**Science Based Targets Network Public Consultation**

***September 10 - October 22, 2024***

*The Science-Based Targets Network is seeking your valuable input to refine its Step 3: Ocean guidance, focusing specifically on seafood value chains. Your feedback will help ensure the guidance is clear, feasible, ambitious, and grounded in sound scientific principles.*

*This public consultation will run for 6 weeks (September 10 - October 22, 2024), providing ample opportunity for your contributions. Your feedback will be instrumental in shaping the final version of the guidance and ensuring its effectiveness in supporting businesses and organizations to set ambitious science-based targets for nature in the ocean.*

*Please take the time to carefully review the following questions and provide your insights and feedback. Throughout the draft guidance document you will also find specific technical questions (listed below) that we ask you to keep in mind and respond to, as you are able.*

***Download a copy of this document and include an attachment of responses in an email to the SBTN Ocean Hub Co-leads. You may also submit your feedback via this*** [***Google Form***](https://forms.gle/YVGhedWN9oEnGkRh7)***.***

*Contact SBTN Ocean Hub Co-leads with any questions:*

* *Taylor Witkin (twitkin@conservation.org)*
* *Alice Thomas-Smyth (alice.thomas-smyth@wwfus.org)*

**FEASIBILITY**

* Do you believe the proposed methodology is feasible for businesses and organizations of various sizes and industries to implement? Please elaborate.
* Are there specific challenges or barriers that you anticipate businesses may face in applying the guidance? If so, what are they?
* How can the guidance be further tailored to accommodate the specific needs and circumstances of different industries or regions?

Response:

**CLARITY**

* Do you find the guidance to be clear and understandable? Are there any terms or concepts that require further explanation?
* Are the steps outlined in the guidance logical and easy to follow? Are there any areas where the sequence could be improved?
* Is the guidance sufficiently detailed to provide practical instruction for businesses and organizations?

Response:

**SCIENTIFIC BASIS**

* Are there any areas where you believe the scientific basis could be strengthened or further elaborated?
* How can the guidance be updated to reflect the latest scientific advancements and emerging best practices in ocean-based action for nature?

Response:

**AMBITION:** Do you find the guidance to be adequately ambitious, such that it would result in positive environmental and societal outcomes? If not, please explain.

Response

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:** Please feel free to share any additional comments or suggestions that you may have regarding the Step 3 guidance. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.

Response:

**TECHNICAL QUESTIONS**

**Target 1: Avoid and Reduce Overexploitation**

* The Avoid and Reduce Overexploitation Target uses generation time (GT = AM50 +1/M) as a decision point for determining whether a company should take a Reduction or Cap & Engage path of action (Section 2.3.1). Is this an appropriate decision point for this target? If not, please suggest alternatives.
* What is the feasibility of companies voluntarily capping or reducing their sourcing of wild capture seafood, as described by this technical guidance? If you feel that it is entirely unrealistic to ask companies to reduce or cap their sourcing volumes, please explain.

Response:

**Target 2: Protect Structural Marine Habitats**

* Is it realistic to expect companies to be able to obtain the necessary data to set this target?
* Please recommend sources where users of this guidance can obtain data needed to set the Protect Structural Marine Habitats targets.

Response:

**Target 3: Reduce Risk to Endangered, Threatened, and Protected Marine Wildlife Populations**

* The guidance uses the threshold of "critically endangered" species (as defined by IUCN Red List or similar) as a trigger for the Cessation pathway in this target (Section 4.4.1). Is this an appropriate threshold? If not, either because it is too high or too low, please suggest an alternative threshold and provide justification.
* The guidance uses a qualitative assessment to establish a baseline of risk to ETP wildlife populations (Section 4.3.2). Will the data collected in the assessment result in an accurate, actionable baseline? If not, what other factors should be considered? Please provide suggestions for how we can improve this assessment and determine accurate baselines.

Response:

**Annex – Engagement Roadmap**

* Do you think companies will be able to provide the required documentation in the time allotted, as described by the Engagement Roadmap (Section 5.3.2)?

Response: