture, marine ecology, or have equivalent experience. The [process for conducting a fisheries or aquaculture assessment](https://www.seafoodwatch.org/methodology) includes determination of the appropriate assessment scope, thorough data and information collection, opportunities for expert input, and multiple detailed reviews by Seafood Watch staff to ensure appropriate and consistent application of the standards. Once all the reviewers’ comments or questions are addressed, the assessment is sent out for peer review to ensure it has considered the most up-to-date and accurate data available for the species. After peer review, the assessments undergo one final internal review before passing through a finalization session during which it is presented by the author to Seafood Watch and partner environmental organizations for feedback and final review prior to publication.

This entire process results in an accurate and transparent assessment of a fishery or aquaculture operation’s environmental impacts.
Areas of Additional Research

To ensure a robust and evolving standard, Seafood Watch regularly convenes scientific expertise around issues of particular interest to the fisheries and aquaculture fields. The goals of these workshops are to advance the scientific understanding of the environmental impacts of fisheries and aquaculture, address current management challenges, and encourage additional research to fill knowledge gaps. Details of these workshops and any suggested modifications to the Seafood Watch standards will be included in an annual M&E report.

Seafood Watch is also interested in soliciting research and case studies from universities or other research institutions that will help us understand the impacts or unintended consequences of our strategies. We encourage interested parties to contact Seafood Watch at SFWresearch@mbayaq.org.
## Annexes

