



OCEAN OUTCOMES
Fish | Food | Livelihoods

Scoping Document and Initial Workplan: South Pacific Albacore and Western and Central Pacific Yellowfin Tuna Longline Fishery Improvement Project

(On fisheryprogress.org: “*Western and Central Pacific albacore and yellowfin tuna - longline*”)

Prepared for Bumble Bee by Ocean Outcomes

May 2019



Table of Contents

[1. Summary](#)

[1.1 Project Scope](#)

[1.2 FIP Period](#)

[2. Background](#)

[3. Specific Objective](#)

[4. Unit of Assessment \(UoA\)](#)

[4.1 Potential Future Expansion of the FIP Scope](#)

[5. MSC Standard](#)

[6. Scores](#)

[6.1 Principles 1 and 2 Scores](#)

[6.2 Principle 3 Scores](#)

[6.3 PIs With Scores Less Than 80](#)

[7. Summary of Key Issues](#)

[8. Workplan Development](#)

[8.1 Initial Structure](#)

[8.2 Considerations for Outcome Development](#)

[8.2.1 Priorities](#)

[8.3 Formulation of Milestones](#)

[8.4 Formulation of Initial Tasks](#)

[8.5 Responsible Parties](#)

[9. Initial Workplan](#)

[9.1 Overview](#)

[9.2 Addressing High Priority Outcomes](#)

[9.2.1 Action 1: Principle 1 – Establish harvest strategies and harvest control rules](#)

[9.2.2 Action 6: Principle 3 - Monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Vanuatu fishery-specific management system](#)

[9.3 Addressing Medium Priority Outcomes](#)

[9.3.1 Action 2: Principle 2 - Data and analyses to support management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species](#)

[9.3.2 Action 3: Principle 2 - Effective management strategies for secondary and ETP species](#)



[9.3.3 Action 4: Principle 3 - Application of the precautionary principle through decision-making processes](#)

[9.3.4 Action 5: Principle 3 - Application of sanctions](#)

[10. Workplan Implementation](#)



1. Summary

1.1 Project Scope

Ocean Outcomes (O2) has prepared a Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Scoping Document for South Pacific (SP) albacore and Western and Central Pacific (WCP) yellowfin tuna which is caught in the Pacific Ocean, landed in Fiji, and supplies Bumble Bee Foods LLC via FCF Fishery Company Ltd (the “South Pacific Albacore and Western and Central Pacific Yellowfin Tuna Longline FIP”). The Scoping Document is based on the pre-assessment for SP albacore and WCP yellowfin tuna caught by longline, conducted by ME Certification Ltd (MEC)¹. Our objective was to review, update if necessary, summarise the results of the fishery’s pre-assessment for SP albacore and WCP yellowfin, and recommend strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges. The Scoping Document was reviewed by Dr. Jocelyn Drugan, Ocean Outcomes, who is a MSC-registered associate technical consultant.

The goal of the scoping document is not to provide a concrete list of Tasks the fishery needs to do, but rather provide suggestions regarding strategies towards meeting the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard.

The FIP will address deficiencies against all three MSC principles (1 - Stock status, 2 - Ecosystem impacts, 3 - Governance) for the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks. The Scoping Document determines the priority of issues to be addressed based on the pre-assessment Performance Indicator scores:

- High-Priority Indicators (a score less than 60, i.e. would fail MSC)
- Medium-Priority Indicators (a score of 60-80, i.e. would likely pass MSC with conditions)
- Low-Priority Indicators (80-100, i.e. would pass MSC)

For each indicator that will not likely earn an unconditional pass score under the MSC Fisheries Standard, the Scoping Document includes potential strategies for what the fishery might do to meet the MSC Fisheries Standard.

The Scoping Document recommendations will inform the development of the FIP Workplan.

The Scoping Document comprises:

- Scope of the FIP
- Methodology for determining the MSC Performance Indicator scores
- Recommended strategies for MSC Performance Indicators with a score less than 80 (high and medium priority indicators)

¹ ME Certification Ltd (2017). *Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Pre-Assessment Report Bumble Bee Seafoods albacore and yellowfin longline tuna*. Prepared by the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) ME Certification Ltd. December 2017.



1.2 FIP Period

This FIP is valid for five years, aiming to commence 1 June 2019, with completion by 1 June 2024. Progress against the FIP Workplan will be reviewed every six months.

2. Background

The FIP partners are O2, Bumble Bee, FCF and and Clover Leaf Seafoods. The administration and FIP Actions will be delivered by O2, Bumble Bee and FCF. Clover Leaf Seafoods will support the FIP financially and will be represented by Bumble Bee for any administration and Actions associated with the FIP.

Ocean Outcomes (O2) is a global, non-profit organization working with communities and the seafood industry to improve the sustainability of high-risk fisheries. O2 cultivates deep relationships with fishermen, seafood buyers, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations to identify locally-led, industry-supported solutions to improve the health of fisheries and aquatic ecosystems.

O2 is a member of the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions, and therefore develops and manages FIPs in accordance with the Alliances' "[Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects](#)". O2 defines FIPs as focused multi-stakeholder initiatives with the goal of achieving a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The Alliance recognises that, for some fisheries, performance at this level is a long-term goal.

Bumble Bee Seafoods and FCF Fishery Company are leaders in the sustainable seafood movement, supporting global policies and management initiatives that ensure the long-term sustainability of seafood resources. In addition, the companies have pioneered traceability and electronic monitoring initiatives within their supply chains. The strong relationship between FCF and Bumble Bee put them in a unique position to help shift Chinese and Taiwanese longline tuna catches onto a more sustainable footing.

Bumble Bee is a founding member of International Seafood Sustainability Association (ISSA), which participates in the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF). Membership in ISSA is voluntary and is contingent upon compliance with ISSF conservation measures and standards of practice. ISSF seeks to improve the sustainability of global tuna stocks by developing and implementing verifiable, science-based practices, commitments and international management measures.

Clover Leaf Seafoods is Canada's leading branded marketer of canned seafood, owned by Bumble Bee Seafoods. Their products include tuna, salmon, oysters, mussels, clams, shrimp, crab, lobster, and sardines.



A large representative sample of longline vessels that supply Bumble Bee with albacore and yellowfin through Levuka, Fiji landings underwent pre-assessment against the MSC Fisheries Standard. That study (MEC 2017) evaluated fishery performance against the three MSC Principles for sustainable fishing. It covered the WCP yellowfin and SP albacore stocks. These two stocks are managed internationally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). As the next step in FIP development, we analysed results from the MEC pre-assessment, and other available albacore and yellowfin tuna pre-assessments and full assessments to determine what specific actions are required to improve the performance of Bumble Bee’s albacore and yellowfin tuna sourcing fisheries to comply with the MSC Fisheries Standard. MEC’s pre-assessment is fairly current, however as a year has passed, WCPFC and IATTC reports were reviewed for any significant changes that would potentially affect indicator scoring.

3. Specific Objective

The specific objective for the FIP is to establish a set of Actions and associated Tasks, which address identified deficiencies in the performance of the albacore and yellowfin tuna fisheries against the MSC Standard. It is intended that the results of this analysis will be used to develop a fully-fledged FIP Workplan for Bumble Bee, which will be supported by O2.

4. Unit of Assessment (UoA)

MSC defines the unit of assessment (UoA) as the “Target stock(s) combined with the fishing method/gear and practice (including vessel type/s) pursuing that stock, and any fleets, or groups of vessels, or individual fishing operators that are covered by an MSC fishery certificate” (MSC-MSCI Vocabulary, 2014).

The FIP encompasses the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks as fished by longline on the high seas and in the Fiji, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu (Exclusive Economic Zones) EEZs (Tables 1a and 1b), and landed in Fiji.

Table 1a. The two Units of Assessment (UoAs) considered in the development of the FIP.

Species	Albacore tuna (<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>)
Stock	South Pacific
Geographic Location	Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) high seas Fiji EEZ (not assessed, as insignificant catch. ²) Solomon Islands EEZ Vanuatu EEZ

² The Fiji management system has not been assessed as the China and Taiwan vessel catch of yellowfin and albacore tuna in the Fiji EEZ is minimal each year. In order to potentially be included under MSC Certification in the future, these catches would need to be assessed under the “Inseparable or practicably inseparable catches” provisions of the MSC Standard if the fishery entered full assessment.



Gear & Method	Pelagic longline
Management systems, including and Regional Fisheries Management Organisation	Western and Central Pacific Ocean: Fiji, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu national management, Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) Eastern Pacific Ocean: Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) Fiji national management (not assessed, as insignificant catch)
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Chinese and Taiwanese-flagged longline vessels that land catches in Fiji Fiji-flagged longline vessels fishing outside of the Fiji EEZ

Table 1b.

Species	Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)
Stock	Western and Central Pacific
Geographic Location	WCPO high seas Fiji EEZ (not assessed, as insignificant catch.) Solomon Islands EEZ Vanuatu EEZ
Gear & Method	Pelagic longline
Management systems, including and Regional Fisheries Management Organisation	Western and Central Pacific Ocean: Fiji, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu national management, Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Chinese and Taiwanese-flagged longline vessels Fiji-flagged longline vessels fishing outside of the Fiji EEZ

The SP albacore stock is shared between WCPFC and IATTC, with management harmonised. Management is mainly driven by WCPFC since this fishery predominantly takes place there. The WCP yellowfin stock is managed by the WCPFC.

At the highest level of fishery management, the stocks are managed by their respective Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, e.g. the WCPFC.



4.1 Potential Future Expansion of the FIP Scope

The scope of the FIP may be expanded in the future, for example to include the Tuvalu EEZ, China and Chinese Taipei. MEC was not contracted to assess the Tuvalu, China or Chinese Taipei management systems and governance in the original pre-assessment.

Bumble Bee Seafoods sources SP albacore and WCP yellowfin tunas landed in Fiji that are caught in the Tuvalu EEZ. The level of catch from Chinese and Taiwanese-flagged vessels is small, but not insignificant. By including the Tuvalu EEZ, the FIP would encompass all SP albacore and WCP yellowfin landed in Fiji sourced by Bumble Bee Seafoods, which is not already MSC-certified.

While challenging, it is critical to include the assessment of the China or Chinese Taipei management jurisdictions for any fishery that includes catches by Chinese and Taiwanese-flagged vessels on the high seas. In the context of this FIP, the operations conducted on the high seas are governed by WCPFC and IATTC Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs), however the CMM implementation, and monitoring, control and enforcement of these vessels is under the purview of the China and Chinese Taipei Governments. Additionally, the MSC released an interpretation on 29 August 2018 that “Flag states should be considered under P3 per the guidance under GSA4.1.1 (below) as they are a jurisdictional level that applies to the management system of the UoA”.

5. MSC Standard

The analysis presented in this FIP Scoping Document utilises the current version of the MSC Fisheries Standard and associated guidance: MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements and Guidance, Version 2.01, 31 August 2018. Hereafter this standard is referred to as FCR2.01.

6. Scores

Tables 2 and 3 provide the scores for all UoAs for Principles 1, 2 and 3. The scoring is based on MEC’s pre-assessment, with three notable deviations described below for Principle 1, and one change in Principle 3. Since the MEC pre-assessment (December 2017), there has been new material information that could potentially affect scores, including new SP albacore and Pacific yellowfin stock assessments. Principle 1 and 3 rationales have been updated in some places, and scores have been changed for PIs 1.2.1 (harvest strategy), 1.2.2 (harvest control rules), 1.2.3 (information and monitoring) and 3.2.3 (compliance and enforcement) for the WCPFC management system.

In keeping with general pre-assessment protocol, MEC’s pre-assessment did not attempt to predict scores at a high level of detail. As such, the score for the Scoring Guideposts (SG) for each Performance Indicator (PI) was not scored. Instead a likely score was assigned to each PI category associated with the following traffic light system:



	Information suggests fishery is not likely to reach SG60 and therefore would fail on this PI. The score is therefore <60.
	Information suggests fishery will reach SG60 but may need a condition for this PI. The score is therefore 60-79.
	Information suggests fishery is likely to exceed SG80 resulting in an unconditional pass for this PI. The score is therefore >80.

In order to pass an assessment, a fishery must:

- i. have no single score below 60; and
- ii. have an aggregate score of at least 80 for each of the three Principles.

For a fishery to enter full assessment, the issue associated with any PI with a score <60 needs to be resolved before MSC certification can advisably be attempted. Any PI with a score of <60 or 60-79 will have a Task/s in the FIP Workplan for the fishery to improve to the SG80 level within a specified timeframe.

6.1 Principles 1 and 2 Scores

Based on the information provided during the pre-assessment, MEC determined that the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks are likely to pass certification, noting that all albacore MSC certified fisheries in the WCPO have conditions for harvest strategy (PI 1.2.1) and harvest control rules (PI 1.2.2).

O2's conclusion on the scoring of PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 differs from MEC's scores. Applying strict interpretation to the scoring of Principle 1 suggests that SP albacore does not meet the SG60 level for harvest strategy design (1.2.1a), harvest control rule design and application (1.2.2a), or harvest control rule evaluation (1.2.2c). Medley & Gascoigne (2017)³ concurs that both the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks do not have adequate harvest control rules (score less than 60), and therefore fail to meet PI 1.2.2a. O2 refers to Medley & Gascoigne (2017) for a clear justification regarding PI1.2.2 scoring.

O2 is aware these scores also differ from those referred to in the MSC's Principle 1 v2.0 assessment upgrade process (February 2019), which was produced in response to the joint Conformity Advisory Bodies variation request. While O2 acknowledges that process, we are mindful that the FIP process does not require harmonisation to the same extent as fisheries going through full MSC assessment as the FIP model allows for both a broader scope than that MSC assessment process and greater flexibility.

MEC's pre-assessment noted "at this stage, the team cannot be confident that the overall fishery assessment would pass, due to the number of prospective conditions arising in Principle

³ Medley, P.A.H. and Gascoigne, J. (2017) An Evaluation of the Sustainability of Global Tuna Stocks Relative to Marine Stewardship Council Criteria (Version 5.0). ISSF Technical Report 2017-09. International Seafood Sustainability Foundation, Washington, D.C., USA. 291 p.



2, which would result in the aggregate Principle score being less than 80”. However, the team also stated “it is likely to pass given the outcomes of other tuna longline fisheries operating in the region”. “The summary of electronic monitoring for 22 longline trips in 2015 identified likely scoring elements, however the lack of observer data for the units of assessment and information on bait species and quantities for all vessel companies made it difficult for the team to give a complete analysis and confident PI scores.” As a result of these data inadequacies, and a medium risk to blue shark, seven Principle 2 PIs will have Tasks in the FIP Workplan.

In catch data taken from two combined datasets (logbook summary and electronic monitoring summary), albacore was 52% of the catch and yellowfin comprised 34% of the catch. At full assessment both species would be considered as a ‘main’ primary species in the assessment of the other species.

Table 2 includes the summary of rationale and key points from MEC’s pre-assessment, with amendments in italics for updated information since the pre-assessment (December 2017), the divergence in PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 scores.

Table 2. Pre-assessment of tuna stocks: Scores assigned to MSC Principles 1 and 2. Italicised text is for updated information and rationale for any score changes since the pre-assessment (December 2017).

Component	PI	Performance Indicator	Likely scoring level	Rationale/Key points
			Albacore and yellowfin each	
Outcome	1.1.1	Stock Status		<p>Albacore: Biomass well above target (MSY) levels, although not good from a bio-economic point of view, noting MSC is not concerned with economics.</p> <p><i>An albacore stock assessment was conducted in 2018. The stock remains considered not overfished and not subject to overfishing, however “SC14 noted that the preliminary estimate of total catch of south Pacific albacore (within the WCPFC Convention Area south of the equator) for 2017 was 75,707 mt, which was a 33% increase from 2016 and a 13% increase over 2012-2016.” The Scientific Committee also included in its “Management Advice and Implication”: “SC14 recalled its previous advice from SC11, SC12, and SC13 that longline fishing mortality and longline catch be reduced to avoid decline in the vulnerable biomass so that economically viable catch rates can be maintained, especially for longline catch of adult albacore.” (Fourteenth Regular Session of the [WCPFC] Scientific Committee Busan, South Korea 8–16 August 2018)</i></p> <p>Yellowfin: Stock above (but close to) the MSY level. <i>A yellowfin stock assessment was conducted in 2017. The</i></p>



				stock remains considered not overfished and not subject to overfishing, however “SC14 noted that the total yellowfin catch in 2017 was a record 670,890 mt, a 4% increase from 2016 and a 12% increase from the average 2012-2016.”
	1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	NA	
Management	1.2.1	Harvest strategy		“...key elements of harvest strategies include: the control rules and tools in place...” (MSC guidance, GSA2.4) [harvest control rules] do not yet exist for these stocks. Therefore the key elements of a harvest strategy, except stock assessments, are altogether absent. Harvest strategy ‘expected to achieve’ objectives based on the stock status, but is not ‘responsive’ to the state of the stock.
	1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools		No well-defined harvest control rule which can act to adjust fishing mortality in response to changes in stock status. Also, no particular evidence that any ‘available’ harvest control rule is able to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment is approached.
	1.2.3	Information/Monitoring		Some data gaps, but generally data is good enough for a robust stock assessment. The OPAGAC Bigeye, Yellowfin, and Skipjack Tuna Purse Seine Fishery FIP scores this PI (1.2.3) between 60 and 79, although the OPAGAC FIP does not have any Tasks associated with this PI. The ISSF 2018 “Recommended best practices for tuna longline fisheries in transition to MSC Certification” ⁴ makes recommendations specifically to address PI 1.2.3 as longline fisheries are historically data deficient, data reporting obligations are not always met, and not all tuna fleets are properly monitored in WCPFC, which results in uncertainty to stock assessments and compliance issues.
	1.2.4	Assessment of stock status		Stock assessment makes the best use of available data.
			All UoAs	
Primary species	2.1.1	Outcome		Several species other than bigeye tuna, Argentinian squid (bait species), Japanese sardine (bait species) and North Pacific blue shark could possibly be listed as main, however, data from client need improvement, which is the main reason for achieving a score of potentially below 80.

⁴ 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



	2.1.2	Management		<p>WCPFC have measures in place for bigeye tuna as well as shark species.</p> <p>Bait: As set out in PI 2.1.1, the amount of bait used by this fishery is trivial in comparison to the biomass and landings from the four bait stocks. This constitutes a partial strategy to ensure that the fishery has no impact on the stock. It does not, however, meet MSC's definition of a strategy as given above, so SG100 is not met.</p> <p>There is no unwanted catch of primary species, as these are retained by the fishery.</p>
	2.1.3	Information		<p>Information is good from WCPFC on species and client data are good for bigeye tuna.</p> <p>Bait species: Each of the primary bait stocks has a stock assessment, providing quantitative information on total landings and stock biomass (details given in 2.1.1. In all cases, the impact of this fishery on these stocks can be evaluated as trivial with a high degree of certainty; SG100 is met.</p>
Secondary species	2.2.1	Outcome		<p>Several species identified as potential secondary species for assessment. Risk-Based Framework will be required for these species as data is generally poor. Client catch data and fate of such species require improvement and validation. SG60-79 is scored due to lack of verified and comprehensive data.</p>
	2.2.2	Management		<p>The very fact that these species are being assessed as secondary species means that there is currently no management of these species by either the WCPFC or national governments associated with the clients vessels.</p>
	2.2.3	Information		<p><i>Most of the species identified lack data from the client catches, WCPFC and basic biological knowledge. Bumble Bee installed cameras on 12 boats that land in Fiji. Bumble Bee and FCF paid for the data analysis, however they have stopped analysis for 2019 as the review process is costly and the results currently do not count towards WCPFC observer requirements. There is a need to ensure a comprehensive data plan that includes electronic observer coverage, including who would pay for analysis costs. The installation of hardware and trialling e-observation has been a sign of goodwill to date. This goodwill will likely cease if there is no link to improving sustainability (as measured against the MSC Standard), and acceptance of the data by the WCPFC.</i></p> <p><i>WWF stated at the TCC "Peer-reviewed research (constituting the best available scientific information on the</i></p>



				<p>issue) indicated a minimum of 20% [analysed] observer coverage was necessary to secure an appropriate level of statistical significance for stock assessment purposes, and that observer coverage requirements for other purposes were likely to be higher — up to 100%, depending on the objective.” (Babcock, E., Pikitch, E. & Hudson, C. (2011). <i>How much observer coverage is enough to adequately estimate bycatch? Oceana.</i>) Electronic-observer coverage could help meet these minimums.</p>
ETP species	2.3.1	Outcome		<p>Client data are poor quality and require improvement. Level of interactions with Endangered, Threatened and Protected (ETP) species and their fate is lacking in detail and requires validation.</p>
	2.3.2	Management		<p>While there is clear management and CMMs by WCPFC for ETPs, there is a lack of such measures and management action by associated countries to this UoA, such as Vanuatu and Solomon Islands are not members of Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. However, the new seabird CMM 2017-06 requires use of seabird mitigation measures in the areas of activity, requirements which were not required in recently repealed CMMs. <i>WCPFC subsequently adopted a revision to the seabird measure, 2018-03, which amends the southern boundary of the measure’s application.</i></p>
	2.3.3	Information		<p>Client data are poor quality and require improvement. Level of interactions with ETPs and their fate is lacking in detail and requires validation. <i>Note e-observer comments against PI 2.2.3 above.</i></p>
Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome		<p>Good data and information exist from both client and WCPFC for longline operations. However, client data could be improved to include set depths. There are no Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems associated with the fishery.</p>
	2.4.2	Management		<p>Based on the UoA there are no VMEs. The water column is the only habitat that is interacted with and current management is appropriate.</p>
	2.4.3	Information		<p>Good data and information exist from both client and WCPFC for longline operations.</p>
Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome		<p>Fisheries inevitably change ecosystems, and the Pacific tuna fisheries are no exception. Although albacore and yellowfin stock status are considered to be healthy in the WCPO, this is not the case for WCPO bigeye, which is overfished (see Principle 1). Any fishery targeting bigeye contributes to this overfished status which may in turn lead to ecosystem-level changes.</p>



				<p>A similar situation is in place in the Eastern Pacific Ocean for yellowfin, whose biomass is estimated to be below the estimate of the Point of Recruitment Impairment (PRI). Fisheries targeting yellowfin disrupt key elements of the underlying ecosystem structure.</p> <p>The question that should be answered is whether any given UoA would be likely to fundamentally alter the capacity of the ecosystem to maintain its structure and function. For individual UoAs this is highly unlikely to be the case – illogical though it may seem, the MSC have refrained from including a cumulative impact assessment in this component. As such, the SG80 level may be met for this PI.</p>
2.5.2	Management			<p>The FAO code states fisheries management should ensure the conservation not only of target species, but also sympatric non-target species (Allain et al., 2011). This resolution is now explicit in WCPFC measures, although tuna fisheries remain managed on a single-species basis. The WCPFC’s application of the FAO code extends to the highly migratory fish species including tuna through CMM-2013-01 on the management of bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack and CMM-2010-05 on the management of albacore, as well as to the management of non-target species, in particular through Resolution 2005-03 on Non-Target Fish Species. Work is also underway via in-country Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management work. SG80 is likely to be met.</p>
2.5.3	Information			<p>There is increasing effort by a range of organisations to collect detailed data on the structure of the Pacific Ocean pelagic ecosystem. This effort occurs through observer programmes, trophic analyses and mid-trophic level sampling. Ecopath, Ecosim and Seapodym models are being developed and their results fed into the Secretariat for the Pacific Community’s work. SG80 is likely to be met.</p>

6.2 Principle 3 Scores

For Principle 3, only one PI did not pass at the SG60 level (see Table 3). The Vanuatu national management system failed for PI 3.2.4. (“Management and performance evaluation”) as the Vanuatu Government Fisheries Division has not conducted internal or external evaluations of the management system.

O2’s conclusion on the scoring of PI 3.2.3 differs from MEC’s scores. The score for the WCPFC management system was changed from >80 to 60-79. The justification is provided in Table 3 below, which includes the summary of rationale and key points from MEC’s pre-assessment, with amendments in italics for updated information since the pre-assessment (December 2017), the divergence in the PI 3.2.3 score.



Table 3. Pre-assessment of tuna stocks: Comparison of scores assigned to MSC Principle 3.

Component	PI	Performance Indicator	Likely scoring level	Rationale/ Key points
Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and customary framework		<p><u>WCPFC</u>: There is a comprehensive Framework for regional cooperation. The WCPFC is required to ensure decision-making is transparent and this is achieved through members being made fully informed of issues and being able to participate in meetings. As the Commission is not currently subject to any disputes or court challenges (Powers & Medley, 2016), the resolution of legal disputes are considered to be effective. The Convention provides for recognition of the interests of small scale and artisanal fishers within its framework for sustainability. SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Solomon Islands</u>: The Solomon Islands have two main legislative instruments governing the management of fisheries resources in the Solomon Island’s EEZ. Solomon Islands is party to a range of international and regional legal instruments relating to fisheries conservation, management and development. The Solomon Islands is also a member of the Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA), which coordinates management for conservation and economic purposes for its members within PNA EEZs. Under the Solomon Islands legal system there is a provision for legal challenges in court through a Fisheries Appeals Committee. Explicit under the Fisheries Management Act (FMA) 2015, commercial fishing is not allowed in inshore waters unless authorised, reserving the right for customary and indigenous fishing (Trumble & Stocker, 2016). Both the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and PNA represent the interests of indigenous and customary users. SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu</u>: The Vanuatu Government has the two main legislative instruments governing the management of fisheries resources in Vanuatu’s EEZ. Vanuatu is party to a range of international and regional legal instruments. Vanuatu is party to the Tokelau Arrangement. Under the Vanuatu legal system there is a provision under the Fisheries Act. Appeals against decisions made by the Director of Fisheries can be made by way of request to the Minister for a re-consideration of the decision. The protection of the customary rights is explicit in the Fisheries Act, which provides for the adoption of measures to ensure sustainable use of fishery resources and takes into account the interests of artisanal, subsistence fisheries and local communities and maintain traditional forms of sustainable fisheries management. SG80 is met.</p>
	3.1.2	Consultation, roles and	*	<p><u>WCPFC</u>: Roles and responsibilities for its members and co-operating non-members are well-defined and understood</p>



		responsibilities		<p>in all areas, with operating procedures and terms of reference. The WCPFC also co-operates through with relevant organisations in the region, including IATTC. Consultation at the international level is formalised and the information derived from these are used by decision-makers at the annual Commission meeting. Attendance at Commission and related meetings is comprehensive and encourages and facilitates engagement by stakeholders. The management system demonstrates consideration of this information but while scientific reports state exactly how information was used by decision-makers, it is unclear how much weight is given to compliance, economic and social issues (Powers & Medley, 2016). SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Solomon Islands:</u> The roles and responsibilities of Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) are outlined in the FMA 2015. The WCPFC, PNA, FFA and Solomon Islands government work together through consultation to incorporate local knowledge into decision-making, which is reflected in the consideration given to small island developing states regionally. Both the FFA and PNA work with small island developing countries to bring consolidated policy advice to WCPFC. Solomon Islands provides for engagement through the FAC and formal consultation with all relevant stakeholders. SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu:</u> The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry, Fisheries and Biodiversity (MALFFB) are outlined in the Fisheries Act 2014 and are well-defined. A Fisheries Management Advisory Council (FMAC) comprised of members from the fishing industry, artisanal fishers, offshore fishers, NGOs and relevant government agencies provide recommendations relating to fisheries conservation and management. Through the FMAC and formal consultations with all relevant stakeholders the Vanuatu government has developed and implemented fishery plans. The WCPFC, FFA and Vanuatu Government work together through consultation to incorporate local knowledge into decision-making, which is reflected in the implementation of management measures that address the needs of member states. SG80 is met.</p>
3.1.3		Long term objectives		<p><u>WCPFC:</u> Long-term objectives regarding shared fish stocks, as well as stocks of bycatch species and the wider ecosystem (P2) are outlined in Article 2 of the WCPFC Convention. The WCPFC Convention provides clear long-term objectives that guide decision-making with an explicit provision regarding the precautionary approach and ecosystem-based management, making it consistent with P1 and P2. Evidence that these objectives are guiding, or beginning to guide decision-making is proved in Commission reports that indicate explicit action is being undertaken to</p>



				<p>develop and implement management arrangements to support the achievement of objectives. Although the precautionary approach is in the Convention, it is less clear that it is applied in practice across all policy. SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Solomon Islands:</u> The Solomon Islands FMA 2015 specifies an overall objective of ensuring “the long-term management, conservation, development and sustainable use of Solomon Islands fisheries and marine ecosystems for the benefit of the people of Solomon Islands”, with a suite of accompanying principles, including the precautionary approach to take into account during decision-making. For the most part these objectives are required by MFMR to be implemented. SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu:</u> The Fisheries Act 2014 Part 2 specifies the main objectives are to conserve, manage and develop fisheries in Vanuatu in order to ensure its long term sustainable use for the benefit of the people of Vanuatu. The main principles that support the objectives of the Act are to ensure management measures are based on the best scientific evidence and are designed to maintain and restore target stocks, amongst others. Long-term objectives are also included in the Vanuatu National Fisheries Sector Policy 2016 and the Revised Tuna Fishery Management Plan 2014. These objectives are required by the MALFFB to be implemented. SG80 is met.</p>
Fishery specific management system	3.2.1	Fishery-specific objectives	*	<p><u>WCPFC:</u> The WCPFC Convention offers guidance and principles on which management plans can be developed. This includes objectives that apply to both target stocks (P1) and the ecosystem (P2). However not all objectives are well enough defined to be operational or measurable especially for CMMs related to P2 outcomes. To date, WCPFC has not yet adopted precautionary and ecosystem-based target and limit reference points for all major tuna and billfish species or put in place effort management system that would work regionally for gear other than purse seine. While the management measures are broadly measurable they are not necessarily well-defined and stock specific, particularly for albacore and a suite of P2 species (Powers & Medley, 2016). SG80 is met.</p> <p><i>OPAGAC: Fishery-specific management system does not have clear, specific objectives designed to achieve the outcomes expressed by MSC’s Principles 1 and 2. Fishery-specific objectives (management targets)</i></p> <p><u>Solomon Islands:</u> The Solomon Islands Tuna Management and Development Plan (MFMR 2015) provides clear policy guidance and consistent direction for tuna fishing and management with both short term objectives and actions</p>



				<p>that are consistent with the MSC principles. The TMDP covers all waters from 3 nautical miles out to the 200NM Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) including archipelagic waters (Trumble & Stocker, 2016). SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu:</u> The Revised Tuna Fishery Management Plan 2014 covers all Vanuatu waters, including the consideration of the area of Vanuatu’s Exclusive Economic Zone around Matthew and Hunter. Within the plan, four key short term objectives provide guidance for the management of the tuna fisheries to ensure that the exploitation of the tuna resources that are found in and pass through Vanuatu waters are compatible with the sustainability of the stock and that the harvest is taken in a way that maximizes long term economic and social benefits. SG 80 is met.</p>		
			W C P F C	S o l o m o n s	V a n u a t u	
3.2.2	Decision-making processes					<p><u>WCPFC:</u> Decision-making processes in the WCPFC are clearly defined, responsive and largely transparent. Decision-making is adaptive and the Commission has been shown to react appropriately, although this may not always be timely (Powers & Medley, 2016). The WCPFC requires the application of the precautionary approach in decision-making, and the use of the best scientific information available. In December 2016, the Ocean Fisheries Program of SPC reported that although South Pacific albacore stocks were not overfished, the decline in Catch per Unit Effort since 1992 has raised concerns over the economic viability of the fishery. The SPC projections suggest the current catch and effort is not sustainable and that consideration should be given for the implementation of alternative management measures as the CMM for South Pacific albacore (CMM 2010-5) appears to ineffective in constraining effort. <i>In 2018, the SC reported: “preliminary estimate of total catch of south Pacific albacore (within the WCPFC Convention Area south of the equator) for 2017 was ...a 33% increase from 2016 and a 13% increase over 2012-2016”.</i> So far, the decision making process has not responded effectively. <i>Additionally there has been lack of transparency of the WCPFC Compliance, Management, Surveillance meetings, with accredited observers being excluded.</i> Therefore, SG60 is met but not SG 80.</p> <p><u>Solomon Islands:</u> The Solomon Islands FMA 2015 establishes procedures for decision-making. Important</p>



						<p>issues are dealt with through plans of action and fishery management plans. Tuna and baitfish have management plans, which invoke the precautionary approach. The Solomon Islands is a party to all decisions at WCPFC level and participates in the Scientific Committee and Commission meetings where final decisions are made at a regional level. Information on the rationale behind decision-making at the national level is not available on the website. While the Minister provides a letter to the Chair of the FAC with an explanation for not adopting recommendations, there is no evidence these explanations were available to the public, so it is unclear explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations. SG80 could therefore not be awarded on this basis.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu:</u> The Fisheries Act 2014 outlines the procedures for decision making. In order to assess and recommend management, development and conservation measures the Director must consult with appropriate wide-ranging stakeholders. The Fisheries Management Advisory Council (FMAC) is responsible for making rules around decision-making to ensure decisions are subject to informed, independent critique and transparency. The Fisheries Act 2014 ensures the application of the precautionary approach. Vanuatu is a party to all decisions at WCPFC level and participates in the Scientific Committee and Commission meetings where final decisions are made at a regional level. The public can access information concerning the fishery's performance and management on the Fisheries Division Facebook site. Information available on Facebook shows how scientific information is used to inform management actions, which are then monitored for effectiveness. There is no evidence to suggest that the Fisheries Division is disrespectful to, or defiant of local laws or legally binding agreements reached at the regional and international level. SG 80 is met.</p>
3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	#				<p><u>WCPFC:</u> Regional MCS systems are employed to improve compliance with its requirements. There is a regional scientific and enforcement programme with an observer programme (CMM 2007-01), which aims to achieve 5% coverage of effort in tuna longline fisheries. Port State Measures have been implemented to an extent but significant gaps remain (Powers & Medley, 2016). Landings and other data should be submitted by member States annually to the WCPFC. Sanctions are applied consistently, but only to fishing entities such as illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) vessels and vessels detected as being non-compliant with resolutions. The WCPFC has a permanent working group on compliance (Technical and Compliance Committee) that reviews and monitors</p>



				<p>compliance with conservation and management measures. It is evident that reporting on compliance is incomplete at least in the public sphere. While some non-compliance has been detected it does not appear substantial or systematic, however information gaps prevent a high degree of confidence that fishers in most fisheries comply (Powers & Medley, 2016). SG80 is met.</p> <p><i>While there is some evidence that sanctions are applied, they are only consistently applied to a subset of fishers and therefore do not provide a deterrence for the majority of the fisheries. Regarding compliance, there are many examples where fishers do not comply with the management system. E.g. “WCPFC15 and TCC14 (2018) noted with concern that despite some improvement some CCMs still do not comply with the requirement under CMM 2007-01 Attachment K Annex C paragraph 6 (minimum 5% ROP longline coverage rate)” (WCPFC15-2018-FinalCMR). As fishers are not cooperating, “where necessary, with management authorities in the collection of catch, discard and other information that is of importance to the effective management of the resources and the fishery”, SG60 is met but not SG 80. Chinese longline vessels do not meet the 5% Regional Observer Program observer coverage requirement, despite the implementation date of “no later than 30 June 2012”. China and Vanuatu were listed as priority non-compliant. Without sanctions, for some countries this equates to lack of incentive comply with measures.</i></p> <p><u>Solomon Islands:</u> MFMR’s compliance duties are conducted in accordance with national measures and the regionally adopted management measures formulated by the WCPFC, PNA and the Niue Treaty. MFMR undertakes MCS duties including management of the VMS system, monitoring catch log sheets, licensing of fishing vessels, managing the national observer programme and conducting at-sea inspections with the Solomon Islands Police Force. Sanctions exist under the Fisheries FMA 2015 to deal with non-compliance. The lack of violations from the fleet reported by MFMR leads to the conclusion the sanctions are effective and provide effective deterrence (Trumble & Stocker, 2016). According to MFMR, the tuna longline fishery is fully compliant with the regulations (Trumble & Stocker, 2016). SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu:</u> The Fisheries Division’s MCS programme adheres to national management measures and regionally adopted management measures formulated by the WCPFC. The MCS programme is responsible for the management of VMS system, monitoring catch log sheets, licensing of fishing vessels, managing the national observer programme and conducting at-sea inspections with two patrol vessels. The</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>Fisheries Act 2014 outlines the requirements and responsibilities for the maintenance of the MCS system. Sanctions applied for non-compliance to regulations concerning VMS, Port State Measures and catch documentation are also contained within the Fisheries Act. The lack of violations from the fleet reported by the Fisheries Division (only 20 minor infractions with 100% being resolved since 2014) leads to the conclusion the sanctions are effective and provide effective deterrence. There is a high degree of confidence that fishers comply with the management system. Observer reports from 2014 were the most recent that the Fisheries Division had available. Also, the observer coverage was only 2.7% which is well below the 5% regional requirement. SG80 could not be awarded on this basis.</p>
3.2.4	Management & performance evaluation			<p><u>WCPFC</u>: WCPFC has mechanisms in place to evaluate key parts of the management system and is subject to regular internal review. This is demonstrated by the various committees and working groups that meet regularly and report their findings to the Commission (Powers & Medley, 2016). WCPFC carried out an external performance review in 2012. SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Solomon Islands</u>: When sufficient resources and capacity are available, MFMR conducts reviews of key parts of the management system, which historically has led to the development of a new fisheries management act and updated management plans (Trumble & Stocker, 2016). External review occurs occasionally. For example, in 2012 the Office of the Auditor General conducted a performance audit of the MFMR with the objective of assessing the effectiveness of the management of offshore fisheries in accordance with national fisheries policies and frameworks (Trumble & Stocker, 2016). SG80 is met.</p> <p><u>Vanuatu</u>: The fisheries-specific management system is subject to review on a regular basis as evidenced by 10 revisions of the Fisheries Act, 3 revisions of the Tuna Management Plan and the Fisheries Regulations are currently under review. However, the Fisheries Division has not conducted internal or external evaluations of the management system. SG60 could not be awarded on this basis.</p>

* The OPAGAC Tropical Tuna Purse Seine Fishery FIP scores these PIs (3.1.2. and 3.2.1) between 60 and 79. The OPAGAC FIP does not have any Tasks associated with these PIs, and for this reason the scores for this FIP have been left at >80 as per MEC's pre-assessment.



The OPAGAC Purse Seine FIP scores this PI (3.2.3) for WCPFC between 60 and 79. The OPAGAC FIP has Activities (Tasks) associated with this PI 3.2.3, and for this reason the score for this FIP has been amended from MEC’s pre-assessment to between 60 and 79 for the WCPFC management system.

6.3 PIs With Scores Less Than 80

Table 4 shows the number of PIs with scores less than 80. The PIs with a score less than 60 will be the high priority and those with a score between 60 and 80 will be medium priority.

Table 4. Number of Performance Indicators with scores less than 80.

Score	Principle 1	Principle 2	Principle 3	Total
<60	2 (PI 1.2.1, 1.2.2)	0	1 (PI 3.2.4)	3
60-79	1 (PI 1.2.3)	7 (PIs 2.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3)	2 (PIs 3.2.2, 3.2.3)	10

Note, the OPAGAC FIP has three additional PIs that score between 60 and 79: PIs 3.1.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.3. The OPAGAC FIP does not have any Activities (Tasks) associated with PIs 3.1.2 and 3.2.1, and for this reason the scores for this FIP have been left at >80 as per MEC’s pre-assessment.

7. Summary of Key Issues

This is an initial analysis, which will be further evaluated Ocean Outcomes and FIP stakeholders during the development of the full Workplan.

Table 5. Summary of the overarching issues for the high and medium priority PIs across the two stocks.

PI	South Pacific Albacore and Western and Central Pacific Yellowfin
1.2.1	Development of well-defined reference points and harvest control rules for both stocks, with agreement and application of the tools required to implement them (catch and/or effort control) in a way that is demonstrably effective.
1.2.2	No well-defined harvest control rule which can act to adjust fishing mortality in response to changes in stock status.
2.1.1	Client data insufficient to confirm/ascertain which species are primary.
2.2.1	Lack of verified and comprehensive client catch and fate data.
2.2.2	No management of secondary species by either the WCPFC or national governments associated with the client’s vessels.
2.2.3	Information inadequate for assessment of impact on secondary species.



2.3.1 and 2.3.3	Effects of Client on ETP species unable to be determined as data are poor quality and require improvement. Level of interactions with ETPs and their fate is lacking in detail and requires validation.
2.3.2	While there is clear management and CMMs by WCPFC for ETPs, there is a lack of such measures and management action by national governments.
3.2.2	Decision-making is not fully transparent (WCPFC and Solomon Islands); and does not effectively responds to important issues (e.g. stock status) (WCPFC).
3.2.3	No application of sanctions (WCPFC), and lack of compliance by fishers (WCPFC and Vanuatu).
3.2.4	Vanuatu: Internal and/or external evaluations of the Vanuatu national management system not conducted.

O2 is cognisant MEC faced a number of constraints when conducting the pre-assessment, including around the availability and quality of data, and lack of input received from the Solomon Islands management authority. MEC noted “The data limitations proved the primary barrier to the pre-assessment process and is likely to be related to the supply chain relationship between the pre-assessment client and the operating vessels, which also includes an intermediary sourcing supply company. There is not a direct or binding relationship between these parties, which has made data acquisition for the fishery difficult. Resolution of this issue is crucial for a successful full assessment.” The constraints highlighted by MEC should be addressed in the FIP Workplan.

8. Workplan Development

8.1 Initial Structure

Section 8 contains recommended strategies for addressing the fishery’s challenges. The recommended strategies take the form of six Actions, which encompass Outcomes and supporting information for the eventual Workplan. Each Action table includes the following sections: Goal; PI/s; Priority; Outcome/s; Milestones and possible Year 1 Tasks. The final Workplan structure may combine Outcomes to address multiple PIs as described in 8.2 below.

8.2 Considerations for Outcome Development

We used scoring information (presented in the Scoping Document) to identify where the fishery will need to demonstrate improved performance in order to obtain passing scores against the MSC Fisheries Standard. These deficiencies were used to formulate a set of specific Outcomes. Each Outcome is directly linked to a PI, which did not attain the SG80 level of performance. We combined closely-related issues into a single Outcome where practical. For example, there is one Outcome for both the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks for PI 1.2.1 (stock status) and PI 1.1.2 (rebuilding). Otherwise, our approach to writing Outcomes generally follows WWF guidance on action plans for Fisheries Improvement Projects (WWF 2013).



To increase clarity and create efficiency in the final Workplan, if/where possible, Outcomes will be combined to cover as many PIs as possible that score less than 80. Under the MSC Standard the PIs are not all independent of each other. The same deficiency may generate several conditional passes across different PIs, but in the MSC system effectively only one condition is generated (for example, reference points, harvest control rules and fishery-specific objectives). In a MSC report assessors are constrained to draft a condition for each PI scoring 60-79, however FIP Workplans are not constrained in the same way, and therefore the consultant may be able to pull out the key issues in a more logical way.

Outcomes were written by:

- considering conditions from previous MSC assessments of comparable tuna fisheries;
- adopting outcomes or activities/tasks from FIPs of comparable tuna fisheries;
- writing new Outcomes to suit the specific attributes of this fishery; or
- some combination of the above.

8.2.1 Priorities

High-priority Outcomes are those where the MSC certification requirement PIs would not pass assessment (i.e. Scoring Issue below 60). Medium-priority Outcomes (Scoring Issue 60-79) have a conditional-pass score with the proviso they must improve during the FIP.

If any MSC Principle scores less than 80 in a weighted aggregate in a MSC assessment, the fishery automatically fails in its bid for certification. As demonstrated in MEC's Bumble Bee pre-assessment, the Principle 2 aggregate score failed without any of the individual PIs failing (<60). The more Outcomes the client works to improve, the more certainty the 80 aggregate score for that Principle will be met in a MSC assessment.

The priority of Outcomes may change during the duration of the FIP, or the need for new Outcomes may arise due to changes in stock status or harmonisation with new FIPs. It is possible the timing for implementation of some medium-priority Outcomes may be shorter than for some high-priority Outcomes, possibly due to ease of implementation (e.g. for issues under the direct control of the fleets), or seriousness of the issue.

8.3 Formulation of Milestones

An essential step in Workplan development is to formulate a set of metrics and key Performance Indicators (Seafood Alliance, 2015) by which fishery progress can be evaluated during the course of the project. We have followed Seafood Alliance and WWF guidance in formulating such metrics, but we borrow the term "milestone" from MSC. This term is preferable because it already has a close association with the concept of an MSC certification condition.

With MSC certifications, it is general practice to harmonise the conclusions of one fishery assessment with the results of another. There is no obvious reason to adopt this practice when developing FIPs. However, we did find that our milestones needed to take adequate account of ongoing developments in related or overlapping tuna fisheries. This FIP will harmonise with the Milestones and Tasks associated with PIs 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.



8.4 Formulation of Initial Tasks

The final Workplan will include Tasks associated with Milestones. These will likely be developed each year for that year and possibly the following year. Tasks are initially proposed here are for Year 1 of the FIP.

8.5 Responsible Parties

In the final Workplan, each Action will have a “Responsible party/ies” section. These will be the parties responsible for the Action, Tasks and Milestones delivery. Many parties will be responsible for Action and Tasks delivery, however as the FIP is for the Bumble Bee and FCF fishery, ultimately Bumble Bee and FCF are responsible for delivery of Actions. The responsible parties will be determined in consultation with the members of the FIP Steering Committee.

Under the MSC Standard, the PIs Principles 1 (Stock Status) and 3 (Governance) for tuna and tuna-like species are primarily determined by what is in place or occurring at the tuna RFMO as these species are managed by RFMOs. Tuna fisheries in FIPs and MSC certification will therefore have Outcomes or Conditions to meet beyond the fishery’s control (e.g. the adoption of Harvest Control Rules). As many aspects of the “South Pacific Albacore and Western and Central Pacific Yellowfin Tuna Longline FIP” are outside of Bumble Bee’s direct control, it is imperative for Bumble Bee and FCF to work with responsible parties and other partners to achieve the Outcomes.

As an ISSF participating company, Bumble Bee complies with ISSF’s conservation and management measures. As part of promoting the adoption of best management, ISSF conducts skipper training workshops, supports advocacy, and publishes scientific publications. ISSF published its “Recommended best practices for tuna longline fisheries in transition to MSC Certification” in 2018 and Skippers’ Guidebook to Sustainable Longline Fishing Practices (2nd Ed.). ISSF will likely be an important stakeholder in the FIP and provide technical advice on how to best meet Principle 2 Outcomes, and collaborate on advocacy for Principles 1 and 3.

9. Initial Workplan

9.1 Overview

Three high-priority and nine medium-priority Outcomes have been identified across the two stocks. These address the Performance Indicators (PIs) that fail to meet the MSC Standard (<60), and the PIs with conditional passes (60-79). Two of the high-priority Outcomes address Principle 1 PIs, and one high-priority Outcome addresses a Principle 3 PI. The bulk of the medium-priority Outcomes address Principle 2 PIs. Table 6 outlines the set of Outcomes provided in this Scoping Document. The sections following Table 6 combine related Outcomes under Actions and gives a detailed description of how the Actions/Outcome will be met. Each Action table includes the following: Goal; PIs; Outcomes; Timelines, Milestones; and suggested initial Tasks associated with the Milestones. Responsible parties and estimated costs will be



included in the final Workplan. Tasks will be established and/or revised annually for the upcoming year.

Table 6. List of Outcomes.

#	PI #	Performance Indicator	Scope (UoAs)	Outcome
1	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	ALB & YFT	By the end of the fifth year, there shall be robust and precautionary harvest strategies in place for South Pacific (SP) albacore and Western and Central Pacific (WCP) yellowfin tuna stocks. For each strategy, 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.
2a	1.2.2	Harvest Control Rules and Tools	ALB & YFT	By the end of the third year ⁵ , WCPFC shall formally adopt appropriately precautionary harvest control rules for SP albacore and WCP yellowfin tuna stocks 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.
2b				By the end of the fifth year, there shall be evidence the tools used or available to implement harvest control rules for SP albacore and WCP yellowfin tuna are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.
3	1.2.3	Information and Monitoring	ALB & YFT	By 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.

⁵ Timing is consistent with the “Work Plan for the Adoption of Harvest Strategies under CMM 2014-06. As refined and adopted at the Fifteenth Regular Session of the Commission, Honolulu, United States of America 10-14 December 2018”.



4	2.1.1	Primary species - Outcome	All	By the third year, fishery data are sufficient to confirm/ascertain which species are primary (including bait species); 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.
5a	2.2.3 & 2.2.1	Secondary species - Information and Outcome	All	By the third year, fishery catch and fate data is verified and comprehensive so 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.
5b				By 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.
6	2.2.2	Secondary species - Management	All	By the fourth year, there is at least a partial strategy in place at the WCPFC, 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.
7a	2.3.3 & 2.3.1	ETP species - Information and Outcome	All	By the third year, the evidence base for determining interaction rates with Endangered, Threatened and Protected (ETP) species should be 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.
7b				By the fifth year, should a potential threat be identified, the fishery should 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.
8	2.3.2	ETP species - Management	All	By the fourth year, the UoA should 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.
9	3.2.2	Fishery specific mgmt system - Decision-making processes	All	By the fifth year, there shall be evidence the WCPFC decision-making processes responds to serious and other important issues, including the declining catch rates of SP 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; and



				Solomon Islands national decision-making processes are transparent.
10	3.2.3	Fishery specific mgmt system - Compliance and enforcement	WCPFC	By the end of the fifth year, there shall be evidence WCPFC 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 WCPFC Secretariat.
11	3.2.4	Fishery specific mgmt system - Mgmt & performance evaluation	Vanuatu	By the end of the fifth year, there is a system for monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Vanuatu fishery-specific management system against its objectives; and at least one effective and timely review of the fishery-specific management system completed.

	High-priority as PI score <60
	Medium-priority as PI score 60-79

9.2 Addressing High Priority Outcomes

9.2.1 Action 1: Principle 1 – Establish harvest strategies and harvest control rules

Action Goal 1: Ensure there are robust and precautionary harvest strategies in place for the South Pacific albacore and Western and Central Pacific yellowfin tuna stocks (PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2), and relevant information is collected to support the harvest strategy (PI 1.2.3).

Outcomes 1, 2a, 2b and 3 from Table 6.

Timeline	Tasks		Evidence of completion / results (Milestones)
Year 1+	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 support the timely implementation of the agreed workplan during 2019.	Evidence of continued progress of the development of the draft harvest strategies presented. As per the WCPFC agreed workplan (CMM 14-06), this includes that the Commission has: considered candidate harvest control rules based on agreed reference points for the SP albacore stock; agreed to a TRP for yellowfin; considered management objectives for the fisheries
	1.2	Support the activities of members of other FIPs	



		(Ecuador (Transmarina), Tunago and OPAGAC) to support the implementation of the harvest strategy workplan during 2019.	and stocks; potentially reassessed acceptable levels of risk; and been undertaking a management strategy evaluation.
	1.3	FIP catching sector representatives and FCF work closely with O2 to engage the Chinese and Taiwanese governments to help ensure the number of their fishing vessels actively fishing for SP albacore in the Convention Area south of 20°S is not above 2005 levels or recent historical (2000-2004) level, to comply with CMM 2015-02. Develop a strategy to engage on this over the duration of the FIP.	The governments and fleets commence working towards reducing the number of their fishing vessels actively fishing for South Pacific albacore in the Convention Area south of 20°S to levels at or below 2005 levels or recent historical (2000-2004), as per CMM 2015-02.
After WCPFC plenary, Jan. 2019	1.4	Review progress against updated 14-06 workplan during 2019 and any further revisions to the workplan.	Implementation gaps and impediments to implementation of the harvest strategy workplan identified.
Year 1	1.5	Conduct a gap analysis for, and develop an approach to, improving 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.	Approach to improve provision of catch and effort data collection developed.
	1.6	Conduct a gap analysis for, and develop a plan to, improving monitoring programs (including discard reporting and observer coverage), and if needed, conduct training for improved data collection and reporting.	Plan to improve monitoring programs and training for improved data collection and reporting developed.
Timeline	Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - Tasks TBD		
Year 2	The WCPFC has: considered candidate harvest control rules based on agreed reference points for the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks; considered management objectives for the fisheries and stocks; and been undertaking a management strategy evaluation.		
	FIP catching sector representatives (from the fleet) and FCF continue to work closely with O2 to engage the Chinese and Taiwanese governments to ensure compliance with CMM 2015-02, as per the engagement plan.		
	Approach to improve catch and effort data provision commenced.		
	Monitoring programs and training commenced.		
Year 3	The WCPFC has: adopted formal scientifically-based appropriately precautionary harvest control		



	rules for the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stock; and considered management objectives for the fisheries and stocks.
	Engagement with China and Chinese Taipei on complying with CMM 2015-02 continued as per the engagement strategy.
	Approach to improve catch and effort data provision, and monitoring and training continued, if required.
Year 4	The adopted harvest control rules for SP albacore and WCP yellowfin have been implemented.
	Evidence of continued progress of the development of the draft harvest strategies presented: recorded management objectives for the fishery or stock; agreed acceptable levels of risk; agreed monitoring strategy; agreed to performance indicators to evaluate harvest control rules; and undertaking a management strategy evaluation.
Year 5	There is a clear basis for considering that the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin harvest control rules will be successful in achieving the desired outcome and they have taken into account the main uncertainties.
	The WCPFC has adopted a robust and precautionary harvest strategy for the SP albacore and WCP yellowfin stocks.
	Operational level catch and effort data or data provided that is identified as source of uncertainty in assessments.
	Highly frequent monitoring occurring.

