

**Questionnaire** (for a word version contact [Bernadette.Clarke@mcsuk.org](mailto:Bernadette.Clarke@mcsuk.org))

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Contact Email</b>	

<b>Section</b>	<b>Question</b>
1.	What is your view on the proposed change to this relationship and therefore the ranges used to identify the scores and subsequent ratings?
A.1	
2.	What is your view on the integration of Certification into Management?
A.2	
3.	What is your view on the proposed changes to weightings for 'Management' and 'Inherent Vulnerability'?
A.3	
3.a	What is your view on the proposal to introduce a caveat for the use of Inherent Vulnerability? i.e. that it only be used when Stock Biomass is at or below B MSY (or equivalent)?
A.3.a	
4.	What is your view on the proposed separation of Stock Status into Biomass and Fishing Mortality?

A.4	
4.a	Do you have any comments on the associated descriptors for Biomass and Fishing Mortality?
A.4.a	
5.	Do you have any comments on these proposed new descriptors? Do they more fully and accurately represent the various situations possible for a stock in terms of development of its management or recovery plan, compliance with management targets, scientific advice and international agreements?
A.5	
6.	What is your view on increasing the weighting for Capture or Fishing Method and Ecological Effects?
A.6	
6.b	What is your view of the proposal to use the baseline score for the fishing method in question (detailed in the Gear League Table), multiply it by the weighting multiplier and then, if appropriate, reducing it by applying deductions commensurate with the quality and number of mitigation measures adopted and enforced in the fishery (in 0.25 increments up to a maximum of 4, i.e. the score can be reduced or improved by a maximum of 1)?
A6.b	
7.	Do you have any views on these default settings?
A.7	

Appendix 1	Do you have any comments on the Management Measures Table?
A.8	
Appendix 2	Do you have any comments on the Mitigation Measures Table?
A.9	