

Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch®

Fisheries and Aquaculture Standards Review Terms of Reference

Contents

Introduction	2
Seafood Watch Standards.....	2
Scope.....	3
Justification of Need	3
Objectives.....	3
Fisheries Guiding Principles/Objectives.....	4
Aquaculture Guiding Principles/Objectives	6
Terms of Reference for Standards Approval and Advisory Bodies	7
Definitions.....	7
Goals, Tasks and Responsibilities.....	8
The Multi-Stakeholder Group	8
Technical Committees.....	8
Seafood Watch Staff	8
Tenure	9
Time Commitment	9
Affiliations and Interests	9
Expenses and remuneration	9
Confidentiality.....	10
Language	10
MSG and TAC composition, selection and decision-making procedures	10
Principles for an effective process	10
Effective MSG/TAC/EWG meetings	10

Effective communications and representation of stakeholders.....	10
Assessment of Risks	11
Contact Details.....	13
Revision History	13

Introduction

The mission of the Monterey Bay Aquarium is to inspire conservation of the oceans. Seafood Watch® is a program of the Aquarium and works to engage and empower consumers and businesses to purchase seafood that is fished or farmed in ways that minimize their impact on the environment. The program was launched in 1999 and continues to research and evaluate the sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture operations worldwide. We share the resulting seafood recommendations with the public, businesses and other interested parties in several forms including pocket guides, smartphone apps and online at seafoodwatch.org.

The Standards undergo regular review and revision to ensure the latest science and best management practices are taken into account when conducting Seafood Watch assessments. Beginning with the 2014-2016 revision cycle, Seafood Watch will establish a Multi Stakeholder Group (MSG) and Technical Advisory Committees (TACs).

The purpose of this document is to provide the Terms of Reference for the review and revision of the Seafood Watch Standard for Fisheries and Standard for Aquaculture, and for the development of the Seafood Watch Standard for Salmonid Fisheries. The current standards can be found on the Seafood Watch website [here](#). This document will be reviewed and updated as necessary at the outset of each standards revision cycle.

Seafood Watch Standards

The Seafood Watch standards consist of:

1. Defined guiding principles or objectives
2. Science-based performance criteria that are regularly revised based on the input from fishery and aquaculture experts
3. A robust and objective scoring methodology that that results in a transparent assessment of a fishery or aquaculture operation against the respective criteria

Seafood Watch revisits the performance criteria every four years to reflect the most current thinking in sustainable fisheries and aquaculture. Standards revision may also be triggered by other factors (see [Process Procedures](#)).

Scope

Seafood Watch assesses the ecological impacts on marine and freshwater ecosystems of fisheries and aquaculture operations up to the dock or farm gate. Seafood Watch assessments do not consider all ecological impacts (e.g. land use, air pollution), post-harvest impacts such as processing or transportation, or non-ecological impacts such as social issues, human health or animal welfare. Our main focus is seafood on the US market, but as some 90% of seafood on the US market is imported, our standards must be applicable to fisheries and aquaculture operations from anywhere in the world.

Justification of Need

The Seafood Watch standards and fishery and aquaculture assessments currently fill a critical role in the North American marketplace. The assessments identify the environmental performance of the fishery or aquaculture operation in question providing producers with areas for improvement. The resulting fishery and aquaculture ratings inform the seafood purchasing decisions of concerned consumers and businesses. Elements of the Seafood Watch standards and program that are unique to existing eco-certification schemes and ratings programs¹ include the following:

1. We assess the majority of the seafood on the North American market. Initial estimates are that our current recommendations cover some 80-85% of the total seafood on the US market, by volume.
2. We use a three tiered system approach with the intention of recognizing better and best performers
3. We publish all assessment results regardless of score and rating outcome at www.seafoodwatch.org
4. Our fisheries and aquaculture Standards press for improvement beyond current best practice.
5. Our assessments are non-voluntary.
6. Our performance criteria are structured to assess the impacts from farms and fisheries not only in isolation, but also in the context of the cumulative effects of multiple fisheries and aquaculture farms in the region.

Objectives

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. In keeping with this definition, Seafood Watch refers to the following objectives to illustrate the qualities that fisheries and aquaculture operations must possess to be considered sustainable. These objectives inform the performance criteria and scoring methodology used to assess fisheries and aquaculture operations.

¹ Seafood eco-certification programs for wild fisheries include Friends of the Sea, Marine Stewardship Council, and various standards built upon the Global trust program (Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute, Iceland, G.U.L.F.). For aquaculture, these include Aquaculture Stewardship Council, Canada Organic, Certified Quality Salmon, Food Alliance, Friend of the Sea, Global Aquaculture Alliance, Global GAP, Naturland, Thai Code of Conduct and Thai GAP

Fisheries Guiding Principles/Objectives

Sustainable wild capture fisheries:

1. Follow the principles of ecosystem-based fisheries management;

The fishery is managed to ensure the integrity of the entire ecosystem, rather than solely focusing on maintenance of single species stock productivity. To the extent allowed by the current state of the science, ecological interactions affected by the fishery are understood and protected, and the structure and function of the ecosystem is maintained.

2. Ensure all affected stocks² are healthy and abundant;

Abundance, size, sex, age and genetic structure of the main species affected by the fishery (not limited to target species) is maintained at levels that do not impair recruitment or long-term productivity of the stocks or fulfillment of their role in the ecosystem and food web.

Abundance of the main species affected by the fishery should be at, above, or fluctuating around levels that allow for the long-term production of maximum sustainable yield.

3. Fish all affected stocks at sustainable levels;

Fishing mortality for the main species affected by the fishery should be appropriate given current abundance and inherent resilience to fishing while accounting for scientific uncertainty, management uncertainty, and non-fishery impacts such as habitat degradation.

The cumulative fishing mortality experienced by affected species must be at or below the level that produces maximum sustainable yield for single-species fisheries on typical species that are at target levels.

Fishing mortality may need to be lower than the level that produces maximum sustainable yield in certain cases such as multispecies fisheries, highly vulnerable species, or fisheries with high uncertainty.

For species that are depleted below target levels, fishing mortality must be at or below a level that allows the species to recover to its target abundance.

4. Minimize bycatch;

Seafood Watch defines bycatch as all fisheries-related mortality or injury other than the retained catch. Examples include discards, endangered or threatened species catch, pre-catch mortality and ghost fishing. All discards, including those released alive, are considered bycatch unless there is valid scientific evidence of high post-release survival and there is no documented evidence of negative impacts at the population level.

The fishery optimizes the utilization of marine resources by minimizing post-harvest loss and by efficiently using marine resources as bait.

² “Affected” stocks include all stocks affected by the fishery, no matter whether target or bycatch, or whether they are ultimately retained or discarded.

5. Have no more than a negligible impact on any threatened, endangered or protected species;
The fishery avoids catch of any threatened, endangered or protected (ETP) species. If any ETP species are inadvertently caught, the fishery ensures and can demonstrate that it has no more than a negligible impact on these populations.

6. The fishery is managed to sustain the long-term productivity of all affected species;

Management should be appropriate for the inherent resilience of affected marine life and should incorporate data sufficient to assess the affected species and manage fishing mortality to ensure little risk of depletion. Measures should be implemented and enforced to ensure that fishery mortality does not threaten the long-term productivity or ecological role of any species in the future.

The management strategy has a high chance of preventing declines in stock productivity by taking into account the level of uncertainty, other impacts on the stock, and the potential for increased pressure in the future.

The management strategy effectively prevents negative population impacts on bycatch species, particularly species of concern.

7. Avoid negative impacts on the structure, function or associated biota of marine habitats where fishing occurs;

The fishery does not adversely affect the physical structure of the seafloor or associated biological communities.

If high-impact gears (e.g. trawls, dredges) are used, vulnerable seafloor habitats (e.g. corals, seamounts) are not fished, and potential damage to the seafloor is mitigated through substantial spatial protection, gear modifications and/or other highly effective methods.

8. Maintain the trophic role of all marine life;

All stocks are maintained at levels that allow them to fulfill their ecological role and to maintain a functioning ecosystem and food web, as informed by the best available science.

9. Do not result in harmful ecological changes such as reduction of dependent predator populations, trophic cascades, or phase shifts;

Fishing activities must not result in harmful changes such as depletion of dependent predators, trophic cascades, or phase shifts.

This may require fishing certain species (e.g. forage species) well below maximum sustainable yield and maintaining populations of these species well above the biomass that produces maximum sustainable yield.

10. Ensure that any enhancement activities and fishing activities on enhanced stocks do not negatively affect the diversity, abundance or genetic integrity of wild stocks;

Any enhancement activities are conducted at levels that do not negatively affect wild stocks by reducing diversity, abundance or genetic integrity.

Management of fisheries targeting enhanced stocks ensure that there are no negative impacts on the wild stocks, in line with the guiding principles described above, as a result of the fisheries.

Enhancement activities do not negatively affect the ecosystem through density dependent competition or any other means, as informed by the best available science.

Aquaculture Guiding Principles/Objectives

Sustainable aquaculture farms and collective industries:

- 1. Have robust and up-to-date information on production practices and their impacts (or lack of impacts) publicly available;**
Poor data quality or availability limits the ability to understand and assess the environmental impacts of aquaculture production and subsequently for seafood purchasers to make informed choices. Robust and up-to-date information on production practices and their impacts should be publicly available (i.e. accessible to consumers and the buyers of the products).
- 2. Prevent effluent discharges from exceeding, or contributing to exceeding, the carrying capacity of receiving waters at the local or regional level;**
Aquaculture farms minimize or avoid the production and discharge of wastes at the farm level in combination with an effective management or regulatory system to control the location, scale and cumulative impacts of the industry's waste discharges.
- 3. Are located at sites, scales and intensities that maintain the functionality of ecologically valuable habitats;**
The siting of aquaculture farms does not result in the loss of critical ecosystem services at the local, regional, or ecosystem level.
- 4. Limit the type, frequency of use, total use, or discharge of chemicals to levels representing a low risk of impact to non-target organisms;**
Aquaculture farms avoid the discharge of chemicals toxic to aquatic life or limit the type, frequency or total volume of use to ensure a low risk of impact to non-target organisms.
- 5. Source sustainable feed ingredients and converting them efficiently with net edible nutrition gains;**
Producing feeds and their constituent ingredients has complex global ecological impacts, and the efficiency of conversion can result in net food gains or dramatic net losses of nutrients. Aquaculture operations source only sustainable feed ingredients or those of low value for human consumption (e.g. by-products of other food production), and convert them efficiently and responsibly.
- 6. Prevent population-level impacts to wild species or other ecosystem-level impacts from farm escapes;**
Aquaculture farms, by limiting escapes or the nature of escapees, prevent competition, reductions in genetic fitness, predation, habitat damage, spawning disruption, and other impacts on wild fish

and ecosystems that may result from the escape of native, non-native and/or genetically distinct farmed species.

7. Preventing population-level impacts to wild species through the amplification and retransmission, or increased virulence of pathogens or parasites;

Aquaculture farms pose no substantial risk of deleterious effects to wild populations through the amplification and retransmission of pathogens or parasites, or the increased virulence of naturally occurring pathogens.

8. Use eggs, larvae, or juvenile fish produced from farm-raised broodstocks thereby avoiding the need for wild capture;

Aquaculture farms use eggs, larvae, or juvenile fish produced from farm-raised broodstocks thereby avoiding the need for wild capture, or where farm-raised broodstocks are not yet available, ensure that the harvest of wild broodstock does not have population-level impacts on affected species. Wild-caught juveniles may be used from passive inflow, or natural settlement.

9. Prevent population-level impacts to predators or other species of wildlife attracted to farm sites;

Aquaculture operations use non-lethal exclusion devices or deterrents, prevent accidental mortality of wildlife, and use lethal control only as a last resort, thereby ensuring any mortalities do not have population-level impacts on affected species.

10. Avoid the potential for the accidental introduction of non-native species or pathogens during the shipment of live animals;

Aquaculture farms avoid the international or trans-waterbody movements of live animals, or ensure that either the source or destination of movements is biosecure in order to avoid the introduction of unintended pathogens, parasites and invasive species to the natural environment.

Terms of Reference for Standards Approval and Advisory Bodies

Definitions

- Consensus (as defined by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)): "General agreement, characterized by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by an important part of the concerned interests and by a process seeking to take into account the views of interested parties, particularly those directly affected, and to reconcile any conflicting arguments. Consensus need not imply unanimity."
- Chatham House Rule: "When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed". The Chatham House Rule has the aim to encourage openness and the sharing of information at meetings.
- Interested party/stakeholder: Any person or group concerned with or directly affected by a standard.

Goals, Tasks and Responsibilities

The Multi-Stakeholder Group

The MSG serves two purposes. First, it is the final approval body for new standards and revision of existing standards. Second, it acts as an advisory board on the direction of the program and other topics outside of standard review. MSG members are encouraged to solicit input from the stakeholder groups they represent. Participation in the MSG must be conducted in a manner that is consistent with this document and the [Process Procedures](#), including abiding by and making decisions that adhere to the Seafood Watch Guiding Principles for Fisheries and Aquaculture (see above).

Technical Committees

The Technical Advisory Committees are advisory bodies and do not vote or make decisions related to standard review. There are two TACs; the Fisheries TAC and the Aquaculture TAC. The main goal of the TACs is to tackle substantive technical issues which may or may not be brought up in public consultation and to suggest changes to the standards based on their combined expertise.

Furthermore, TAC members shall:

- Provide detailed input on the issues (needs, challenges, opportunities) that need to be incorporated into the revision process, including recommending relevant agenda topics for its own deliberations
- Review and propose revisions to the standards considering input from public consultation
- Review and consider stakeholder comments received during and outside the formal public consultations

Additional Expert Working Groups may be convened to deliberate on specific issues. These can include TAC members, MSG members or external experts. External studies may also be commissioned as needed.

Seafood Watch Staff

Seafood Watch staff shall organize and direct the process. Furthermore, Seafood Watch staff (or a contractor as assigned by Seafood Watch staff) shall:

- Draft and then update the standard review documents below and publish to the [Seafood Watch Standards Revision webpage](#):
 - Terms of Reference (this document)
 - Public Summary
 - Process Protocols
 - Complaints Procedure
 - Work Program
 - Draft proposed changes to existing standards
- Select and invite MSG and TAC members
- Convene EWGs and commission additional external research as needed
- Organize the necessary meetings, including in person, webinars and phone calls

- Collate all public feedback for the Technical Committees and MSG and post on the website
- Prepare the draft standards after TAC and MSG input
- Solicit approval from the TACs and MSG on the draft standards (if the TACs and/MSG are unable to do so in the in-person meetings)

Tenure

The Seafood Watch Standards are updated at least every four years, and provisions exist for more frequent updates as necessary (see [Process Procedures](#) for more information). The actual cycle for revising the standards lasts 12-18 months; this is the time when the demands on the MSG and TACs will be greatest. However, there is need to retain the MSG and possibly the TACs even when not in a revision cycle, in order to help keep Seafood Watch staff apprised of the latest science and management policy. For this reason, we expect MSG and TAC members to commit to two years of service.

Time Commitment

When in cycle, the full MSG and TACs will meet in person once a year, for no more than two days. Additionally, MSG and TAC members will meet remotely by conference call or webinar as needed at least once. Members will review and provide feedback on draft standards prior to and otherwise outside of these meetings. It is required that MSG members provide Seafood Watch with any objections to and/or proposed changes to the revised standard at minimum one month prior to the in-person convenings.

When out of cycle, the MSG will still meet once a year, typically in person. The TACs will meet on a more as-needed basis, by webinar (or potentially in person by piggy-backing on existing events if enough members are attending).

Affiliations and Interests

Seafood Watch will ask members to make a written statement of their relevant affiliations and interests prior to appointment.

It is incumbent upon the member to update their declaration in writing, should their personal situation change. Seafood Watch will review declarations prior to appointment and on an ongoing basis as updates occur.

Members are expected to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner; the use of their positions cannot be reasonably construed to be for their private gain or that of any other person, company, or organization.

Expenses and remuneration

Members will be reimbursed for expenses incurred during their work on the MSG and TACs, such as travel and accommodation.

Confidentiality

All documents prepared by or presented to the MSG and TACs are assumed to be public unless identified otherwise by Seafood Watch and agreed by the MSG/TAC.

The MSG and TACs operate according to the Chatham House Rule (see Definitions). So, while members of the MSG and TACs have full authority to share the non-confidential substance of discussions and papers, they shall not report or attribute either the comments of individuals or their affiliations outside of meetings, whether conducted face to face or virtually. The default approach of the MSG and TACs is that the non-attributable content of discussions and papers is not confidential, unless so specified.

Language

The working language of the MSG is English. There is no provision for other languages during this process.

MSG and TAC composition, selection and decision-making procedures

Please refer to the [Process Procedures](#) for TAC and MSG composition, selection, and decision-making procedures.

Principles for an effective process

Effective MSG/TAC/EWG meetings

- Established solid foundation at the start (objectives, roles, timetable, etc)
- Agreed meeting protocols
- Detailed agendas provided before and at meetings; meeting materials provided well in advance of meetings whenever possible to ensure that members have sufficient time to review.
- Clear decision making structures, e.g., use of decision-making matrix based on criteria that need to be considered and scenario-testing
- Simple, logical discussion format, e.g., commencing with clarifying the issue(s) the requirement is meant to address before starting to comment on the specific requirement
- Regular, ongoing temperature checks on points-of-agreement
- Decision point, end of day and end of meeting summaries
- Use of technical experts in drafting the documents to support Working Group's role and task
- Decision on use of sub-groups, break-out groups in meetings, etc.
- Temperature check from TACs before a final draft is recommended to the MSG for approval.
- Straw poll of the MSG before going to decision-making.

Effective communications and representation of stakeholders

MSG members are expected to consult and represent the views of their respective constituencies. This includes:

- Proactively contacting a range of stakeholders during the revision process - a combination of soliciting views on questions/issues; sharing information and building enthusiasm for formal consultations
- Coordinating with other colleague(s) to ensure a wide range of views inform the development or finalization of the standards
- Passing on agreed public statements emerging from MSG meetings
- Representing the views of their constituency within the MSG meetings for the betterment of Seafood Watch and its mission. At the beginning of sessions, MSG members will be asked for 'report-outs' to share input they have received from their constituents. At the end of meetings, specific issues will be identified on which MSG members are expected to consult with other experts. These issues will be posted on the website for easy access.

To support stakeholder engagement, Seafood Watch staff will also:

- Implement a communications strategy to ensure ongoing and meaningful stakeholder engagement
- Proactively push communication towards those who self-declare their interest, or otherwise may be impacted by the standard/policy, via email and/or the website.
- Make available for all interested parties via the website:
 - All documents identified in the first bullet in "Tasks and Responsibilities of other entities in the process" above
 - Working Group agendas
 - Working Group minutes (non-attributable)
 - Signed off internal documents and drafts of the TACs
 - Anonymized comments from stakeholders on draft documents
- Use tracking/document handling software tools to facilitate dialogue amongst stakeholders as part of the consultation process.

Assessment of Risks

The table below provides an assessment of risks in implementing the Seafood Watch standard, and measures we have taken to mitigate them. Note that these are not additional risks we have identified relative to the standards review process beginning in 2014; rather they are the main risks we have identified and mitigated for since the inception of the program in 1999.

Risk	Mitigation
Robustness of recommendations	Continually improve the scientific rigor of our reports, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum educational/professional qualifications for authors of reports • Full training modules for new authors • Updated training module for existing authors when necessary • Internal review process to ensure consistency in interpretation of the

	<p>standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External peer-review of all reports to ensure the most up to date science and management measures have been used and interpreted correctly • Final review with colleagues that use Seafood Watch recommendations <p>2. Timeliness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review relevant stock assessment summaries when they are released (e.g. quarterly in the case of US federal fisheries) • Review and update reports as necessary, but at least every three years • Ensure partners receive our new recommendations in a timely manner <p>3. Standards and guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodically review and update our standards through a multi-stakeholder input process • For the revisions cycle from 2014 onwards, organizing the process so that it follows ISEAL’s Code of Good Practice for Standard Setting. This will provide greater transparency and assurance around the robust nature of our process for rating wild and farmed seafood.
Maintain and increase North American market coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct an annual prioritization exercise to identify gaps in the market coverage of our recommendations • Establish and support a robust External Assessment Program. This program must follow the mitigation measures above (under ‘Robustness of Recommendations’), except ‘internal review’ step is replaced with an external reviewer. To be an external reviewer in this program, a person must have proven they fully understand the Seafood Watch review process and criteria. This is operationalized as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have written at least two Seafood Reports as part of the internal program above • Undergone training including at least one webinar followed by review of at least 5 Seafood Watch reports which are then shadow reviewed by internal staff.
Confusion over claims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly state that we are not an eco-certification, as we do not audit or have any control over individual companies’ chain of custody. • Encourage people at point of sale to seek out traceability mechanisms • Follow ISEAL Making Claims about Sustainability Standards Systems Good Practice Guide (when completed)
Duplication of effort/redundancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to identify equivalent eco-certs we can defer to based on benchmarking analysis of their standards. For information on our benchmarking work to date, please visit www.seafoodwatch.org/seafood-recommendations/eco-certification.

Contact Details

Project management of the Seafood Watch Standards Revision is being conducted by Santi Roberts, SFWstandardreview@mbayaq.org. The Seafood Watch Standards revision website can be found at: www.seafoodwatch.org/seafood-recommendations/standards-revision

Revision History

- This document was first published as three separate documents in October 2014 – a general Terms of Reference, a Terms of Reference for the MSG, and a Terms of Reference for the TACs.
- The general ToR was updated in April 2016 to reflect the fact that the Standard for Fisheries and Standard for Aquaculture are now published and that the Standard for Salmonid Fisheries and criteria for greenhouse gas emissions are in development. The guiding principles regarding greenhouse gas emissions have been removed to be consistent with the revised Standard for Wild Fisheries and Standard for Aquaculture.
- The introduction for all three documents were updated in February 2017 to state that it will be reviewed and updated as necessary at the outset of each standards revision cycle
- The general ToR was updated in May 2017 to remove reference to our developing criteria to assess the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions, which we are no longer doing.
- The three documents were combined into a single ToR to reduce confusion over the number of documents. No substantive changes were made to the content.