

# Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) Tool: Aquaculture Interpretation

April 28, 2023

Version 1.0 DRAFT

## Contents

<b>Background &amp; Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>Purpose</b> .....	4
<b>How to Read this Document</b> .....	4
<b>Principle 1: Protect human rights, dignity, and access to resources</b> .....	6
<b>Component 1.1: Fundamental human rights are respected, labor rights are protected, and decent living and working conditions are provided, particularly for vulnerable and at-risk groups</b> .....	6
Indicator 1.1.1: Abuse and harassment .....	6
Indicator 1.1.2: Human trafficking and forced labor (1.1.2a); Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries (1.1.2b) .....	7
Indicator 1.1.2a: Forced labor and human trafficking .....	7
Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries* .....	8
Indicator 1.1.3: Child labor .....	8
Indicator 1.1.4: Freedom of association and collective bargaining .....	9
Indicator 1.1.5: Earnings and benefits.....	11
Indicator 1.1.6: Adequate rest.....	12
Indicator 1.1.7: Access to basic services (1.1.7a and 1.1.7b).....	12
Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities .....	13
Indicator 1.1.8: Occupational safety .....	13
Indicator 1.1.9: Medical response.....	15
<b>Component 1.2: Rights and access to resources are respected and fairly allocated and respectful of collective and indigenous rights</b> .....	15
Indicator 1.2.1: Customary resource use rights.....	15
Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency.....	17
<b>Principle 2: Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit</b> .....	18
<b>Component 2.1: Recognition, voice, and respectful engagement for all groups, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, political, or socioeconomic status</b> .....	18

Indicator 2.1.1: Grievance reporting and access to remedy .....	18
Indicator 2.1.2: Stakeholder participation and collaborative management .....	20
Component 2.2: Equitable opportunities to benefit are ensured to all, through the entire supply chain .....	22
Indicator 2.2.1: Equitable opportunity to benefit.....	22
Indicator 2.2.2: Discrimination.....	23
<b>Principle 3: Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Component 3.1: Nutritional and sustenance needs of resource-dependent communities are maintained or improved.....	23
Indicator 3.1.1: Food and nutrition security (3.1.1a and 3.1.1b) .....	23
Indicator 3.1.1a: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries.....	24
Indicator 3.1.1b: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries.....	25
Indicator 3.1.2: Healthcare .....	25
Indicator 3.1.3: Education.....	25
Component 3.2: Livelihood opportunities are secured or improved, including fair access to markets and capabilities to maintain income generation.....	25
Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to and within community .....	25
Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention .....	26
Indicator 3.2.3: Long-term profitability and future workforce .....	26
Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy .....	27
Indicator 3.2.5: Livelihood security .....	27
Indicator 3.2.5: Fuel resource efficiency .....	27

## Background & Introduction

The Social Responsibility Assessment Tool (SRA) was developed in 2017 as a means to action the [Monterey Framework](#) as a risk assessment for users to better understand social risk in seafood supply chains. The Monterey Framework is based on three main principles:



The SRA itself actions these principles by further breaking them down into components, indicators, and specific Performance Indicator Scoring Guideposts (PISGs). During an assessment, data are collected against the PISGs, which can then be used to determine risk levels based on the SRA framework.

The SRA was designed for applicability in a broad range of contexts, including fisheries (small-scale and industrial), aquaculture, and seafood processing. The applicability Decision Tree (page 7 of the SRA) was designed to ensure the SRA indicators are suited for the context within which the SRA is being implemented. This Decision Tree poses a set of very intentional yes / no questions which once answered, determines which SRA indicators should be assessed during an SRA.

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide detailed guidance and explanation on how to interpret certain SRA PISGs for the aquaculture context. It is meant to be used in preparation for and during an SRA to ensure appropriate data are being collected to adequately assess risk according to the SRA intent.

## How to Read this Document

The document is divided into principles and components and includes tables for each indicator where interpretation is merited. Each indicator also notes applicability for the aquaculture context, with anecdotes to demonstrate for additional clarity.

The following outlines the format of each indicator:

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
##.##	Applicability decision tree questions verbatim.	Indicates if / which indicators are applicable according to your answer related to the scoring guidance	Describes why this indicator is important generally	Details about applicability and how it may differ in aquaculture for different farm types / sizes. This section should make it clear to the reader whether or not they should collect data on the respective indicator according to Unit of Assessment characteristics.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection
SRA#.#.# S#	HIGH MEDIUM LOW	Verbatim text from the SRA.	Details on how the SRA PISG should be interpreted for aquaculture and guidance on relevant data collection sources.

Only PISGs that need interpretation are listed. If there is no interpretation, the assessor should collect data on the PISG as it is written. There are some indicators within which none of the PISGs include interpretation for aquaculture, however these indicators will have interpretation on applicability. Where there is no further interpretation, this will be noted.

In this document, the following definitions specific to the aquaculture sector will apply:

- **Industrial farm:** An industrial farm hires workers, either directly, or through a recruitment agency or labor contractor. These farms will have a formal employee-employer relationship and overall, the employer is responsible for the conditions of work for all their employees.
- **Smallholder farm:** A smallholder farm primarily relies on informal labor from relatives or community members and may hire external employees occasionally during peak seasons. As guidance, a smallholder farm can be defined as a farm with no more than 5 permanent hired workers and/or up to 5 hectares, however these numbers should not be interpreted as rigid thresholds. Smallholder farms may be aggregated into a cooperative, but may also operate independently of one another.
- **Piece Rate:** The ILO defines piece rate as “pay occurs when workers are paid by the unit performed (e.g., the number of tee shirts or bricks produced) instead of being paid on the basis of time spent on the job”<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Find more information about piece rate pay on the ILO website: [https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/wages/minimum-wages/definition/WCMS\\_439067/lang-en/index.htm#1](https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/wages/minimum-wages/definition/WCMS_439067/lang-en/index.htm#1)

## Principle 1: Protect human rights, dignity, and access to resources

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

### Indicator 1.1.1: Abuse and harassment

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.1	Score for all fisheries / farms	Abuse and harassment	In any occupation anywhere in the world, workers should be able to undertake their roles free from abuse and harassment.	Some interpretation for smallholder farms included.

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.1 S6	LOW	There is a written policy publicly disclosed, posted in all languages with special accommodations for illiteracy that prohibits physical abuse, bullying, and sexual harassment, with a disciplinary procedure in place to address cases of harassment, and discipline commensurate to the actions	<p>For large farms, this is to be applied as written.</p> <p>For smallholder farms organized into a cooperative, there should be a policy at the level of the cooperative, at a minimum, that defines the conduct expected of cooperative members.</p> <p>For a smallholder farm that is not organized into a cooperative, it is still expected that there is a policy. At a minimum, if there are written contracts, this should be evident in written contracts. However, if data collected suggest that workers are aware of their rights as they relate to abuse and harassment (via key informant interviews with workers), that can demonstrate effective communication for those small sites with informal or verbal work agreements.</p>

**Indicator 1.1.2: Human trafficking and forced labor (1.1.2a); Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries (1.1.2b)**

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.2	Is the fishery/farm industrial or medium scale with labor recruitment from other countries and/or contracts with employers likely?	If YES, score 1.1.2a Human trafficking and forced labor If NO, score 1.1.2b Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries	The main risk in 1.1.2a is focused on an employee-employer relationship, as this is where forced labor situations occur most commonly (i.e., due to power dynamics). This can also be true for hired labor on smallholder farms that may be put in a vulnerable situation.  Conversely, the main risk in 1.1.2b is that a small-scale fisher or farmer may be coerced into an abusive relationship with a buyer / debtholder (such as a lender supporting the purchase of a farm or vessel), hindering the fisher / farmer's ability to earn an income.	See definition of smallholder vs. industrial farm in the 'How to Read this Document' section above.  1.1.2a is applicable in all cases of an industrial farm with employees and may also be applicable for a smaller sized farm (including smallholders) that hires labor as well, especially if it is foreign or domestic migrant labor. The concepts of 1.1.2a should apply on a smallholder farm that has hired labor regardless of whether or not they have formal written contracts, contrary to how the scoring guidance for this indicator is written. Anytime there is a power dynamic between farm ownership and an individual working on the farm, this indicator is applicable.  1.1.2b will be applicable for smallholder farms that either have no hired labor, or have community members or family onsite to support, but do not have formal contracts with these workers. In this case, a smallholder farm may be paying back debt to a lender that supported the purchase of the farm and/or resources the farm uses in production. This should be assessed in all cases for smallholder farms (note some may not be paying off any debt, but this should be determined as part of the assessment).

**Indicator 1.1.2a: Forced labor and human trafficking**

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.2a S4	LOW	The farm/fishery has a policy prohibiting the use of forced, bonded, indentured, prison labor, slavery or trafficked labor, and managers and workers / fishers / farmers are aware of and trained on the forced labor policy with access to	Refer to interpretation for <a href="#">SRA1.1.1 S6</a> .

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
		effective grievance procedures for reporting violations of the policy,	

### Indicator 1.1.2b: Debt bondage in small-scale fisheries\*

\*Fisheries here includes smallholder farms in the aquaculture context.

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.2b S4	MEDIUM	The fisher/farmer is allowed to witness the product being weighed or graded to calculate their income (or share of catch),	While this primarily applies between the farm owner and their direct buyer, this also applies to workers on the farm hired by the farm owner. This does not mean they have to always be present, but that the farm owner is transparent to workers on the farm as best practice (e.g., sharing total production with workers on a regular basis, itemized pay slips, etc.).

### Indicator 1.1.3: Child labor

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.3	Score for all fisheries / farms	Child labor	Protection of children is fundamental to their rights to develop free from hazardous labor that may infringe on their ability to complete schooling. For small, family-owned operations, it is common that children grow up supporting the family farm, however there is still a need to protect those children from abusive labor practices and any support to their family should not interfere with their right to attend school.	The SRA has PISGs targeting the situation whereby children may support some light work on family farms. No children should be working with their parents that are hired labor.

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.3 S4	MEDIUM	Children below the legal age of employment work alongside family members only if this does not interfere with schooling,	This is only allowed on smallholder farms. At no point should hired workers on large, industrial farms be bringing their

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
		and on tasks which do not harm their health, safety or morals, and do not work at night,	children / family members below the legal age of employment along with them to work. Mark this as N/A for an industrial scale farm.

### Indicator 1.1.4: Freedom of association and collective bargaining

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.4	Score for all fisheries / farms	Freedom of association and collective bargaining	Worker voice is critical right to those in the labor force. Employees of any kind should be supported in speaking up as a group and bring forward issues in a constructive manner at their place of work, whether as a right protected by law, or as a protection offered by their employer.	This is applicable in all cases, however a smallholder that is not part of a cooperative and does not have any hired employees has specific guidance listed in the PISGs below. Interpretation for smallholder farms is provided for individual PISGs in this indicator below.

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.4 S3	MEDIUM	There are national laws protecting collective workers' rights (including cooperatives) which are upheld and respected, or the country restricts trade union rights but the company / fishery / farm has provided a way for workers / fishers / farmers to organize and express grievances,	<p>For a large farm, this is to be applied as written.</p> <p>For a smallholder with no employees that is not organized into a cooperative, data collection on this PISG may be limited to secondary data collection on national and regional regulations. Only if a smallholder has employees, will an assessor undertake primary data collection (i.e., worker interviews, management interviews, document review, etc.).</p> <p>In all cases, data should be collected that indicates national and regional regulations on freedom of association and collective bargaining.</p>
SRA1.1.4 S4	MEDIUM	Human rights defenders are not actively suppressed and there is no recent record of litigation by employers against human rights defenders,	This PISG as it is written does not specify if this is suppression via the Unit of Assessment or generally, but the intent is that this covers both. The assessor should collect secondary data (desk research) that indicates whether or not

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
			this is an issue in the country or sector, independent of the site, in addition to the site specifically. Furthermore, the assessor should collect data that indicates whether or not they have reason to believe the Unit of Assessment itself is engaged in any suppression of human rights defenders. This may include supporting groups that are engaging in these kinds of activities.
SRA1.1.4 S5	MEDIUM	There is no discrimination against workers/fishers/farmers who are members or leaders of organizations, unions or cooperatives, and workers / fishers / farmers are not dismissed for exercising their right to strike.	For large scale farms, this also applies to any alternative worker organizations inside the company.  If there are no union workers on the farm and/or farms in the Unit of Assessment that are part of cooperatives, this can be marked as N/A in the SRA.
SRA1.1.4 S6	LOW	The employer or association has a written policy or by-laws (shared with workers / fishers / farmers in relevant languages and with provisions for illiteracy) that they respect the rights of workers/fishers/farmers to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining,	Refer to interpretation for <a href="#">SRA1.1.1 S6</a> .
SRA1.1.4 S7	LOW	Workers/fishers/farmers are trained by workers' organizations on their rights to organize and bargain collectively,	For a cooperative of smallholder farms, this can be offered at the cooperative level.  For a smallholder farm that is not part of a cooperative and does not hire employees, the assessor should collect data that demonstrates whether or not the farmer is aware of any cooperatives in the region or any collective bargaining arrangement for the sector in the region. Access to collective bargaining in the sector can be beneficial for smallholder farms to negotiate access and prices for inputs. If farmers within the Unit of Assessment are unaware, this should be marked as not met. If farmers within the Unit of Assessment are aware and have elected not to participate in a training provided by a third party organization, this can still be marked as met.

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.4 S8	LOW	Women participate in unions or cooperatives commensurate with their representation in the workforce.	If there are no union workers on the farm and/or no Unit of Assessment farms that are part of cooperatives, this can be marked as N/A in the SRA.

### Indicator 1.1.5: Earnings and benefits

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.5	Are workers or farmers wage workers?	If YES, score 1.1.5 Earnings and benefits	<p>This indicator is designed to have an assessor collect data on pay to workers hired by an employer to ensure the terms are fair and in line with legislation.</p> <p>For a small-scale fishery or smallholder farm, if hired labor is not present and/or only family labor is used, the risk is related to livelihood security covered in Principle 3 of the SRA.</p>	<p>This indicator is N/A for a self-employed farmer on his/her own farm that does not hire additional help.</p> <p>“Wages” here can also refer to “<i>piece rate</i>”. A farm site that pays a \$/unit amount is still responsible to set rates allowing for employees to earn at least the legal minimum wage in a regular work week (i.e., without having to work overtime hours).</p>

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.5 S4	MEDIUM	Wage levels and benefits meet the minimum legal requirements according to domestic labor laws of workplace, farm, or country of flagged vessel.	In aquaculture, it is common that workers may be paid via a piece rate system whereby they earn a set amount per unit produced. If workers on farms are paid via piece rate, the assessor must still verify whether or not the defined rates allow for workers to earn at least the minimum wage during a regular work week, as defined by the ILO as 48 hours (i.e., workers should not have to work overtime to earn equivalent to the minimum wage).
SRA1.1.5 S7	MEDIUM	Employers legally contract employees,	This is in relation to labor contracting. This can be contracting of production workers, but may also include security, transportation workers, canteen workers, etc.

### Indicator 1.1.6: Adequate rest

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.6	Are workers or farmers self-employed?	If NO, score 1.1.6 Adequate rest	This indicator is designed so the assessor can collect data on working hours allocated by an employer, as risk increases with excessive working hours.	<p>This indicator is N/A for a self-employed farmer on his/her own farm that does not hire additional help. If a self-employed smallholder farmer has workers supporting onsite, this indicator is applicable, as they should be responsible for managing workers' time.</p> <p>Whenever there is a management entity dictating the hours that an employee is to be working (e.g., a large farm with hired labor), this risk should be assessed.</p> <p>Generally speaking, whenever there are individuals on a farm whose working hours are determined by someone other than themselves, this indicator is applicable.</p>

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.6 S4	MEDIUM	Workers have at least 10 hours of rest in a 24-hour period and at least 77 hours in a 7 day period,	This is not applicable for aquaculture, these guideposts are included in ILO C188, which is specific to vessels.
SRA1.1.6 S6	LOW	Onshore workers do not work more than 48 hours/week even if the law permits more	All aquaculture operations are to be considered "onshore" even if the work is happening offshore (e.g., marine pens).
SRA1.1.6 S7	LOW	Onshore workers do not work more than 6 days/week	

### Indicator 1.1.7: Access to basic services (1.1.7a and 1.1.7b)

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.7	Does the fishery/farm provide worker housing or require live-aboard vessel time?	<p>If YES, score 1.1.7a Access to basic services for worker housing/live-aboard vessels</p> <p>If NO, score 1.1.7b Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities*</p>	The risks here differ depending on whether or not an employer is responsible for a worker's safety and wellbeing outside of work.	An aquaculture employer may or may not be responsible to provide their employees with housing. If a farm does provide housing as an option to employees, they are responsible for the conditions of the housing, and the burden of risk for worker safety and wellbeing falls on the employer (1.1.7a).

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
				<p>When employers don't provide housing, 1.1.7b is applicable and is to be assessed only for any community adjacent to the farm, even if workers live elsewhere.</p> <p>For a self-employed farmer who lives on their farm or close to it, this is referring to the community of which they are directly a member.</p>

\*Fishing communities here includes communities of smallholder farms in the aquaculture context.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.7a S3	MEDIUM	When present, fisheries observers are provided adequate accommodation appropriate to the size of the monitored entity and equivalent to that of the officers of the monitored entity	This is always N/A for aquaculture.
SRA1.1.7a S8	LOW	There are separate sleeping quarters for men and women, or if there is one sleeping space, men and women have separate bunks, or share same bunk during different shifts	This PISG indicates that workers can share the same bunk during different shifts – this is not an acceptable practice for employer-provided housing onshore. Men and women are always expected to have separate bunks.

**Indicator 1.1.7b: Access to basic services for small-scale fishing communities**

(No additional guidance)

**Indicator 1.1.8: Occupational safety**

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.8	Score for all fisheries / farms	Occupational health and safety	<p>Work in fisheries, aquaculture, or processing all come with risks associated with the day-to-day activities of fishers/crew/workers. Ensuring protections are in place is essential to minimize risks to reduce the likelihood of injury or fatality.</p>	Interpretation for smallholder farms is provided for individual PISGs in this indicator below.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.8 S2	MEDIUM	On large vessels, making long trips, vessels carry a crew list and provide a copy to authorized persons ashore at the time of vessel departure [long trips defined as 3 days],	This is always N/A for aquaculture.
SRA1.1.8 S3	MEDIUM	Workers/fishers/farmers/observers have access to communication equipment, or there is a radio on board for vessels over 24 meters	Communication equipment can vary onshore for aquaculture, however it is a baseline expectation regardless of farm size that this is met. Farms can be located in especially remote areas with little to no cell service. In these cases, the assessor should be looking at what options are available (e.g., WiFi, radios, etc.), especially since the more remote places will also be harder to reach in an emergency.
SRA1.1.8 S7	LOW	On small vessels (<24 meters), there is a working radio on board,	This is N/A for aquaculture as this is an expectation for smallholder farms under SRA1.1.8 S3 above.
SRA1.1.8 S9	LOW	Workplace risks and risk areas are identified in relevant languages with provisions for illiteracy, and workplace accidents are recorded,	Applied as it is written for large farms with employees.  For smallholder farms, this is also an expectation, however assessors should expect to see some more informal processes. At the very least, the farm owner should have identified risks and all workers should be made aware of risks associated in a language they understand and with provisions for illiterate workers. Records may be hand-written, but should still be recorded.
SRA1.1.8 S10	LOW	Workplace/fishery/farm has a written health and safety policy, properly implemented, and workers/fishers/farmers are engaged in reviewing and implementing policy,	Refer to interpretation for <a href="#">SRA1.1.1 S6</a> .
SRA1.1.8 S11	LOW	Workplace/fishery/farm has a structure or mechanism in place (i.e., occupational health and safety committee), with formal channels of communications established, to discuss and implement protection of workplace health and safety,	For a smallholder farm with a very small number of workers (e.g., less than ten), a formal committee structure may not make sense. A farm owner should make channels of communication clear to hired workers so they know where to go if issues arise. Assessors should discuss with workers in interviews how they can come forward with occupational safety issues that need to be resolved, and this should be consistent with how the farm owner describes feedback channels.

### Indicator 1.1.9: Medical response

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.1.9	Score for all fisheries / farms	Medical response	In the fishing, aquaculture, or processing sector, the nature of the work may lead to injury. Ensuring that there is due diligence in place to respond adequately to potential accidents can mean the difference between life and death.	Interpretation for smallholder farms is provided for individual PISGs in this indicator below.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.1.9 S4	<b>MEDIUM</b>	On large vessels, making long trips, fishers have a valid medical certificate attesting to their fitness to work [long trips defined as 3 days],	This is always N/A for aquaculture.
SRA1.1.9 S7	<b>LOW</b>	Workers/fishers/farmers are trained in emergency response and first aid.	In comparison to SRA1.1.9 S3 which requires a trained first aid responder, this PISG is focused on ALL workers. However, not all workers need to be formally trained in first response (e.g., not all have to be CPR certified). Emergency response includes, for example, fire drills, and first aid can be limited to basic first aid knowledge (e.g., knowing where the first aid kits are, what is in them, and how to use equipment). This is cumulative with SRA 1.1.9 S3, as in this is expected in addition to having someone onsite who is formally trained in first aid response.

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

### Indicator 1.2.1: Customary resource use rights

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.2.1	Does the fishery/farm operate within or adjacent to a customary use area?	If YES, score 1.2.1 Customary resource use rights If NO, not applicable	It is essential that farm operations are not limiting access to resources that are claimed by customary users, either legally or otherwise. Engaging customary users regarding resource use is key to protect communities and users from unfair competition for resources essential to their culture and livelihoods .	In aquaculture, this can be related to ocean-based resources as well as land-based resources, depending on the operation. For example, an aquaculture farm operation may have impacts on resources that customary users depend on, either directly via contamination, or indirectly via restricting access due to location.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.2.1 S4	<b>MEDIUM</b>	Fishers are not denied or revoked of fishing rights due to discrimination (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, political affiliation) by authorities and/or other communities or entities,	In the aquaculture sector, this indicator should be scored in relation to the Unit of Assessment’s potential infringement of fishing rights based on their operation. Furthermore, for inland operation, this may be related to land use disputes wherein traditionally owned land that is critical for customary users may be converted, infringing on their rights to benefit from that land.  Therefore, this indicator should consider any ways in which the Unit of Assessment may be directly impacting access of a specific group due to their operation.
SRA1.2.1 S7	<b>LOW</b>	There is an active process to establish a protocol agreement, or there is a protocol agreement in place, with indigenous communities, or communities with customary use rights, using Free, Prior, and Informed Consent,	For aquaculture, this may include both land-use and shared marine resources that customary users rely on for subsistence / livelihood.
SRA1.2.1 S10	<b>LOW</b>	Communities or people with claims to the resource are strongly involved in management of the resource, and traditional practices and knowledge are incorporated into resource management,	This PISG is much more directly interpreted when considering an open access resource, such as fisheries. For aquaculture, however, this may still be applicable. For an aquaculture farm that interacts with the wild-capture environment, this will be applicable, for example, if the farm location limits access of locals to the wild-capture resource.  On land, this can be related to land-use rights and the processes that the government and other stakeholders

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
			<p>undergo when developing land (e.g., a social or environmental impact assessment prior to the development of the farm on that land).</p> <p>Even if the farm has been established for years, if the establishment of that farm did not follow FPIC and there are groups that have laid claims to that land, efforts should still be made to resolve these issues.</p>

**General note on Indicator 1.2.1:**

In many cases, desk research will be a key source of data collection for this indicator as the Unit of Assessment can either be affected as customary users themselves or may be affecting customary users through farm activity. It is important that the assessor first understands the Unit of Assessment’s role more broadly before making conclusions in this section. For example, in many regions, it is required to undertake a social and/or environmental impact assessment before building a farm or gaining a business license to operate a farm. These processes may or may not include FPIC processes, and the assessor should make note of what the Unit of Assessment has done well or poorly as it relates to this indicator.

**Indicator 1.2.2: Corporate responsibility and transparency**

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
1.2.2	Does the fishery/farm constitute a single taxable enterprise or business?	If YES, score 1.2.2 Corporate responsibility and transparency	A company that is committed and transparent about social responsibility, and who holds themselves to a higher standard, is in a better position to enable social responsibility throughout their operations.	In aquaculture, this will be applicable for most units of assessment. This also applies to a cooperative of smallholder farms, as these smallholder farms are often organized as a legal entity. In certain circumstances, there will be smallholder farms that are not part of a cooperative, however these farms will likely still be classified as a taxable enterprise, just individually rather than as part of a group.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.2.2 S4	<b>MEDIUM</b>	The fishery/farm has a human rights policy in place (appropriate to their size and circumstances to meet their responsibility to respect human rights), and can demonstrate evidentiary compliance with their policy.	For large farms and cooperatives of smallholders, these PISGs should be applied as it is written.

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA1.2.2 S8	LOW	Farm or fishery has published social responsibility and environmental policies.	<p>For smallholders that are individual farms, it is the assessor’s job to determine appropriateness. For example, a large company or cooperative should make their commitments clear and public, which inherently allows for the public and the employees to hold the company accountable through social license.</p> <p>For small smallholder farms, their audience may be much smaller, and accountability from external parties may not be as applicable. All farms should have some form of a policy, but if the farm doesn’t have a forum for sharing information to the public, it is not the expectation they have to develop an entirely new system (e.g., if they don’t already have a website and are in a remote area, the policy should just be made clear to workers operating on their farm, or to community stakeholders that are affected by the farm’s operation).</p>
SRA1.2.2 S9	LOW	The human rights policy is communicated and training is provided, in a language or medium understandable to all workers and observers on the fishing vessel and other relevant persons who assume the responsibility or duties for the operation of the fishing vessel or its workers.	Although this PISG specifically mentions fisheries and does not mention farms, this is an important point of data collection for all sizes of farms as well.

## Principle 2: Ensure equality and equitable opportunity to benefit

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

#### Indicator 2.1.1: Grievance reporting and access to remedy

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
2.1.1	Score for all fisheries / farms	Grievance reporting and access to remedy	Social risks can only be understood when you are aware of the issues that fishers / farmers / workers are facing in the workplace. The only way to know this is to create an environment of trust, whereby workers feel comfortable coming forward with issues and trust their voices will be heard. The more effective these channels of communication, the lower the risk of social issues going unnoticed.	<p>This will be applicable in all cases for aquaculture, however the grievance channels may differ. For example, a larger farm will need a mechanism that is fit for purpose to handle grievances in an employee-employer relationship. For smallholder farms that are part of a cooperative, grievance mechanisms can enable fair representation of cooperative members.</p> <p>There may be circumstances where smallholder farms have little to no workers onsite beyond the farm owner. Even in these cases, as long as there is someone hired on the farm other than the farm owner / farm owner family, there should be clear channels of communication between the farm owner and those they have hired.</p> <p>Additional guidance is provided below.</p>

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA2.1.1 S2	<b>MEDIUM</b>	Workers/fishers/farmers that pertain to a business have knowledge of and access to effective, fair, and confidential grievance mechanisms, or if workers/fisher/farmers are part of a cooperative, association, or customary group, they have knowledge and access to effective and fair grievance mechanisms (according to established protocols and by-laws of transparency, democracy, and equal representation) appropriate for and commensurate with size and scale of fishery/farm,	<p>We can interpret that in most cases, workers in the Unit of Assessment will “pertain to a business”, with the sole exception of an individual smallholder farmer who does not have hired employees. This indicator will generally always be applicable in the aquaculture context.</p> <p>Assessors should be collecting data and assessing risk based on the appropriateness of the grievance mechanism to achieve what is outlined in this PISG. A large farm should have a robust, documented system that may be fairly sophisticated. A smallholder farm with only a few employees may have a more informal system. For a cooperative, a documented system is highly recommended and ideally built into cooperative by-laws.</p>

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
			For smallholder and cooperative contexts, the assessor should also look out for more informal systems of reporting grievances and make an assessment of how well these systems are able to capture and address grievances of those in the Unit of Assessment. The assessor should also assess this in correlation to SRA1.2.2 S9 to ensure workers fully understand their rights. An informal system can act as evidence here if fishers understand their rights (SRA1.2.2 S9 is met), know they can come forward to the farm owner or cooperative leadership if they have an issue, and feel confident that their issue will be resolved (data collected via interviews with farmers / workers).

**Indicator 2.1.2: Stakeholder participation and collaborative management**

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
2.1.2	Score for all fisheries / farms	Stakeholder participation and collaborative management	There are two main pieces to this indicator: 1) internal stakeholder participation within the Unit of Assessment, and; 2) stakeholder participation in broader management of a resource (e.g., community / government) between the Unit of Assessment and stakeholders outside of the Unit of Assessment.	<p>Depending on the characteristics of the farm, either 1) and/or 2) applies. For a larger farm with hired employees, this indicator applies to employee engagement, or number 1) as described in the intent. When employees are able to work with management to improve day-to-day life at the farm, both the company and workers see benefits, and engaged workers who have an influence on decision-making builds worker empowerment.</p> <p>For smallholder farms organized into a cooperative, data collection on this indicator should demonstrate decision-making within the cooperative, including how the cooperative fits into external decision-making by government and in their communities. This pertains to numbers 1) and 2) above.</p> <p>For smallholder farms that are not organized into a cooperative, data collection on this indicator should focus on</p>

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
				how the smallholder farm owners are engaged by their communities and government, or number 2) only.

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA2.1.1 S2	<b>MEDIUM</b>	There is a mechanism for stakeholder participation or in the fishery/farm management unit (i.e., worker committees, worker-management communication channels, advisory/technical councils, co-management bodies, consultation processes, etc.),	<p>In aquaculture, stakeholder participation within the farm will always be applicable (i.e., farm management engaging with workers onsite or farm owners communicating within a cooperative), however engagement with stakeholders outside of the farm may or may not be relevant. Aquaculture often interacts with fisheries management agencies, in particular for offshore or coastal operations. In those cases, the assessor should look at the process of stakeholder consultation in fisheries management and whether or not aquaculture stakeholders are invited to participate.</p> <p>For inland farms, assessors should focus on collecting data about engagement with workers within the farm unless desk research prior to the onsite assessment points to management issues related to land-use.</p>
SRA2.1.2 S5	<b>LOW</b>	Decisions are publicly communicated, promoted, and transparent,	<p>“Public” in this PISG can mean something different if there is stakeholder participation that is internal vs. external to the farm.</p> <p>For external stakeholder engagement, public here refers to the general public, as decisions relate to management of the resource.</p> <p>For internal stakeholder engagement, decisions of a private company need not be made public unless decisions made affect the public broadly. These will likely be decisions about topics such as altering shifts, decisions on new production processes, new products, etc.</p>

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA2.1.2 S7	LOW	All affected and relevant stakeholders are free to engage in all aspects of fishery/aquaculture governance including decision-making, monitoring, enforcement, and conflict resolution,	“Governance” here may refer to national / regional legislative bodies, however it can also refer to cooperative management, or governance within a company. Both of these cases must be true in order for this indicator to be met.

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

### Indicator 2.2.1: Equitable opportunity to benefit

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
2.2.1	Does the fishery/farm employ women or other marginalized groups (i.e., migrants, ethnic, or religious minorities)?	If YES, score 2.2.1 Equitable opportunity to benefit If NO, not applicable	This indicator is similar to 2.2.2, but is related to the industry in general, rather than internal to a farm. The intent of this indicator is to better understand access issues of any minority groups to benefit from the economic opportunity created by the aquaculture industry. Minority groups having access to resources can be beneficial for livelihood security and can create a multiplying effect within the community.	As this indicator relates to aquaculture farms, this is primarily referring to access to marginalized groups entering the aquaculture industry. For example, few women are farm owners and/or employees, however women often work in processing. It is the assessor’s role to understand why a minority is not represented and whether or not there is intentional discrimination at play. This indicator will be applicable in all cases, and desk research (secondary data collection) will often serve as the main data collection source. When the Unit of Assessment is a company with hired employees, discrimination in internal company processes is to be evaluated in 2.2.2.

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA2.2.1 S2	MEDIUM	There is equal access to or opportunity to benefit from the fishery/farm regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, class, migrant status, political affiliation, etc.,	2.2.1 is in relation to access to the industry broadly, whereas 2.2.2 is about discrimination within a farm. In the context of aquaculture, this can be in relation to acquiring business licenses or any other permits to operate in relation to a large or smallholder farms. This could also pertain to restrictive laws that disproportionately affect a key stakeholder group of the region, but is not limited to legal restrictions.

## Indicator 2.2.2: Discrimination

### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
2.2.2	Score for all fisheries / farms	Discrimination	<p>The intent of this indicator is that individuals that are participating within the Unit of Assessment are not facing any form of discrimination based on race, color, gender, religion, political opinion, immigration status, national extraction, disability, family responsibilities, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, trade union membership, trade union activities, or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation.</p> <p>In comparison to 2.2.1, this relates to those who are already participating in the industry, rather than access to the industry.</p>	<p>This indicator is applicable in all cases, with one exception. If the Unit of Assessment is a smallholder farm with no hired employees and is not organized into a cooperative, the assessor should focus on 2.1.2.</p> <p>For smallholder farms organized into cooperatives, this is applicable to cooperative management, including democratic processes, leadership positions, and exit / termination policies.</p>

(No additional guidance)

## Principle 3: Improve food, nutrition, and livelihood security

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

#### Indicator 3.1.1: Food and nutrition security (3.1.1a and 3.1.1b)

### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.1.1a	Does the fishery/farm operate adjacent to or offshore of a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies) (within the country's	If YES, score 3.1.1a Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries If NO, answer applicability question for 3.1.1b	3.1.1a and 3.1.1b are conceptually opposites of one another. These indicators are seeking to understand food security. The risks involved are 1) the Unit of Assessment is creating food insecurity via competing for local resources, or 2) whether food insecurity is affecting those	In the aquaculture sector, this applicability question will not be limited solely to "marine" resource-dependent communities, as aquaculture operations can be located in inland. For a large farm with hired employees employing migrant workers, 3.1.1a will be applicable. For a smallholder farm operating in the region, they themselves pertain to the local community, therefore 3.1.1b will be applicable.

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
	EEZ) and is industrial to medium-scale?		participating in the Unit of Assessment due to reliance on local resources.	However, a smallholder farm may also be affecting local food resources indirectly via access issues, competition, and/or contamination. Therefore 3.1.1a and 3.1.1b will both be applicable in a smallholder context.
3.1.1b	Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies)?	If YES, score 3.1.1b Food and nutrition security for small-scale fishing communities If NO, not applicable		For both small and large operations, depending on the type of production, the farm may pose a threat to resources the local community relies on for sustenance. For example, an in-land pond operation may have effects on neighboring crops consumed by local communities or fresh waterways the community depends on for water and/or agriculture production. A marine pen operation may affect wild-capture subsistence fisheries local communities are reliant on (e.g., sea lice outbreak, cross-breeding escapees, etc.). A mangrove operation may affect stages in the lifecycle of wild-capture subsistence species.

### Indicator 3.1.1a: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries

#### PISG Interpretation:

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA3.1.1a S2	<b>MEDIUM</b>	The fishery/farm is operating offshore a marine resource-dependent community or fishing for the same resource (or fish stock) as the local community (either directly as target catch, or indirectly as bycatch), but active measures are being taken to address these impacts, <b>OR</b> The majority of the catch landed by the fishery/farm is not retained for local consumption, or the country or community in question is food/nutrition insecure (i.e., based on % undernourished or FIES, respectively), but active measures are being taken to address these impacts.	As mentioned in applicability above, in aquaculture, this is not necessarily only in relation to marine-resource dependent communities, as an aquaculture operation can have inland affects as well. In this case, it won't be that their fishing on the same resources as written in this PISG, but there may be other affects. <b>Examples are listed in the applicability section above.</b>  Furthermore, unlike wild-capture fisheries that may directly affect the locals' ability to get food they have traditionally relied on, aquaculture operations tend to be set up with the purpose of commercial export, which means they may not have even been a local food source at any point in their production. Therefore, an aquaculture farm that is not

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
			contributing to local food security directly is not necessarily posing a risk to food security in the community.

### Indicator 3.1.1b: Food and nutrition security impacts of industrial fisheries

(No additional guidance)

### Indicator 3.1.2: Healthcare

### Indicator 3.1.3: Education

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.1.2	Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies)?	If YES, score 3.1.2 Healthcare If NO, not applicable	Healthcare and education are primarily related to the wellbeing of individuals that are part of a community, but at the national level, can also be an indication of development and livelihood security more broadly.	In the aquaculture context, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 will be marked as YES for smallholder farms whose owners either live on the farm or in the community, who hire directly from the community only, and who do not have formal employment arrangements with those working on their farms.  For large farms with hired employees, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 will not be applicable.
3.1.3		If YES, score 3.1.3 Education If NO, not applicable		

(No additional guidance)

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

### Indicator 3.2.1: Benefits to and within community

#### Applicability:

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.2.1	Does the fishery/farm pertain to a marine / coastal resource-dependent community(ies)?	If YES, score 3.2.1 Benefits to and within community If NO, not applicable	In communities where seafood production is a key economic driver, it can become a source of livelihood security for that community. It is possible that when regions are identified as key production areas, larger companies can	The applicability question here is incorrectly linked to this indicator. In aquaculture, this indicator will always be applicable, but will apply differently based on the scale of operation. Data collection will look different as well and is noted in the sections below.

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
			come in and scale up production, bringing in migrant labor, and acquiring all the licenses / permits for operation, which can compromise livelihood security in those communities.	

**PISG Interpretation:**

PISG #	Risk	PISG Language	Aquaculture Interpretation & Data Collection Guidance
SRA3.2.1 S2	MEDIUM	People from within the community hold at least some resource access rights or permits,	This is N/A for all aquaculture operations.
SRA3.2.1 S3	MEDIUM	Consideration is paid to hiring a local workforce (in the case of industrial vessels, some labor positions are occupied by local workforce).	This PISG refers to industrial fisheries, which in the context of agriculture, applies universally to all types and sizes of aquaculture production.
SRA3.2.1 S5	LOW	People from within the community hold the majority of resource access rights or permits,	This is N/A for all aquaculture operations.

**Indicator 3.2.2: Economic value retention**

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.2.2	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If NO, score 3.2.2 Economic value retention	This indicator is related to business operations, using the ratio of gross value added to turnover to understand if there are risks to livelihood security.	This is not applicable to aquaculture and will default to N/A for the assessment.

(No additional guidance)

**Indicator 3.2.3: Long-term profitability and future workforce**

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.2.3	Is the fishery/farm operating for subsistence purposes only?	If NO, score 3.2.3 Long-term profitability and future workforce	This indicator is related to business operations, using the profit margin to understand if there are risks to livelihood security. An inconsistent or diminishing profit margin can mark a risk to livelihood security.	This is not applicable to aquaculture and will default to N/A for the assessment.

(No additional guidance)

### Indicator 3.2.4: Economic flexibility and autonomy

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.2.4	Do fishers/farmers or their organization (i.e., cooperative, association, etc.) sell their own product?	If YES, score 3.2.4 Economic flexibility and autonomy	This indicator is specifically targeted at understanding the risk of livelihood security of a fisher or farmer selling their own product (individual operators that are self-employed). This indicator specifically seeks to collect data to better understand the dynamics between fishers or farmers and their buyers as transparency and negotiation are essential piece to protect fishers and farmers from potential abusive buying practices.	In aquaculture, 3.2.4 is applicable to a smallholder farm selling their own product or selling through a cooperative.

(No additional guidance)

### Indicator 3.2.5: Livelihood security

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.2.5	Is the fishery/farm contributing to local livelihood security?	If YES, score 3.2.5 Livelihood security	Seafood industry production can be a major driver of the local economy for communities, which then inherently links the livelihood of those locals participating to that industry, whether via direct primary production, processing, or other steps along the way.	This will generally be applicable in aquaculture for the same reason it would be in wild-capture fisheries. Generally speaking, if the farm / aquaculture industry is a key driver of the economy in the local community, this will be applicable.

### Indicator 3.2.5: Fuel resource efficiency

**Applicability:**

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
3.2.6	Is the fishery/farm operating for	If YES, score 3.2.6 Fuel resource efficiency	Fuel resource use can be a main indicator of the health of a fishery and whether it is financially sound. If fishers have to stay out	This is not applicable to aquaculture and will default to N/A for the assessment.

Ind. #	Scoring Guidance	Applicable Indicator	Intent	Interpretation for aquaculture
	subsistence purposes only?		longer to bring home a consistent supply of fish, this can be an indication that the SSF is being hindered, either by competition with industrial fleets, a depleting fish stock, or other potential factors (e.g., climate change, legislation, etc.). This poses a risk to livelihood security for those participating in the fishery.	

(No additional guidance)

DRAFT