

Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch®

Seafood Watch® Criteria for Aquaculture

Public Consultation 2 Comment Form

The *Seafood Watch Aquaculture Sustainability Assessment Criteria* is now available for public comment through August 2, 2015. Seafood Watch assesses the sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture by compiling relevant science-based information and evaluating that information against our standards (called 'Criteria' elsewhere on this website). We periodically revise our standards to ensure we account for developments in the scientific understanding of the ecological impacts of fisheries and aquaculture operations, as well as in our understanding of what producers and managers can do to mitigate those impacts. Seafood Watch initiated a public comment period from October 27, 2014 to January 16, 2015 and received comments from ENGO's, producers, certification schemes, and other interested stakeholders.

Key Instructions for Feedback

Individuals are asked to provide basic demographic details including Name, Organization, and Contact details below. Seafood Watch will keep official, documented information in relation to participants engaging in the 30-day public comment period, and relevant feedback/comments on the *Aquaculture Criteria*.

Page 2 and 3 include a table which enables participants to directly provide feedback in relation to the Draft Criteria. Users should type directly into the comment/feedback boxes next to the relevant Criterion and/ or Factor.

Please save all comments and send saved forms as attachments to SFWStandardReview@mbayaq.org prior to the public comment period deadline, August 2, 2015.

Registration

Please fill in all appropriate information in the boxes below. Note: unless otherwise specified, comments will be consolidated and attributed within a public summary of stakeholder feedback document.

Registration Information	
Name:	Hannah Bassett
Organization:	MARINA Lab, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs, University of Washington
Address:	
Email:	uwmarina@uw.edu

Feedback Template

Standard Criteria	<i>Factors</i>	Comment/Feedback
General Comments	N/A	<p>“A number of social issues exist related to aquaculture, especially in underdeveloped countries outside the US. Among others, those issues of greatest concern relate to unsafe and unfair (going as far as slavery and child labor) conditions for aquaculture workers. Beyond focusing on the environmental sustainability of seafood produced through aquaculture, Seafood Watch should consider including social criteria in rating products of this nature. This notion becomes especially important as Seafood Watch’s regard grows for Ecosystem Based Management principles which consider human dimensions in wild capture fisheries.”</p>
<u>Criterion 1 – Data Availability</u>	N/A	
<u>Criterion 2 – Effluent</u>	<i>Evidence Based Assessment</i>	
	<i>Risk Based Assessment 2.1 - Waste discharged per ton of fish</i>	<p>“Nets, cages, and pens (as well as ponds) seem to be grouped into a very similar category. Each of these systems produce different levels of pollutants relative to each other in addition to the variety of species with which these systems are employed. It may be more accurate (though obviously more demanding) to divide these systems into separate categories.”</p>
	<i>Risk Based Assessment 2.2 - Management of farm-level and cumulative impacts</i>	<p>“Seafood Watch should use precaution in rating productions within the US where illegal effluent activities are taking place, assigning a “red” rating automatically and</p>

		when evidence regarding environmental impact is lacking. Productions outside the US may be more difficult to rate, as environmental protection laws may be significantly weaker or potentially non-existent, in these instances, precautionary principles would be ideal, but depend more upon consistent environmental assessments.”
<u>Criterion 3 – Habitat</u>	<i>3.1 - Habitat conversion and function</i>	
	<i>3.2 - Farm siting regulation and management</i>	
<u>Criterion 4 – Chemical Use</u>	N/A	
<u>Criterion 5 – Feed</u>	<i>5.1 – Wild fish use</i>	
	<i>5.2 - Net protein gain or loss</i>	
	<i>5.3 – Feed Footprint</i>	
<u>Criterion 6 – Escapes</u>	<i>6.1 – Escape risk score</i>	
	<i>6.2 – Invasiveness</i>	
<u>Criterion 7 – Disease</u>	<u><i>Evidence Based Assessment</i></u>	
	<u><i>Risk Based Assessment</i></u>	
<u>Criterion 8 – Source of Stock</u>	N/A	
<u>Criterion 9 –</u>	N/A	

Predator and wildlife mortalities		
<u>Criterion 10 –</u> Escape of unintentionally introduced species	<i>Factor 10Xa - International or trans-waterbody live animal shipments</i>	
	<i>Factor 10Xb – Biosecurity of source and destination (for introduced species)</i>	