# Diagnostic Scorecard User Guide

*Beta version – May 2018*

EDF
ENVIRONMENTAL
DEFENSE FUND®

## TOOL DEVELOPERS

Alexis N. Rife, Jake Kritzer and Nicole Sarto

## TOOL CONTRIBUTORS

Merrick Burden, Erica Cunningham, Sarah Smith and Phoebe Higgins

## VERSION

This tool is being released as a beta version that will be updated as we receive feedback from fishery practitioners. The beta designation is a recognition of the value of stakeholder input, which we know will make this tool even more successful in supporting sustainable fisheries management around the world. We invite you to share your feedback on the Sustainable Fisheries Toolkit website.

## TOOL COMPONENTS

User Guide
Excel Tool

*Any views expressed in this tool and associated materials are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the contributors or their organizations. Any errors are those of the authors. This tool and any supporting materials are decision-support tools and results should be interpreted as such. Neither EDF, nor the authors, take responsibility for any outcomes that result from the use of this tool.*



Rife, A.N., Sarto, N., and Kritzer, J. (2018). *Diagnostic Scorecard*. Environmental Defense Fund.

## BACKGROUND

The Diagnostic Scorecard is comprehensive way to assess and holistically characterize the condition of a fishery. The Scorecard measures the condition of various components important for successful and sustainable fisheries management, covering bio-ecological, socio-cultural, governance and management, and markets and finance systems, each of which can have a significant impact on the design of sustainable fisheries management systems. Using the Scorecard, users can identify areas where their fishery (whether within a community, fishery or other governance scale) may be underperforming. This process allows the user to identify challenges and opportunities in their fishery and allows the user to recognize where to focus reform efforts in order to have the greatest impact and address underperforming components.

### Intended audience

The Diagnostic Scorecard is meant to be used by fishery managers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other stakeholders interested in understanding more about the condition of a fishery.

### When to Use This Tool

The Diagnostic Scorecard is first and foremost a diagnostic tool that can be used to identify opportunities and challenges across various components of a fishery system. The Tool can help diagnose what aspects of the fishery system are underperforming and therefore inform reform efforts and areas of focus during design and implementation. Additionally, the Scorecard can be used to identify areas where more information is needed in order to make design and implementation decisions. Therefore, the Tool can be used at various times throughout the fishery reform process, but is most helpful during the Assessment and Engagement phase. If used multiple times throughout the Design and Implementation phase, the Scorecard can review status and performance of the fishery and direct the user towards necessary tweaks and adjustments to the reform process as needed. See the Sustainable Fisheries Toolkit website for more information on the phases of a fishery reform process.

The Scorecard can be completed by conducting desk research or in a workshop setting. Completing the Scorecard as part of desk research is estimated to take a half day or less. In a workshop setting, the applying the Scorecard is estimated to take one full day.

Use of the Diagnostic Scorecard is complemented by completion of the Fishery Systems Mapping Tool and the Fishery Characterization Guide, available on the Sustainable Fisheries Toolkit website.

### Limitations

This tool relies on the knowledge of those filling it out. The Diagnostic Scorecard does not include characteristic or context-related questions about the fishery or strategic/practical considerations that may affect a fishery.

Some of the socio-cultural components are conditions that will not necessarily change during the course of a project, but may have large degrees of impact on project success and so practitioners should be aware of them in advance.

## INSTRUCTIONS

### Getting started

This User Guide is designed to walk you through the Diagnostic Scorecard. The Tool is divided into multiple tabs: (1) Overview, (2) Instructions, (3) Scorecard, (4) Summary & Reflections, and (5) Questions for Experts.

To begin, **open the Diagnostic Scorecard Excel file**, which will open on the Overview tab.

### Before you begin

The Scorecard tab includes four systems: bio-ecological, governance and management, socio-cultural, and markets and finance, each of which contains several key fishery components. These components are characteristics or conditions of a site or fishery whose performance in the fishery can be rated or a characteristic which can have a significant impact on the implementation of sustainable fisheries management. A reform process can target underperforming components for improvement.

Each component includes a definition, list of potential indicators, and guidelines on how to score (following a red-yellow-green scoring system). Component definitions are also included in the Glossary section of this User Guide.

Determine who will fill out the scorecard and how it will be done—the Scorecard can be filled out by an individual, with a group of experts, or in a workshop setting with a group to arrive at consensus around the current state of various components of the fishery.

This user guide will walk you through scoring the performance of each Component and your level of certainty in each score. The results of the Scorecard will visually highlight areas where the fishery is underperforming or further research is needed. Upon completion, the Scorecard guides users through a series of reflection questions to determine next steps.

### Step 1: Define the scope

a. Open the Scorecard tab. At the top of the Scorecard, you will fill in who is completing the scorecard and the current date, and define the scope of the fishery you are diagnosing. The scope of diagnosis can vary widely depending on the project area; users can specify the target species, fleet type, communities, and the management body and system for which the analysis is being conducted.

The scope of scoring should specify: a specific target species (e.g., hake) or complex of species (e.g., groundfish), a gear type, a fishery defined by an area or community (e.g., multi-species

fishery in a lagoon), or by a specific community or group of fishers themselves (e.g., fishing cooperative).

While the scope can be inclusive of multiple governance or social scales, it is important to be clear up front what the boundaries of the system are in order to accurately diagnose the conditions within that project area.

### Step 2: Score performance and certainty for each component

You will score the performance of each component on spectrum of red-yellow-green and you will indicate your level of certainty in that score. You may fill out the Scorecard using your own knowledge, with the input of experts, or in a workshop setting.

We advise scoring in a precautionary manner such that the scores will highlight challenges that need to be addressed (even if the challenges is faced in only for a portion of the fishery, or one dimension of the component).

a. On the Scorecard tab, begin scoring the Bio-Ecological System.
b. For each Component, review the Definition and Potential Indicators. Indicators may vary depending on the context of your fishery and some example indicators are provided in the Scorecard.
c. Refer to the scoring guidelines in columns F, G, and H to determine which color (red, yellow, or green) each component should be scored and select the most appropriate option from the drop down menu in column I.
    a. In some cases, your fishery may fall between the three primary color options—red, yellow and green. In this situation, select an intermediate scoring option between the primary scoring options. For example, if you would like to indicate a score between red and yellow, use the dropdown to select the “red-yellow”.
    b. The questions on the “Questions for Experts” tab can help guide scoring, especially when relying on stakeholder and expert knowledge. It is recommended to talk to multiple experts in order to avoid biases and/or limited knowledge in one of the categorical areas.
    c. If you do not have enough information or knowledge to give a score, select "not enough info"
d. Once the component has been scored, rate your degree of certainty in your response, selecting high, medium, or low from the dropdown in Column J.
e. Include any notes on where the information came from or more detail on the status or important caveats in Column K (Notes) for each component.
f. Continue moving down the Scorecard through each component and on through the components for the Governance & Management System, Socio-Cultural System and Markets & Finance System.

### Step 3: Review results

After you have completed scoring each component, scan the Summary and Reflections tab.

The Scorecard results provide a visual assessment of the performance of the fishery. The Scorecard does not prioritize or weigh any component above another, so interpretation and prioritization is left to the user when planning next steps. However, a red or yellow rating can flag areas to prioritize.

- **Green:** A green score indicates that the fishery is performing well in that attribute or there is no cause for concern. High level of certainty are also rated green.
- **Yellow:** A yellow score indicates that, in that specific attribute, the fishery is not performing ideally, but that there is no immediate change needed. Medium certainty is also rated yellow.
- **Red:** A red score indicates either that the fishery is underperforming, that there is an issue in the fishery, OR that the current condition of the component may have an impact on sustainable fisheries management efforts. Low certainty levels will also be rated red.
- **Purple:** A purple score is for when no information exists around that specific component and so rating could not be done.

Generally, anything rated red (or purple) warrants a deeper and closer look into that Component. High uncertainty levels are also labelled red, indicating a potential need to collect more information in order to better understand the component.

In situations where both the Component score and Uncertainty are rated yellow, users may also want to understand that Component better.

## Step 4: Reflection & next steps

The Summary and Reflections tab is designed to help users think about the implications and next steps necessary to address underperforming areas identified in the Scorecard.

Component Performance and Certainty scores will automatically transfer. You can answer two questions for each component:

a. How might the condition of this component affect sustainable fisheries management implementation?
b. What next steps will I take to address, if necessary?

In some cases, Component scores do not indicate an area where performance needs to be improved, but rather the score indicates the relative importance of the fishery to the economy or culture. The performance of these Components may be affected by fishery management reform efforts and they should be given special consideration when interpreting or determining next steps. Specifically:

- **Social and cultural importance of fishery**: The color rating for this component does not indicate a good or bad performance. Red is scored when fishing is an integral part of the cultural identity of the community or if there is no cultural importance associated with fishing. The red score in this case indicates that changes to the fishery resulting from fishing may have significant impact on the community or that there may be no cultural motivation to engage in fishery management. Either of these cases are important to consider when implanting a fishery management process.

- **Jobs and economic-well-bring**: Very high or low involvement here (scored as red) indicates that changes to the management systems could have an impact on the number of jobs in a fishery. The red-green scale should not be interpreted to indicate that varying levels of involvement are "good" or "bad", as this is something that may not necessarily need to change.

In other cases, changes to the Component may have unintended consequences on other aspects of the fishery. Special consideration should be given to the following components:

- **Market access of entire fishery:** In formulating a strategy, if this is rated red or yellow, it is important to note that it may not be desirable to change market access conditions if the seafood meets local demand for affordable seafood.

### Step 5: Refer to the Sustainable Fisheries Toolkit

After reviewing and reflecting on the results of Diagnostic Scorecard and identifying potential next steps, we recommend visiting the Sustainable Fisheries Toolkit to view additional tools, resources, and guidance that can be utilized to complete next steps and improve performance of specific components.

In particular, we suggest reviewing the following tools and resources:

- Comprehensive Assessment for Risks to Ecosystems
- Fishery Policy and Governance Analysis Tool
- SEASALT Evaluation Tool
- Design Manuals
- FISHE

The interventions and resources that you choose will depend on the next steps you have identified and the priorities of your reform efforts.

## GLOSSARY

**Access to capital and financial systems** – The ability of fishermen to exercise financial literacy skills, acquire capital which can be used to finance or negotiate vessel and fishing gear expenses at fair rates, where fishermen do not have high indebtedness.

**Adaptability of fishermen** – Ability and ease of fishermen to make decisions in the short term around fishing practices and running their business in response to changing conditions.

**Availability of alternative or supplemental livelihoods** – The number of industries comprising the local economy and possibility to diversify livelihoods and supplement fishing income through other means or switch to another sector.

**Community participation in governance** – Interest and active participation of stakeholders in fisheries management and evidence of social capital. Means of stakeholder participation in and influence of fisheries management decisions.

**Conflict** – Degree to which there is inter- or intra- sector conflict within the fishery.

**Corruption** – Presence of dishonest or fraudulent behavior and extent to which it impedes/interacts with fisheries management.

**Critical habitat health** – Extent and health of critical habitats for marine resources, including presence, productivity, and connectivity of native habitat types.

**Data collection, monitoring and/or scientific capacity** – Existing and historical data on fisheries and existence and capacity of scientific institutions

**Ecosystem resilience** – The extent to which an ecosystem can recover from disturbance or withstand ongoing pressures without collapsing into a different state from which it cannot recover, as exemplified by complexity and richness of biodiversity.

**Efficacy of harvest regulations** – Presence of regulations that limit harvest (input and/or output controls) to meet management objectives.

**Fishing mortality rate** – Fishing pressure relative to levels estimated to achieve abundance/biomass targets.

**Food security / importance of fishery for subsistence and nutrition** – Importance of fish as source of food/nutrition for the local community, including the proportion of local diet made up by seafood, access to alternative sources of protein, and how much fish stays in the community relative to the amount that goes to external markets.

**Institutional effectiveness and ability to affect change** – Degree to which institutions are able to implement changes and adapt to changing conditions, including their commitment to sustainability and conservation.

**IUU (Illegal, Unreported, Unregulated) fishing** – Nature and extent of illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing practices.

**Jobs and economic well-being** – The importance and stability of the fishing industry for jobs and livelihoods for the community and in the region (direct harvest, processing, marketing).

**Legal framework for fishery management** – The legal framework for the fishery, including laws, regulations and fishery management plans contain measures to allow for sustainable fisheries management.

**Market access of entire fishery** – Ability of fish harvested in the fishery to command market prices consistent with other fisheries or geographies

**Markets equity/power of fishermen** – The degree to which fishermen are paid an equitable share the overall value of the finished product and their ability to exhibit independence in making business decisions.

**Non-fishing threats** – Presence and severity of non-fishing threats (e.g., pollution, mining), which may impede the ability of fisheries to recover.

**Planning horizons** – Ability to plan ahead and think far into the future, evidenced by plans and investment in the future.

**Political will** – Interest and willingness of key political leaders to reform fisheries and a commitment to sustainability and conservation.

**Profitability (of fishermen)** – Revenue, not including subsidies, generated by fishermen above and beyond what they would otherwise make working at the next best alternative.

**Secure fishing rights** – Secure fishing rights are part of the management system and are implemented effectively.

**Social and cultural importance of fishery** – Role of fish or fishing in cultural rituals, identity, or heritage. Extent to which fishery is a significant part of social fabric and interactions.

**Strength and efficacy of leadership** – Extent to which local leaders (of fishing organizations, municipalities, or otherwise) represent and are accountable to interests of fishery stakeholders.

**Strength of local institutions and organizations** – Existence and capacity of local stakeholder groups and organizations for management and/or advancing sustainable fisheries (e.g., fishing organizations, civil society organizations, official co-management groups).

**Supply chain efficiencies** – The systems and infrastructure in place to connect harvested fish to consumers, including the processing, distribution and sale linkages that exist along the supply chain and the efficiency of that system.

**Threats to vulnerable groups** – Presence of groups that may be more marginalized or underrepresented than others, making them more susceptible to impacts and more easily disenfranchised.