Some fishing practices are more inherently destructive 2 % than others Destructive Fishing shares some characteristics with the term 'fishing that causes serious or irreversible 7 % harm' Percentage of responses 'Neither agree nor disagree' Destructive Fishing is the same (conceptually) as the 5 % term 'fishing that causes significant adverse impact' All fishing practices can be destructive (if not carried out appropriately or maintained at an 0 % appropriate level) Destructive Fishing is the same (conceptually) as the 9 % term 'fishing that causes serious or irreversible harm' Destructive Fishing shares some characteristics with 13 % the term 'fishing that causes significant adverse Destructive Fishing shares some characteristics with the term 'overfishing' Some practices that use 'legitimate' fishing gears should be considered inherently destructive Destructive Fishing shares some characteristics with 0 % the term 'illegal, unreported and unregulated (iuu) All practices that use 'legitimate' fishing gears can 3 % be adapted or mitigated to reduce their impact to an appropriate level Only some practices that use 'legitimate' fishing gears can be adapted or mitigated to reduce their impact to 0 % an appropriate level or 'Prefer not to say Poor or low capacity management - rather than specific 0 % fishing practices – determines how destructive a fishing activity is Only practices that use 'non-legitimate' fishing gears (i.e. poisons and explosives) should be considered inherently destructive Destructive Fishing is the same (conceptually) as the 7 % term 'overfishing' Destructive Fishing is the same (conceptually) as the term 'illegal, unreported and unregulated (iuu) 3 % fishina' No fishing practices are more or less inherently 4 % destructive than others (if not carried out appropriately or maintained at an appropriate level) 

Percentage of responses that agree or disagree

Response types: Strongly agree Somewhat agree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree