



OCEAN OUTCOMES  
Fish | Food | Livelihoods

Workplan:

## Indian Ocean Albacore Tuna Longline Fishery Improvement Project (FIP)

(On [fisheryprogress.org](http://fisheryprogress.org): "*Indian Ocean albacore - longline*")

January 2020



## Table of Contents

[Acronyms](#)

[Introduction](#)

[FIP Period and Reporting](#)

[Definition of the FIP Unit of Assessment \(UoA\)](#)

[Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks](#)

[Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts](#)

[Principle 3: Effective management](#)

[Additional Impacts](#)

[Traceability](#)

[Glossary](#)



## Acronyms

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| CMM   | Conservation and Management Measure  |
| EEZ   | Exclusive Economic Zone  |
| ETP   | Endangered, Threatened and Protected   |
| FAO   | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations  |
| FIP   | Fishery Improvement Project  |
| IO    | Indian Ocean   |
| IOTC  | Indian Ocean Tuna Commission   |
| ISSF  | International Sustainability Seafood Foundation  |
| MSC   | Marine Stewardship Council   |
| O2    | Ocean Outcomes   |
| PI    | Performance Indicator  |
| RFMO  | Regional Fisheries Management Organization   |
| SC    | Scientific Committee   |
| UoA   | Unit of Assessment   |
| WCPFC | Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission   |
| WPSTA | Western Pacific Sustainable Tuna Alliance Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin free school purse seine fishery |



## Introduction

Ocean Outcomes (O2) has prepared a Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Workplan for Indian Ocean (IO) albacore tuna which is caught in the Pacific Ocean, landed in Mauritius, and supplies Bumble Bee Foods LLC (Bumble Bee) via FCF Fishery Company Ltd (FCF) (the “Indian Ocean Albacore Tuna Longline FIP”). The Workplan is based on the Scoping Document prepared by O2<sup>1</sup>, and pre-assessment for IO albacore caught by longline, conducted by ME Certification Ltd (MEC)<sup>2</sup>. The Scoping Document was reviewed by Dr. Jocelyn Drugan, Ocean Outcomes, who is a MSC-registered associate technical consultant.

Developing a FIP Workplan is an important, required step in the FIP process. The Workplan aims to help stakeholders develop a clear plan for implementing the fishery improvements that need to be made and provides the information needed for reporting on FisheryProgress.org. Each Performance Indicator (PI) that has a scoring category of <60 or 60-79 must have at least one action directly linked to it, that would, when completed, result in an increased score (i.e., meeting the requirements of the next scoring guidepost for that PI).

The Indian Ocean Albacore Tuna Longline FIP is a “Comprehensive FIP.” A “Comprehensive FIP” has time bound objectives for addressing all of the fishery’s environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. For Comprehensive FIPs, actions should clearly link to the PIs of the MSC Fisheries Standard.

The critical elements that need to be included in the FIP Workplan are:

- 1) **Actions:** Defined as a major activity in the FIP’s Workplan that must be completed to address specific deficiencies identified in the Scoping Document and/or MSC pre-assessment. Actions should clearly link to the PIs of the MSC Fisheries Standard, and progress reporting will need to be against the MSC Principles.
- 2) **Completion dates:** To ensure accountability, an expected completion date should be included for each action.
- 3) **Priority:** High, medium or low priority taking into account scoring in the Scoping Document and sequencing of actions (output of one action needed to begin another action).

---

<sup>1</sup> Ocean Outcomes (2019). Scoping Document: *Indian Ocean Albacore Tuna Longline Fishery Improvement Project, Prepared for Bumble Bee. May 2019.*

<sup>2</sup> ME Certification Ltd (2017). Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Pre-Assessment Report: *Bumble Bee and FCF Mauritius, Madagascar and High Seas albacore longline fishery. On behalf of Bumble Bee and FCF Prepared by ME Certification Ltd March 2018.*



- 4) **Estimated cost:** Costs for each action.
- 5) **Responsible parties:** Organisations/individuals responsible for completing the actions as agreed upon by FIP stakeholders.
- 6) **MSC PIs:** All PIs that will be addressed by the action.
- 7) **Tasks:** This section breaks the actions identified above down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished. Tasks provide more clarity on how the FIP intends to complete each action. This allows participants to better track progress over time and communicate FIP progress.

The FIP stakeholders are O2, Bumble Bee and FCF. The administration and FIP Actions will be delivered by O2, Bumble Bee and FCF.

### FIP Period and Reporting

This FIP is valid for five years, commencing December 2019, with a projected completion by December 2024. Progress against the FIP Workplan will be reviewed every six months. The Scoping Document, this Workplan, notifications of any modifications, progress reporting and the three-yearly independent audit for this FIP will be made public on [FisheryProgress.org](https://fisheryprogress.org).



## Definition of the FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA)

The FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA) defines the full scope of what was assessed.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Target species   | Albacore tuna ( <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> )  |
| Stock  | Indian Ocean   |
| Geographic location  | Indian Ocean (IO) high seas<br>Mauritius Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)<br>Madagascar EEZ |
| Gear and method  | Pelagic longline   |
| Management systems, including Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO)    | Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)<br>Mauritius and Madagascar national management      |
| Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock | Chinese and Taiwanese-flagged longline vessels   |

## Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b> | <b>1. Establish harvest strategies and harvest control rules</b>   |
| <b>Action Goal</b>            | Ensure there are robust and precautionary harvest strategies in place for the Indian Ocean albacore stock (PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2), and relevant information is collected to support the harvest strategy (PI 1.2.3). |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b></p>   | <p>Outcome 1. By the end of the fifth year, there shall be a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place for the Indian Ocean (IO) albacore tuna stock. There shall be an explicit description of: 1) how the design makes the harvest strategy responsive to the state of the stock; and 2) how elements of the harvest strategy (monitoring, stock assessment, harvest control rules and management actions) work together towards achieving stock management objectives. The harvest strategy must be constructed such that its effectiveness can be empirically evaluated.</p> <p>Outcome 2a. By the end of the third year, IOTC shall formally adopt appropriately precautionary harvest control rules for the IO albacore tuna stock that ensures the exploitation rate is reduced as the limit reference point is approached and is expected to keep the stock fluctuating around the target level and robust to the main uncertainties. The selection of harvest control rules shall take into account the main uncertainties.</p> <p>Outcome 2b. By the end of the fourth year, there shall be evidence the tools used or available to implement harvest control rules for IO albacore tuna are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation in the Indian Ocean.</p> <p>Outcome 3. By the end of the fifth year, a comprehensive range of information related to stock structure, stock productivity, fleet composition and other data are available to support the harvest strategy; and all information required by the harvest control rule is monitored with high frequency and a high degree of certainty.</p> <p><i>Note the phrase “precautionary” should be taken to mean conservative where there are multiple options, and in line with the precautionary approach as included by the FAO International Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (1995) and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement (1995).</i></p> |
| <p><b>Expected Completion Date</b></p>        | <p>End of Year 5</p>  |
| <p><b>Priority</b></p>                        | <p>High for PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, and Medium for PI 1.2.3</p>  |
| <p><b>Responsible Parties</b></p>             | <p>O2, Bumble Bee (BB), FCF, International Sustainable Seafood Foundation (ISSF)</p>  |
| <p><b>MSC PIs Addressed by the Action</b></p> | <p>1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3</p>   |



| Action   | Tasks | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones)   | Responsible (lead)   | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date      |        |
|--|-------|---|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| <b>1. Establish harvest strategies and harvest control rules</b> | 1.1   | Develop options for, and commence, working with other stakeholders (e.g. ISSF, NGO Tuna Forum, other MSC-certified fisheries, FIPs, roundtables, e.g. possibly Global Fresh and Frozen Yellowfin and Bigeye Tuna Supply Chain Roundtable, and/or national authorities) to expedite the completion of the albacore harvest strategy; and specifically, to finalise the operating model and management strategy evaluation (MSE). | ISSF   | O2                            | Year 1+                  |        |
|  | 1.2   | Work with members of the Thai Union “Indian Ocean Longline Tuna Fishery FIP for Malaysian and Taiwanese-flagged vessels” to expedite the completion of the harvest strategy; and specifically, to finalise the operating model and management strategy evaluation.  |  | ISSF                          |                          | O2     |
|  | 1.3   | Possible attendance by ISSF representatives at the IOTC Working Parties on Temperate Tunas and Methods, to support expediting the IO albacore harvest strategy development and halting overfishing.   |  | ISSF                          |                          |        |
|  | 1.4   | Review progress of the IO albacore harvest strategy development.  | ISSF   | O2                            | After IOTC SC, Dec. 2019 |        |
|  | 1.5   | Evaluate the IO albacore Executive Summary and supporting documentation to identify the gaps in IO albacore data and develop an   | Approach to improve provision of catch and effort data collection developed. Plan to improve | FCF                           | BB                       | Year 1 |





|                 |   |  |  |     |      |        |
|-----------------|---|--|--|-----|------|--------|
|                 |   | approach to improving the collection requirements for, and provision of, operational level catch and effort data and data identified as source of uncertainty in assessments at both the vessel and flag-state levels. | monitoring programs and training for improved data collection and reporting developed. |     |      |        |
|                 | 1.6   | Conduct training for FIP vessels to ensure accurate data collection and reporting.   | FIP vessel data collection and reporting training conducted.                           | FCF | ISSF | Year 1 |
| <b>Timeline</b> | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - Activities TBD</b>   |  |  |     |      |        |
| <b>Year 2</b>   | The IOTC has considered candidate harvest control rules for the IO albacore stock.  |  |  |     |      |        |
|                 | Approach to improve catch and effort data provision commenced.  |  |  |     |      |        |
|                 | Monitoring programs and training commenced.   |  |  |     |      |        |
| <b>Year 3</b>   | The IOTC has adopted candidate harvest control rules for the IO albacore stock.   |  |  |     |      |        |
|                 | The IOTC has evidence of continued progress of the development of the draft harvest strategy, for example: final management objectives for the IO albacore stock; agreed acceptable levels of risk; agreed monitoring strategy; agreed to performance indicators to evaluate harvest control rules; and undertaking a management strategy evaluation. |  |  |     |      |        |
|                 | Approach to improve catch and effort data provision, and monitoring and training continued, if required.  |  |  |     |      |        |
| <b>Year 4</b>   | The IOTC has evidence of continued progress of the development of the draft harvest strategy.   |  |  |     |      |        |
|                 | The adopted harvest control rules for IO albacore have been implemented.  |  |  |     |      |        |
|                 | There is a clear basis for considering that the IO albacore harvest control rules will be successful in achieving the desired outcome and they have taken into account the main uncertainties.  |  |  |     |      |        |



|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| <b>Year 5</b> | The IOTC has adopted a robust and precautionary harvest strategy for the IO albacore stocks.                           |
|               | Operational level catch and effort data or data provided that is identified as a source of uncertainty in assessments. |
|               | Highly frequent monitoring occurring.  |

## Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b>        | <b>2. Data and analyses to support management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species</b>  |
| <b>Action Goal</b>                   | Data are comprehensive and verified to support; maintaining primary and secondary species above the point where recruitment would be impaired (PRI)/above a biologically based limit and does not hinder recovery of primary and secondary species if they are below a PRI/biologically based limit (PIs 2.1.3 and 2.2.3); and relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA impacts on ETP species (PI 2.3.3).   |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b> | <p>Outcome 5. By the end of the third year, information on the nature and amount of primary species taken are adequate to determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage primary species.</p> <p>Outcome 8. By the end of the third year, fishery catch and fate data is verified and comprehensive information on the nature and amount of secondary species taken is adequate to determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of at least a partial strategy to manage secondary species.</p> <p>Outcome 11. By the end of the third year, the evidence base for determining interaction rates with Endangered, Threatened and Protected (ETP) species should be considerably improved to support the development of the management strategy; support information to assess the effectiveness of the management strategy; and so trends in interactions can be measured over time and so it can be determined whether the UoA may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species.</p> |
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>      | End of Year 3  |



|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Priority</b>                        | High                       |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>             | BB, FCF, O2, ISSF          |
| <b>MSC PIs Addressed by the Action</b> | PIs 2.1.3, 2.2.3 and 2.3.3 |

| Action  | Tasks   | Evidence of completion / results<br>(Milestones)  | Responsible (lead) | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|---|---|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>2. Data and analyses to support management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species</b> | 2.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Work with relevant national authorities to evaluate current data collection and reporting strategies against IOTC requirements and requests and identify areas of improvement.</li> <li>B. Consider what is needed to improve the IOTC's species composition and fine scale resolution requirements.</li> <li>C. Develop improved data collection and reporting plan; this can be through increased observer coverage (human or electronic), improved self-reporting (e.g. e-logbooks), or through some other measures as appropriate. An observer sampling design and protocol, to address different data needs and compliance issues, will also need to be developed, noting need to meet the IOTC requirements for 5% representative coverage at a minimum.</li> </ul> | Comprehensive data collection and reporting improvement plan and ongoing data collection and reporting strategy developed, including for discards and bait species. Initial assessment on sourcing of bait. | FCF, O2            | ISSF                          | Year 1              |



|  |     |   |  |    |           |  |
|--|-----|---|--|----|-----------|--|
|  |     | <p>The aspiration is for 100% scientific electronic observer coverage (with at least 20% analysed), including sampling at landing sites and transshipment operations, when applicable. This information will also be helpful to demonstrate compliance with existing RFMO, national and international measures for ETP species.</p> <p>Conduct an initial assessment on the sourcing of bait, and ensure the origin and amounts of bait is being documented and monitored. Ensure integration with the Bycatch policy/code of conduct being developed in Task 3.2, which will also include data collection.</p> |  |    |           |  |
|  | 2.2 | <p>Consult with the “Mozambique &amp; Mauritius Tuna Longline Tuna FIP” on their actions to implement e-monitoring and e-reporting.</p>   | <p>FIP informed and working with the “Mozambique &amp; Mauritius Tuna Longline Tuna FIP” on their actions to implement e-monitoring and e-reporting.</p>                             | O2 | FCF, ISSF |  |
|  | 2.3 | <p>Commence assessment of how to integrate e-observer coverage into a comprehensive data plan, including: how e-observer coverage can be used to increase observer coverage from 5% to 20+%; sampling approach and protocol to address different data needs and compliance issues; encouraging buying and installing units; responsibility for undertaking analysis and analysis costs; how the data will be used, who will own data, under what conditions data can be accessed by third parties; and how the data may be accepted by</p>  | <p>Assessment of how to integrate e-observer coverage into a comprehensive data plan commenced. Responsibility for e-observer footage analyses occurring as part of discussions.</p> | O2 | FCF, ISSF |  |



|  |     |   |  |     |      |         |
|--|-----|---|--|-----|------|---------|
|  |     | <p>the IOTC. Ensure integration with the Bycatch policy/code of practice being developed in Task 3.2, which should also include adequate percentage (20+%) of analysed electronic observer coverage.</p> <p>Discussions both within the FIP and with the working group need to include future responsibility for e-observer footage analyses.</p>   |  |     |      |         |
|  | 2.4 | <p>Assess whether supplying vessels implement mitigation measures for reducing bycatch in accordance with RFMO regulations and/or Best Practice advice. If implementation cannot be verified (e.g. through lack of data), integrate into Task 2.1. If bycatch mitigation measures are not being implemented in accordance with regulations, develop a process to address, including developing crew training (in Action 3).</p>   | <p>Either confirmed that supplying vessels effectively implement mitigation measures for reducing bycatch, by identifying and use of best practice bycatch mitigation techniques, or process set to improve data and address any non-compliance if required.</p> | FCF | ISSF | Year 1+ |
|  | 2.5 | <p>Regarding sharks, assess whether: i. supplying vessels are complying with the shark finning ban (5% ratio); ii. supplying vessels comply with the prohibition from retaining, transshipping, storing or landing oceanic whitetip and thresher sharks; iii. supplying vessels comply with recommendation for incidentally caught sharks to be released, the incident recorded and reported; iv. China, Taiwan, support flag states in which fishing takes place to develop Nation Plans of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks; and are complying generally with the Resolutions pertaining to sharks. If data are</p> | <p>Either confirmed that sharks fishing CMMs are being adhered to, or process set to improve data and address any non-compliance if required.</p>  | FCF | ISSF |         |



|                 |   |  |  |      |    |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------|----|
|                 |   | insufficient to determine these, integrate into Task 2.1. If any non-compliance is identified, set process to address (Action 3).  |  |      |    |
|                 | 2.6   | Assess how to support rapid adoption of effective management measures for shortfin and longfin mako sharks.  | IOTC Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch have considered and recommended potentially effective management measures to the Scientific Committee for shortfin and longfin makos. | ISSF | O2 |
|                 | 2.7   | Require vessels to fill in discard information in logbooks, and commence improvement of the species composition data resolution (life status of discards (dead or alive) and size frequencies) required on the logbooks. | Vessels recording discards in logbooks.  | FCF  |    |
| <b>Timeline</b> | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - Activities TBD</b>   |  |  |      |    |
| <b>Year 2</b>   | Demonstrate new data collection and reporting plan has been implemented, including recording of discard information.  |  |  |      |    |
| <b>Year 3</b>   | Continued data collection and reporting.  |  |  |      |    |
|                 | CPUE time series from EM and reliable logbook sources are compiled and shared with IOTC Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch by 2021.  |  |  |      |    |
| <b>Year 4</b>   | Fishery data are sufficient to confirm/ascertain which species are primary 'main and 'minor'.   |  |  |      |    |
|                 | Data analysis results confirm/ascertain which species are primary, and it is highly likely the primary species are above the point where recruitment would be impaired (PRI) and the UoA does not hinder recovery of primary species if they are below the PRI. |  |  |      |    |
|                 | Fishery catch and fate data is verified and comprehensive so that information on the nature and amount of secondary species taken is adequate to determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of at least a partial strategy to manage             |  |  |      |    |



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | secondary species.   |
|  | Data analysis results determine the risk posed by the UoA and the effectiveness of at least a partial strategy to manage secondary species.  |
|  | The evidence base for determining interaction rates with ETP species is considerably improved so trends in interactions can be measured over time and so it can be determined whether the UoA may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species. |
|  | Data analysis results determine whether the UoA may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species.   |

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b>        | <b>3. Ensure effective management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species</b>  |
| <b>Action Goal</b>                   | Primary and secondary species are being maintained above the point where recruitment is impaired/a biologically based limit, and the UoA does not hinder recovery of primary species if they are below the biologically based limit (PIs 2.1.1 and 2.2.1); there are strategies in place that are designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of primary and secondary species (PIs 2.1.2 and 2.2.2); and the UoA meets, and has in place precautionary management strategies designed to, national and international requirements for protection of ETP species (PIs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2).   |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b> | <p>Outcome 4. By the end of the fourth year, there is a strategy in place that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of primary species; and the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of unwanted catch.</p> <p>Outcome 6. By the end of the fifth year, the secondary species are above biologically based limits and the UoA does not hinder recovery of secondary species if they are below a biological based limit.</p> <p>Outcome 7a. By the end of the fourth year, there is at least a partial strategy in place at the IOTC, national government and fleet levels for managing secondary species that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of secondary species; and the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of unwanted catch.</p> <p>Outcome 7b. For China and Chinese Taipei, by the end of the second year, provide evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate that it is highly likely that shark finning is not taking place.</p> |



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Outcome 9. By the end of the fifth year, should a potential threat be identified, the fishery to demonstrate the current ETP management strategy in place is adequate to ensure direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species.</p> <p>Outcome 10. By the end of the fourth year, the UoA should have sufficient fishery-specific information to provide evidence there are precautionary management strategies in place at the national level, and all relevant national and regional regulations on fishery interactions with ETP species are adhered to by the UoA so it can be demonstrated the fishery does not hinder recovery of ETP species.</p> |
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>        | End of Year 5  |
| <b>Priority</b>                        | Medium   |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>             | BB, FCF, O2, ISSF  |
| <b>MSC PIs Addressed by the Action</b> | PIs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2  |

| Action  | Tasks  | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones)   | Responsible (lead)  | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>3. Ensure effective management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species</b> | Tasks (2.1 - 2.4) and Milestones under Action 2. |   |   |                               | Year 1              |
|   | 3.1  | Prepare a strategy to advocate for the management, including considerations of future research, of the secondary species by the IOTC and national governments associated with the vessels. The strategy will be designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of secondary species; and include regular reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, | Plan for the development of a secondary species management strategy agreed. | O2                            |                     |





|  |     |   |  |          |     |
|--|-----|---|--|----------|-----|
|  |     | to minimise the mortality of unwanted catch. The strategy will be enshrined in legislation and/or the Bycatch policy/code of conduct referred to in Task 3.2.'  |  |          |     |
|  | 3.2 | <p>Commence development of a compulsory and verifiable Bycatch policy/code of practice for participating vessels, that includes full retention of tunas, best practices, gear improvements, mitigation and research<sup>3</sup>, best practices which include each of the ETP species groups (sharks, rays, cetaceans, turtles and birds), 100% observer coverage, data collection and reporting of all interactions and fate.</p> <p>Appropriate monitoring and bycatch policies are critical to characterise, quantify and manage the interactions as well as verify the implementation of any Bycatch policies.</p> <p>Cumulative effects with other MSC certified fisheries should be taken into account. Skipper and crew training considerations to be made in conjunction with the Bycatch policy/code of practice development.</p> <p><i>Note ISSF has extensive training experience with the purse seine sector. The longline sector will require a different approach/model, and set of languages. For example, training staff and fleet managers who can then in turn train their people, as the fleet doesn't</i></p> | Development of a comprehensive and verifiable Bycatch policy/code of practice commenced. | BB, ISSF | FCF |

<sup>3</sup> In the context of this Action these could be related to the following three areas:

- species biology/stock status;
- vulnerability to gear and fleet as vulnerable species interacting with the fishery are being identified by monitoring; and
- mitigation (research on new methods/species).



|     |  |   |     |      |         |
|-----|--|---|-----|------|---------|
|     |  | <i>come in in large numbers at the same time.</i>   |     |      |         |
| 3.3 | Develop a strategy to encourage the supply chain to adopt voluntary shark fins naturally, or otherwise, attached regulations and promote the adoption of this rule by the IOTC.  | Strategy developed for adoption of shark fins naturally attached.   | BB  | FCF  | Year 1+ |
| 3.4 | <p>This FIP will draw on information gained from the WPSTA MSC-certified fishery’s investigations into shark finning, and follow the process outlined in the WPSTA’s fishery’s Action plan for Conditions 5 and 6:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Work with Taiwan Fisheries Agency (TFA) and Bureau of Fisheries (BoF) and request the IOTC for the observer records for 2014 to 2017.</li> <li>II. Discuss with BoF/COFA and TFA any concerns over ROPs adequately delivering records to the IOTC. FIP partners may choose to work directly with IOTC to ascertain other causes of uncertainty regarding records of trip coverage at IOTC. FIP partners may also choose to work with BoF/COFA and TFA to demonstrate flag state control/transparency of which observers (and observer programmes) all vessels are carrying.</li> <li>III. Re-evaluate if the number and nature of events and sanction program indicates that the shark finning is highly unlikely taking place in UoC China and Chinese Taipei fleets.</li> </ol> | Evidence recorded by observer and provided through IOTC clearly demonstrates that it is highly unlikely the shark finning is taking place in the UoA China and Chinese Taipei fleets for the year 2018. | FCF |      | Year 1  |
| 3.5 | Work with the NGO Tuna Forum, Global Tuna Alliance, and other relevant interested parties to develop and implement a pathway to revise the IO yellowfin rebuilding strategy so that recovery of the stock is possible.   | There is a clear plan in place to achieve a revised IO yellowfin rebuilding strategy that will recover the stock.   | O2  | ISSF |         |



| Timeline  | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - <i>Activities TBD</i>   |
|-----------|---|
| Years 2-3 | Milestones under Action 2.  |
|           | If needed: develop and implement a strategy (through legislation and/or Bycatch policy/code of conduct) for managing secondary species designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of secondary species, including regular reviews.  |
|           | If needed: develop and implement a strategy (through legislation and/or Bycatch policy/code of conduct) to manage fishery encounters with ETP species and reduce ETP species mortality; and support process to amend/update national regulations to meet internationally obligations. Take account of best practice guidelines, including the "ISSF Skippers Guidebook to Sustainable Longline Fishing Practices. 2nd Ed. An International Seafood Sustainability Foundation Publication" and "Recommended best practices for tuna longline fisheries in transition to MSC certification." <sup>4</sup> |
|           | If needed: evaluate the plan to revise the IO yellowfin rebuilding Resolution 18/01.  |
|           | A process is in place (including crew training) to address any bycatch mitigation measures that are not being effectively and consistently implemented, and any non-compliance with shark, marlin and swordfish CMMs identified under Action 2, Tasks 2.4 and 2.5; and implementation of process commenced. For sharks, take account of best practice guidelines, including the "ISSF Skippers Guidebook to Sustainable Longline Fishing Practices. 2nd Ed. An International Seafood Sustainability Foundation Publication."  |
|           | Strategy developed to encourage the supply chain to voluntarily adopt a ban on the use of wire traces and shark lines, and to promote the adoption of this rule by the IOTC.  |
|           | Evidence recorded by observers and provided through the IOTC clearly demonstrates that it is highly unlikely the shark finning is taking place in UoC China or Chinese Taipei fleets for year 2019.   |
|           | Adoption by the fleet of a requirement for shark fins to be naturally attached, and the requirement promoted at relevant IOTC meetings.   |
|           | Skipper and crew training on secondary and ETP species commenced as identified during the Bycatch policy/code of practice   |

<sup>4</sup> Restrepo, V. J.P. Monteagudo and A. Justel-Rubio. (2018). Recommended best practices for tuna longline fisheries in transition to MSC certification. ISSF Technical Report 2018-22. International Seafood Sustainability Foundation, Washington, D.C., USA.”



|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | development.   |
| <b>Year 4</b> | Based on the data analyses in Year 4 in Action 2 for Primary, Secondary and ETP species, additional management measures implemented if necessary.  |
|               | Evidence recorded by observers and provided through the IOTC clearly demonstrates that it is highly unlikely the shark finning is taking place in UoC China or Chinese Taipei fleets for year 2020. It may then be concluded that it's "highly unlikely" shark finning is happening in UoC China or Chinese Taipei fleets. |
|               | Adoption by the fleet of a requirement banning the use of wire traces and shark lines, and the requirement promoted at relevant IOTC meetings.   |
|               | Provided a Bycatch policy/code of practice is already in place, the fishery should work with the RFMO to adopt mandatory handling and release practices for ETP species which should also be transposed to the flag stated, i.e. application of the policy beyond the participating fleets.                                |
| <b>Year 5</b> | Data analysis results show that the current ETP management strategy in place is adequate to ensure direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species.  |
|               | The UoA meets national and international requirements for protection of ETP species.   |

### Principle 3: Effective management

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b>        | <b>4. Legal and/or customary framework</b>   |
| <b>Action Goal</b>                   | The Chinese and Chinese Taipei management systems each exist within an appropriate and effective legal and/or customary framework which ensures that it is capable of delivering sustainability in the UoA(s) (PI 3.1.1).  |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b> | Outcome 12. For China and Chinese Taipei, by the end of the third year, provide evidence of an effective national legal system and organised and effective cooperation with other parties, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2. |



|                                       |               |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>       | End of Year 5 |
| <b>Priority</b>                       | Medium        |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>            | BB, FCF, O2   |
| <b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b> | PI 3.2.2      |

This Action will be harmonised with the WPSTA purse seine MSC-certified fishery Client Action Plans for Conditions 7 and 8, noting that the compliance for that fishery is with the WCPFC measures. The milestones listed below are from the original assessment. The WPSTA fishery has now completed its first year, and the site visit will be conducted in Early-Mid November 2019, with results to be published in 60 days of that visit.

| Action                                     | Tasks  | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones)   | Responsible (lead) | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|--|--|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>4. Legal and/or customary framework</b> | 4.1 Work with the WPSTA purse seine MSC-certified fishery to implement their Client Action Plan for Condition 7. | China has been implementing the 13th 5-years National Offshore Fisheries Development Plan for a 2nd year. WPSTA has lobbied the Bureau of Fisheries to improve root causes and enforcement outcomes, in problem areas identified in the IOTC by the compliance committee. | FCF                | O2                            | Year 1              |
|  | 4.2 Work with the WPSTA purse seine MSC-certified fishery to implement their Client Action Plan for              | Chinese Taipei has been providing operational-level data to IOTC for the second year as set out in CMMs and   | FCF                | O2                            |                     |



|                 |  |   |  |    |     |
|-----------------|--|---|--|----|-----|
|                 | Condition 8.   | other formal requirements. Coverage of the operational data is improved. The TFA has been implementing its National Plan of Control and Inspection (NPCI) for a third year. |  |    |     |
|                 | 4.3  | Request Mauritius and Madagascar improve transparency by asking to upload all necessary work to their website.  | Mauritius and Madagascar has agreed to publish online all of the legislation, regulations and support documentation relating to the fishery. | BB | FCF |
| <b>Timeline</b> | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - <i>Activities TBD</i></b>   |   |  |    |     |
| <b>Year 2</b>   | China: Enforcement is improving in accordance with the 5-years National Plan. There is evidence of increased compliance with CMMs.   |   |  |    |     |
|                 | Chinese Taipei: Coverage in the operational data has improved and is compliant with IOTC requirements. Enforcement is improving in accordance with NPCI work plan and timeline.  |   |  |    |     |
| <b>Year 3</b>   | China can show further decreases in the number of non-compliances at the Compliance Committee, demonstrating an effective national system to deliver effective measures and control over the distant water fishing vessels, consistent with the requirements of PI 3.1.1.  |   |  |    |     |
|                 | Chinese Taipei can show an effective national system to deliver effective measures and control over the distant water fishing vessels, consistent with the requirements of PI 3.1.1a, SG80. Cooperation with IOTC on scientific contribution by submission of all required fishing operational data is demonstrated. |   |  |    |     |

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b> | <b>5. Decision-making processes and application of the precautionary principle through decision-making processes</b>   |
| <b>Action Goal</b>            | The Chinese and Chinese Taipei management systems have effective consultation processes that are open to interested and affected parties (PI 3.1.2); the roles and responsibilities of organisations and individuals who are involved in the IOTC management process are clear and understood by all relevant parties (PI 3.1.2); and the IOTC, China and Chinese Taipei |



|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
|                                       | management systems include effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives (PI 3.2.2).  |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b>  | <p>Outcome 13a. By the end of the fifth year, the functions, roles and responsibilities of organisations and individuals who are involved in the IOTC management process are clearly and explicitly defined, and well understood by all relevant parties.</p> <p>Outcome 13b. For China and Chinese Taipei, by the end of the second year, provide evidence to demonstrate that clear and transparent processes exist to regularly seek and accept “relevant information” provided via consultative processes and that any such information is considered in management decision making at national and regional levels.</p> <p>Outcome 15a. By the end of the fifth year, there shall be evidence the IOTC decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues, including the overfishing of IO albacore, identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and takes account of the wider implications of decisions.</p> <p>Outcome 15b. For China and Chinese Taipei, by the end of the second year, provide evidence that decision-making processes at the national level respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions.</p> |
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>       | End of Year 5  |
| <b>Priority</b>                       | Medium   |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>            | BB, FCF, O2, ISSF  |
| <b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b> | PI 3.1.2. and 3.2.2  |

For the Chinese and Chinese Taipei management systems, this Action will be harmonised with the WPSTA purse seine MSC-certified fishery Client Action Plans for Conditions 9 and 10. The milestones listed below are from the original assessment, and may be amended as the WPSTA fishery has completed its first year.



| Action  | Tasks  | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones)   | Responsible (lead) | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|---|--|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 5. Decision-making processes and application of the precautionary principle through decision-making processes | 5.1 Collaborate with OPAGAC and/or other relevant stakeholders on their request to the EU (or others) to evaluate responsiveness of decision-making, and therefore application of the precautionary approach, by IOTC over the last 5 years.   | Evaluation of IOTC responsiveness commissioned.   | BB                 | ISSF                          | Year 1              |
|   | 5.2 Collaborate with the WPSTA MSC-certified fishery partners on the follow-up to their year 1 activities, which were: “to provide evidence that regular consultation occurs across broad stakeholder groups and that relevant information from this consultation is considered and adopted (as necessary) by the management system as changes to domestic arrangement or input to regional management arrangement. The process will be clearly documented.”<br><br>The WPSTA year 2 activities are: “If the documented processes provided at the Year 1 Audit are considered by the CAB to be sufficient evidence that SG80 is met, no further activities are | Collaboration with the WPSTA MSC-certified fishery results in: an assessment of their Year 1 findings; if procedures insufficient, a gap analysis has identified key gaps in consultation structures or procedures; and a Plan to meet the SG80 requirements. This may focus on support of transparency and regularity of the consultation process directly, as well as how output from these processes is inputted/considered in decisions related to domestic and regional management arrangements. | FCF                | O2                            |                     |





|                  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|                  | <p>required. Otherwise, activities are proposed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WPSTA members will evaluate with the CAB at the Year 1 Audit where the existing consultation process fails to meet the SG80 requirements (e.g. in process, regularity of consultations, range of participants and ability to demonstrate consideration in the management system – domestic and regional);</li> <li>2. WPSTA will develop a Plan to meet these requirements. This may focus on support of transparency and regularity of the consultation process directly, as well as how output from these processes is inputted/considered in decisions related to domestic and regional management arrangements; and</li> <li>3. WPSTA will start implementation of the Plan.”</li> </ol> |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Timeline</b>  | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - Activities TBD</b>  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Years 2-3</b> | Some evidence that the Commission is responding to the issue of IO albacore catch rates, e.g. by reducing catches, progressing with the harvest strategy, or some other evidence.  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Year 2</b>    | Milestones for Action 4. In relation to the application of the precautionary approach in decision-making to be developed with OPAGAC and other IO FIPs pending the outcomes of Task 5.1.   |  |  |  |  |
|                  | A. Gaps in consultation identified in Year 1 analysis are addressed, either via a change in formal procedures at government level, or via FIP members.   |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>B. China and Chinese Taipei have demonstrably clear and transparent processes to regularly seek and accept “relevant information” provided via consultative processes, and that any such information is considered in management decision-making at national and regional levels.</p> <p>C. China and Chinese Taipei are demonstrably effectively responding to important issues (e.g. stock status) and generally using the precautionary approach or show it is taking account of the best available information.</p> |
|--|--|

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b>         | <b>6. Long term objectives</b>   |
| <b>Action Goal</b>                    | The IOTC’s long term objectives that guide decision-making are consistent with the MSC Standard (PI 3.1.3).  |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b>  | Outcome 14. By the end of the fifth year, the precautionary approach and the ecosystem approach to management will be explicit in IOTC’s long-term objectives. |
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>       | End of Year 5  |
| <b>Priority</b>                       | Medium   |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>            | ISSF, BB   |
| <b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b> | PI 3.1.3   |

| Action | Tasks | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) | Responsible (lead) | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|--------|-------|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
|--------|-------|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|



|                                |  |   |  |      |    |         |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|------|----|---------|
| <b>6. Long term objectives</b> | 6.1  | Collaborate with the OPAGAC purse seine FIP partners and other FIPs and like-minded stakeholders to develop a plan for incorporating an ecosystem approach the IOTC management framework.       | Joint plan for incorporating an ecosystem approach the IOTC management framework.                        | ISSF | BB | Year 1  |
|                                | 6.2  | Hold inter-sessional discussions on implementing the plan, including on long-term objectives, between like-minded IOTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IOTC meeting. | Record of IOTC and other meetings to reflect discussions held on amending the IOTC long-term objectives. | ISSF | O2 | Year 1+ |
| <b>Timeline</b>                | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - <i>Activities TBD</i></b>   |   |  |      |    |         |
| <b>Years 2</b>                 | Draft and submit a Resolution or other suitable paper proposed, which would incorporate the precautionary approach and the ecosystem approach to management explicitly in IOTC's long-term objectives. |   |  |      |    |         |
| <b>Year 3 - 4</b>              | Resolution reviewed and revised if required by IOTC.   |   |  |      |    |         |
| <b>Year 5</b>                  | Resolution adopted by the IOTC.  |   |  |      |    |         |

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b>        | <b>7. Application of sanctions</b>   |
| <b>Action Goal</b>                   | IOTC, Chinese, Chinese Taipei, Madagascar and Mauritius monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms ensure the management measures in the fishery are enforced and complied with (PI 3.2.3).   |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b> | Outcome 16a. By the end of the fourth year, there shall be evidence IOTC has begun to address issues of non-compliance with management measures through the use of sanctions. Initial efforts shall focus on members providing timely and accurate catch data to the IOTC Secretariat. |



|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | Outcome 16b. For China, Chinese Taipei, Madagascar and Mauritius by the end of the third year, provide evidence that sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, are consistently applied and thought to provide effective deterrence. |
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>       | End of Year 5   |
| <b>Priority</b>                       | Medium and High   |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>            | BB, ISSF, FCF   |
| <b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b> | PI 3.2.3  |

For the IOTC management system, this Action is partially harmonised with the OPAGAC purse seine FIP workplan. The milestones are the same, although the timeline is different. For the Chinese and Chinese Taipei management systems, this Action will be harmonised with the WPSTA purse seine MSC-certified fishery Client Action Plans for Conditions 13 and 14. The milestones listed below are from the original assessment, and may be amended as the WPSTA fishery has completed its first year.

| Action                             | Tasks   | Evidence of completion / results<br>(Milestones)   | Responsible (lead) | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>7. Application of sanctions</b> | 7.1 IOTC: Collaborate with OPAGAC, SIOTI and/or other relevant stakeholders on their request to the EU (or others) to evaluate compliance and application of sanctions over the last 5 years. The fishery must implement a MCS system consistent with RFMO and flag state requirements while meeting obligations that apply in third countries EEZ. | Evaluation of application of sanctions by the IOTC has been commissioned with completion date by mid-way through Year 2. | ISSF               | FCF                           | Year 1              |



|  |     |  |   |      |     |  |
|--|-----|--|---|------|-----|--|
|  | 7.2 | Continue to verify that all transshipments made by the FIP fleet occur under the monitoring of an RFMO observer program; and Collaborate with the NGO Tuna Forum regarding their transshipment review and future work.                             | Evidence provided, or a way determined how, to verify that transshipments made by the fleet are occurring in accordance with IOTC regulations; and active engagement with the NGO Tuna Forum on transshipment has occurred. | ISSF | O2  |  |
|  | 7.3 | Engagement with other like-minded stakeholders to develop a plan for improving the IOTC management framework.  | Strategy for including sanctions in the IOTC management framework developed.  | ISSF | O2  |  |
|  | 7.4 | Hold inter-sessional discussions on implementing the strategy between like-minded IOTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IOTC meeting.  | Inter-sessional discussions held on implementing the strategy.  | ISSF | O2  |  |
|  | 7.5 | WPSTA will request the Chinese Bureau of Fisheries and Taiwanese Fisheries Agency to provide evidence of application of sanctions that allows evaluation of demonstrable improvement in enforcement in problem/risk areas, using relevant metrics. | WPSTA receives evidence from the Chinese Bureau of Fisheries and Taiwanese Fisheries Agency that allows the evaluation of demonstrable improvement in enforcement in problem areas, using relevant metrics.                 | FCF  |     |  |
|  | 7.6 | Request Madagascar and Mauritius to provide evidence of application of sanctions that allows evaluation of demonstrable improvement in enforcement in problem/risk areas, using relevant metrics.  | The FIP receives evidence from Madagascar and Mauritius that allows the evaluation of demonstrable improvement in enforcement in problem areas, using relevant metrics.   | BB   | FCF |  |



|                    |   |  |          |     |  |
|--------------------|---|--|----------|-----|--|
|                    | 7.7 IOTC: Where existing effective programs do not already exist, develop a training program to ensure that fleet managers and skippers are trained on obligations arising from flag state, RFMOs and licensing countries (part of code of good practice or responsible fishing).   | Program developed for skipper and crew training on obligations arising from flag state, RFMOs and licensing countries. | BB, ISSF | FCF |  |
| <b>Timeline</b>    | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - Activities TBD</b>   |  |          |     |  |
| <b>Years 1 - 3</b> | <p>Inter-sessional discussions held on implementing the strategy, including on sanctions, between like-minded IOTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IOTC meeting.</p> <p>Work with the Chinese, Chinese Taipei, Madagascar and Mauritius Governments on areas of non-compliance.</p> <p>Conduct skipper and crew training on obligations arising from flag state, RFMOs, and licensing countries.</p>   |  |          |     |  |
| <b>Year 2</b>      | <p>The IOTC has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. pending the results of Task 7.1, development commenced on a proposal to strengthen compliance by development of sanctions for any instances where members repeatedly fall short in complying with IOTC management measures</li> <li>II. agreed to enhance the reporting of member’s non-compliance with management measures by the IOTC, including the quality of member’s reporting.</li> </ol> <p>IOTC: Review recent reports of the Compliance Committee and evaluate whether sanctions are providing sufficient deterrence (noting that since the pre-assessment, the situation in regard to bluefin tuna, taken as an example, has improved to a degree).</p> <p>IOTC: If sanctions are not providing sufficient deterrence, engage with Chinese or the Fishing Entity of Taiwan delegation or other appropriate stakeholders to request assessment of key compliance gaps by Compliance Committee or by a suitable external expert.</p> <p>China, Chinese Taipei, Madagascar and Mauritius: the FIP continues receiving evidence from the governments that allows for the evaluation of demonstrable improvement in enforcement in problem/risk areas, using relevant metrics.</p> |  |          |     |  |



|        |   |
|--------|---|
| Year 3 | The IOTC has commenced a process to: develop sanctions for the IOTC; and provide more in-depth and critical reporting of non-compliance.  |
|        | China, Chinese Taipei, Madagascar and Mauritius can show an effective national system of sanctions that can demonstrate that they are consistently applied and though to provide effective deterrence.                      |
| Year 4 | The IOTC has adopted sanctions for non-compliance with IOTC management measures.  |
|        | End of Year 4:<br>I. The IOTC presents a public in-depth summary of all non-compliances, including the quality of reporting; and<br>II. sanctioned any member/s with repeated non-compliance with IOTC management measures. |

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Number and Name</b>         | <b>8. Monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Mauritius and Madagascar fishery-specific management systems</b>  |
| <b>Action Goal</b>                    | There are effective and timely reviews of the Mauritius and Madagascar fishery-specific and associated enhancement program(s) management systems (PI 3.2.4).   |
| <b>Action Description (Outcomes)</b>  | Outcome 17. By the end of the fifth year, there is a system for monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Mauritius and Madagascar fishery-specific management systems against its objectives; and at least one effective and timely review of each fishery-specific management system completed. |
| <b>Expected Completion Date</b>       | End of Year 5  |
| <b>Priority</b>                       | Medium   |
| <b>Responsible Parties</b>            | BB, O2   |
| <b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b> | PI 3.2.4   |



| Action  | Tasks  | Evidence of completion / results (Milestones)   | Responsible (lead) | Responsible (supporting role) | Completion due date |
|---|--|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>8. Monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Mauritius and Madagascar fishery-specific management systems</b> | 8.1 Approach the “Mozambique and Mauritius Large Pelagics Longline Fishery FIP” partners and Mauritius and Madagascar Governments regarding a process for monitoring and evaluating the performance of their albacore longline fishery management systems. | Mauritius and Madagascar have agreed to develop a time-bound process for monitoring and evaluating the fishery. | FCF                | ISSF, BB                      | Year 1              |
| <b>Timeline</b>   | <b>Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - <i>Activities TBD</i></b>   |   |                    |                               |                     |
| <b>Years 2 and 3</b>  | Mauritius and Madagascar on track with process to develop a process for monitoring and evaluating the fishery.   |   |                    |                               |                     |
| <b>Year 4</b>   | Review of the Mauritius and Madagascar fishery-specific management systems commissioned.   |   |                    |                               |                     |
| <b>Year 5</b>   | Review of the Mauritius and Madagascar fishery-specific management systems completed.  |   |                    |                               |                     |

## Additional Impacts

Some FIPs include objectives that go beyond the MSC PIs. There are two additional areas of work for the FIP, ghost gear and labour conditions.

In addition, while not an impact of the FIP, the FIP partners will work to ensure all vessels that are part of the FIP sign up to the ISSF Proactive Vessel Register.

| Addition Impact Title | Additional Impact Description |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
|                       |                               |





|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Status Summary</b>  | Potential for ghost fishing due to lost gear   |
| <b>Description of risk factor. Where applicable, a description of relevant mitigation measures or traceability systems (this can include the role of existing regulatory or fishery management controls)</b> | While there are no habitat-related issues directly associated with this longline fishery, and longline gear is considered medium risk for impact of lost gear by the Global Ghost Gear Initiative (GGGI), there is increasing concern over the entanglement and/or beaching of abandoned, lost and discarded fishing gear, including buoys, ropes and lines. There are no strategy at the regional or national levels to deal with this. In addition, there is limited information on the spatial extent of longline gear.<br><br>Bumble Bee Seafoods is a member of the GGGI ( <a href="https://www.ghostgear.org/">https://www.ghostgear.org/</a> ). |
| <b>Improvement Recommendation</b>  | Bumble Bee to continue being an active and engaged member of the GGGI and following international best practice. Work with FIP participants on developing a prospective GGGI project.  |

| <b>Addition Impact Title</b>   | <b>Additional Impact Description</b>   |
|--|--|
| <b>Status Summary</b>  | Improvement of labour and employment conditions  |
| <b>Description of risk factor. Where applicable, a description of relevant mitigation measures or traceability systems (this can include the role of existing regulatory or fishery management controls)</b> | In recent years concerns have been raised over recruiting practices and labour conditions onboard fishing vessels.   |
| <b>Improvement Recommendation</b>  | Both Bumble Bee and FCF are committed to responsible supply chains. Both have supplier codes of conduct and programs and are active participants of the Seafood Task Force which has established a Vessel Auditable Standard which will serve as a basis for audits of fleets/vessels going forward which will include the vessels in the FIP. |

## Traceability

FCF/Bumble Bee have traceability processes in place that collect data elements that include: vessel name, flag, RFMO number, International Maritime Organization number, trip dates, landing weight by species, port of landing, ocean area fished (RFMO zone



and FAO), EEZ's or high seas fished. The landings from specific vessel trips are assigned unique lot identifications, which carry through the loining process through to finished canned product. FCF and Bumble Bee's intent is for all trips to take place in zones in scope of FIP or eventual MSC Unit of Certification. A full assessment would further consider any traceability concerns.

## Glossary

**Pre-assessment:** A pre-assessment is a preliminary evaluation of a fishery against all MSC performance indicators to provide a picture of the fishery's baseline environmental performance and challenges. A pre-assessment allows a fishery to identify any areas that need to be improved to reach an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. A pre-assessment must be completed by someone experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited auditing body](#)).

**Comprehensive FIP:** A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing all of the fishery's environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. Comprehensive FIPs engage a party experienced with applying the MSC standard to complete an MSC pre-assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery and must have independent, in-person audits of progress against the MSC standard every three years.

**Performance indicator (PI):** A performance indicator evaluates the success of a particular activity when compared against desired goals. In the case of FIPs that follow the MSC Standard, it measures the impact of the action in place against desired conditions or results.