### Annex 1. M&E Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Objective / Question</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Targets / Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amplify Seafood Watch’s position as a leading authority in providing fisheries and aquaculture expertise and guidance. | Improve and expand use of Seafood Watch digital platforms, multi-media assets and data delivery systems | Track IT activities, Digital platform Reach, Monitor community recognition | Seafood Watch has sufficient tools and platforms in place to be a leading authority.  
- Summary of improvements made to digital platforms  
Recognition of Seafood Watch is increasing.  
- # of people reached via digital platforms  
- # organizations utilizing and/or deferring to Seafood Watch ratings and science |
| | Participate in authority platforms and events as leading expert | Track engagement opportunities | Quality and quantity of engagement opportunities increase.  
- Summary of Seafood Watch participation in and goals of strategic engagement opportunities |
| Maintain levels of public awareness and behavior regarding sustainable seafood | Communicate Seafood Watch messaging | Consumer survey, Event tracking, Messaging platform reach, Media coverage tracking | Public awareness of sustainable seafood and Seafood Watch program are maintained over time.  
- % of aided and unaided public awareness of sustainable seafood  
- % of aided and unaided public awareness of Seafood Watch program  
Seafood Watch messaging strategies are effective and sufficient.  
- # of audience members reached through messaging via digital platforms, pocket guides, and events  
- # awareness events organized by Monterey Bay Aquarium or partners  
- # mentions print/online/social media |
| | Communicate Seafood Watch calls-to-action | Consumer survey, Social media response | Target audience does desired behavior and calls to action.  
- % of consumers that use a sustainable seafood program to choose seafood |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Partner Actions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number and improve the effectiveness of business partnerships</td>
<td>Business partners and activities</td>
<td>Businesses we advise make good on meaningful commitments and engage in conservation actions. - #/type of businesses - Commitment progress scorecard - Case studies on business engagement in conservation actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What motivates businesses to develop sustainable seafood policies?</td>
<td>Business survey</td>
<td>Motivations identified by businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the unintended consequences of our seafood sourcing asks?</td>
<td>Analysis of FIP progress, Feedback from Multi-stakeholder advisory committee, SFW standard public comment period, MBA Board</td>
<td>- # of FIPs that report Seafood Watch red ratings impede progress - % of FIPs with Seafood Watch ratings that are on track - Summary of unintended impacts and action plan to resolve it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective are business partners at spreading sustainable seafood messaging to consumers?</td>
<td>Business partner reach Consumer survey</td>
<td>- # of consumers reached - % of partners consumer audience awareness of sustainable seafood (future effort) - % of partners consumer audience awareness of Seafood Watch program (future effort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do businesses engaged in pre-competitive activities influence policy?</td>
<td>Pre-competitive calls-to-action</td>
<td>- # of businesses that take requested action - Outcome of requested action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do sales shift as a result of including</td>
<td>Supplier partner interviews</td>
<td>Supplier case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ensure high sustainability standards for global fisheries and aquaculture programs that are science-based and practicable | sustainability rating information? | The Seafood Watch standards recognize better and best performers and necessary improvement beyond current industry best practice.  
- Score of Seafood Watch standards relative to other eco-certification standards (internal and external assessment)  
- # organizations utilizing and/or deferring to Seafood Watch ratings and science  
- # of research institutes engaged in multi-stakeholder groups and standard development |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain robust standard</td>
<td>Benchmarking standard scores</td>
<td>Score of Seafood Watch standards relative to other eco-certification standards (internal and external assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community recognition</td>
<td>Benchmarking standard scores</td>
<td>Volume of certified seafood that has improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does outreach around the Seafood Watch standards influence industry, government or other NGO ratings/eco-certification programs?</td>
<td>Track outreach activities</td>
<td>Case studies of standards / governments / industries that have made improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide Seafood Watch ratings for 85% of the U.S. seafood market | Seafood Watch rating database (SWAT) | Seafood Watch has sufficient rating coverage globally to identify sustainability issues.  
- # / coverage of Seafood Watch ratings |
| Provide information and tools that incentivize and facilitate improvements in fisheries and aquaculture operations and governance | Seafood Watch rating database (SWAT) | Through other global ratings programs, Seafood Watch has sufficient rating coverage to identify sustainability issues.  
- # new ratings produced by collaborative efforts  
- Summary of activities and accomplishments |
| Support efforts to develop ratings for unevaluated seafood (focus on China, Japan, Latin America) | Track activities to support global sustainable seafood initiatives | Fishery and aquaculture operations have sufficient guidance and tools to improve.  
- Data analysis of ratings over time |
<p>| Provide guidance and tools for fisheries and aquaculture operations | Seafood Watch rating database (SWAT) |<br />
|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Summary and status of tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do red or yellow ratings influence fisheries and aquaculture operations</td>
<td>Seafood Watch rating database (SWAT)</td>
<td>- # / % of yellow or red rated groups that improve overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Producer survey</td>
<td>- # / % of yellow or red rated groups that improve criteria score(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement project database</td>
<td>- Motivations to improve identified by producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Case studies of fisheries and aquaculture operations motivated by ratings that have made improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead or integrate with efforts fundamental to enabling sustainability in fisheries and aquaculture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Summary of activities and accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Seafood Slavery Risk Tool meet business partner needs to identify human rights abuses in seafood supply chains? Does the tool enable businesses to engage in improvements to reduce human rights abuses in their supply chains?</td>
<td>Business survey</td>
<td>- Survey responses to identify usefulness of tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- # / % of businesses reached that intend to use the tool for procurement purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- # / % of business partners that stopped sourcing high-risk seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- # / % of business partners that engage in improvement activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues around IUU, traceability, human rights, Greenhouse gas emissions, and governance are advanced.**

- Summary of activities and accomplishments
- Case studies of policies / governments / industries that advance environmental and social sustainability
Annex 2. Definitions
(adapted from the Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation)

Activity - A specific action undertaken by project staff and/or partners to reach one or more objectives.

Adaptive Management - The incorporation of a formal learning process into the evolution of a program. Specifically, it is the integration of project design, management, and monitoring, to provide a framework to systematically test assumptions, promote learning, and supply timely information for management decisions.

Approach - For impact evaluations, this is a set of actions with a common focus that work together to achieve specific objectives and impacts by targeting key intervention opportunities and limiting constraints. Approaches should be linked, focused, feasible, and appropriate.

Assessment - A Seafood Watch evaluation of the sustainability of seafood, resulting in one or more ratings for individual seafood products. Each rating is unique to a species, location, and gear type or production method.

Assumption - Logical sequences linking project approaches to one or more results or objectives as reflected in a results chain diagram.

Audience - Those individuals or groups a project team is trying to reach, be it for communication purposes or to influence a particular behavior.

Business partner - A restaurant or retailer with a formal partnership with Seafood Watch which requires a time-bound commitment to sell only environmentally responsible seafood and the promotion of sustainable seafood messaging.

Conceptual Model - A diagram that represents relationships between key factors (drivers and threats) identified through situation analysis that are believed to impact one or more targets.

Conservation partner - A zoo, aquarium, science museum, or organization that engages in and promotes the Seafood Watch program in the local community.

Evaluation - An assessment of a project or program in relation to its own previously stated goals and objectives.

Factor - An element of a conceptual model including drivers and threats.

Goal - A formal statement detailing a desired impact of a project, such as the desired future status of a target. Goals should be linked to targets, impact-oriented, measurable, time-limited, and specific.
Impact - The desired future state of a target. A goal is a formal statement of the desired impact.

Improvement project (Fishery or Aquaculture)- An in-country or in-region effort to collaborate with stakeholders and understand the fishery or aquaculture sustainability challenges and advance sustainable production practices and responsible management. Also referred to as FIP or AIP.

Industry (business) collaborator - A supplier or producer that has made a commitment to identify environmentally responsible recommendations on all product listings and provide accurate Seafood Watch information to all consumers.

Question - What you want to learn based on the implementation of your project. Questions drive the identification of information needs, and thus, your monitoring plan.

Major buyer - A corporate partner or food service company with a formal relationship with Seafood Watch which has committed to source only sustainable seafood, be transparent about the environmental performance of seafood products, educate staff and customers about sustainability issues, and support improvements in fisheries and aquaculture operations.

Monitoring - The periodic collection and evaluation of data relative to stated project goals and objectives. Many people often also refer to this process as monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

Monitoring Plan - The plan for monitoring your project. It includes information needs, indicators, and methods, timeframe, and roles and responsibilities for collecting data.

Method - A specific technique used to collect data to measure an indicator. Methods should be accurate, reliable, cost-effective, feasible, and appropriate.

Objective - The term objective is used differently in performance monitoring than in impact evaluations. In performance monitoring, an objective is a goal that is achieved through undertaking applicable activities. For impact evaluations, an objective is a formal statement detailing a desired outcome of a project such as reducing reducing unsustainable fishing and aquaculture practices. Objectives should be results-oriented, measurable, time-limited, specific, and practical.

Outcome - The desired future state of a threat. An objective is a formal statement of the desired outcome.

Program - A group of strategies or approaches which together aim to achieve a common broad vision. For Seafood Watch, this includes the Science, Business, Program Engagement, and Policy programs.
Project - A set of actions undertaken by a defined group of practitioners – including managers, researchers, community members, or other stakeholders – to achieve defined goals and objectives.

Rating - A Seafood Watch evaluation of the sustainability of a seafood product which is unique to a species, location, and gear type or production method. Ratings can be scored as Best Choice (Green), Good Alternative (Yellow), or Avoid (Red).

Recommendation - Seafood Watch endorsement of a seafood product as a buy option (includes Seafood Watch Best Choice and Good Alternative rating and certain Eco-certified products).

Result - The desired future state of a target or threat. Results include impacts which are linked to targets and outcomes which are linked to threats.

Results Chain - A graphical depiction of a project’s core assumption, the logical sequence linking project approaches to one or more targets. The diagram lays out hypothesized relationships.

Scope - The broad geographic or thematic focus of a project.

Stakeholder - Any individual, group, or institution that has a vested interest in, can influence, or can be affected by project activities. Stakeholders are all those who need to be considered in achieving project goals and whose participation and support are crucial to its success.

Strategy - For performance monitoring, this is a term used in the Monterey Bay Aquarium’s annual workplan and describes a goal that is achieved through accomplishing the applicable objectives. Strategies should be linked, focused, feasible, and appropriate.

Threat - A human activity that directly or indirectly degrades one or more targets. Typically tied to one or more stakeholders.