9.2.2 Action 6: Principle 3 - Monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Vanuatu fishery-specific management system

Action Goal 6: There is an effective and timely review of the fishery-specific and associated enhancement program(s) management system (PI 3.2.4).

Outcome 11 from Table 6.

Timeline	Tasks	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones)
Year 1	6.1 Approach the Tunago FIP partners and Vanuatu Government regarding a process for monitoring and evaluating the performance of their albacore and yellowfin longline fishery management system.	Vanuatu has agreed to develop a time-bound process for monitoring and evaluating the fishery.
Timeline	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones) - Tasks TBD	



Years 2 and 3	Vanuatu on track with process to develop a process for monitoring and evaluating the fishery.
Year 4	Review of the Vanuatu fishery-specific management system commissioned.
Year 5	Review of the Vanuatu fishery-specific management system completed.

9.3 Addressing Medium Priority Outcomes

9.3.1 Action 2: Principle 2 - Data and analyses to support management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species

Action Goal 2: 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 2.1.1 and 2.2.3); and the UoA meets national and international requirements for protection of ETP species (PI 2.3.3).

Outcomes 4, 5a and 7a from Table 6.

Timeline	Tasks	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones)
Year 1	<p>2.1 Work with relevant national authorities to evaluate current data collection and reporting strategies and identify areas of improvement. Develop improved data collection plan; this can be through increased observer coverage (human or electronic), improved self-reporting (e.g. e-logbooks), or through some other measure as appropriate. An observer sampling approach and protocol, to address different data needs and compliance issues, will also need to be developed.</p> <p>The aspiration is for 100% scientific 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 bycatch, extend data collection to determine the origin and amounts of bait should be documented and monitored. Ensure integration</p>	<p>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.</p>



		with the Bycatch policy/code of conduct being developed in Task 3.2, which should also include data collection.	
	2.2	<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 100%; 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; and how the data may be accepted by the WCPFC. Ensure integration with the Bycatch policy/code of practice being developed in Task 3.2, which should also include adequate percentage (20+%) of analysed observer coverage.</p> <p>Encourage the WCPFC E-reporting and E-monitoring Working Group stays on track. Adoption of CMM in 2020.</p> <p>Discussions both within the FIP and with the working group need to include future responsibility for e-observer footage analyses.</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>
Year 1+	2.3	<p>Assess whether supplying vessels effectively implement mitigation measures for reducing bycatch, by identifying and use of best practice bycatch mitigation techniques. If data are insufficient to determine this, integrate into Task 2.1. If bycatch mitigation measures are not being effectively and consistently implemented, set process to address, including developing crew training (in Action 3 to meet Outcomes 5b and 7b).</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>
	2.4	<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 sharks; iii. that supplying vessels comply with recommendation for incidentally caught sharks to be released, the incident recorded and reported; iv. China, Taiwan, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands</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>



		implement the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks. If data are insufficient to determine these, integrate into Task 2.1. If any non-compliance is identified, set process to address (Action 3 to meet Outcomes 5b and 7b).	
	2.5	Regarding marlin and swordfish, assess whether China, Taiwan, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu: complied with reduction in catches of striped marlin resulting in an 80% reduction of 2000-2003 levels (individual countries were to identify ways to accomplish this); and are limiting the number of fishing vessels targeting swordfish to levels from any year between 2000 and 2005. The level of marlin and swordfish catches will need to be confirmed as part of improved data collection.	Either confirmed that marlin and swordfish fishing CMMs are being adhered to, or process set to improve data and address any non-compliance if required.
	2.6	Require vessels to fill in discard information in logbooks.	Vessels recording discards in logbooks.
Timeline	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones) - Tasks TBD		
Year 2	Demonstrate new data collection and reporting plan has been implemented, including recording of discard information.		
Year 3	Continued data collection and reporting.		
Year 4	Fishery data are sufficient to confirm/ascertain which species are primary.		
	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.
--	------------------

9.3.2 Action 3: Principle 2 - Effective management strategies for secondary and ETP species

Action Goal 3: Secondary species are being maintained above a biologically based limit, and the UoA does not hinder recovery of primary and secondary species if they are below a biologically based limit (PIs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2); and the UoA meets national and international requirements for protection of ETP species (PIs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2).

Outcomes 6, 5b, 7b, and 8 from Table 6.

Time line	Tasks	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones)
Year 1	Tasks (2.1 - 2.4) and Milestones under Action 2.	
	3.1 Prepare plan to develop a strategy for the management of the secondary species by the WCPFC 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, 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.'	Plan for the development of a secondary species management strategy agreed.
	3.2 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 ⁶ , 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. Appropriate monitoring and bycatch policies are critical to characterise, quantify and manage the	Development of a comprehensive and verifiable Bycatch policy/code of practice commenced.

⁶ 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).



		<p>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>NB ISSF has extensive training experience with the purse seine sector. The longline sector may 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 come in in large numbers at the same time.</i></p>	
	3.3	<p>Assess whether national law and vessels meet international and national requirements for ETP species protection, including preparing for the new seabird CMM 2018-03, which requires use of seabird mitigation measures in the specified areas of activity.</p>	<p>Gaps in meeting international and national obligations identified.</p>
Year 1+	3.4	<p>Develop strategy to encourage the supply chain to adopt voluntary shark fins naturally attached regulations and promote the adoption of this rule by the WCPFC and IATTC.</p>	<p>Strategy developed for adoption of shark fins naturally attached.</p>
Year 1	3.5	<p>Discuss with Birdlife International collaboration regarding their project working with Chinese fishing vessels in Fiji to educate about required mitigation, and building tori lines with a local women's group to supply the vessels, which operate in latitudes where bird interaction is regular.</p>	<p>Collaboration with Birdlife International commenced.</p>
Timeline	Evidence of completion / results (Milestones) - Tasks TBD		
Years 2-3	Milestones under Action 2 for Outcomes 5a and 7a.		
	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		



	<p>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"⁷.</p>
	<p>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 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4; 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."</p>
	<p>Strategy for the adoption of shark fins naturally attached implemented by the fleet, and promoted at WCPFC and IATTC.</p>
	<p>Skipper and crew training on secondary and ETP species commenced as identified during the Bycatch policy/code of practice development.</p>
Year 4	<p>Based on the data analysis in Year 4 in Action 2 (for Outcome 5a Secondary species), additional management measures implemented if necessary.</p>
	<p>Based on the data analysis in Year 4 in Action 2 (for Outcome 7a ETP species), additional management measures implemented if necessary.</p>
	<p>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.</p>
Year 5	<p>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.</p>
	<p>The UoA meets national and international requirements for protection of ETP species.</p>

9.3.3 Action 4: Principle 3 - Application of the precautionary principle through decision-making processes

Action Goal 4: The WCPFC management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives; and the Solomon Islands decision-making is transparent (PI 3.2.2).

Outcome 9 from Table 6.

⁷ 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."



Timeline	Tasks	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones)	
Year 1	4.1	Request the USA and/or other relevant stakeholders to evaluate responsiveness of decision-making, and therefore application of the precautionary approach, by WCPFC over the last 5 years. Collaborate with OPAGAC on this, as they may have requested the EU do this.	Evaluation of WCPFC responsiveness commissioned with completion date by mid-way through Year 2.
	4.2	Approach the Solomon Islands Government regarding a process to improve the transparency of their decision-making processes.	Solomon Islands agreed to either improve transparency, or a time-bound process to improve transparency of their decision-making processes.
Timeline	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones) - Tasks TBD		
Years 1-3	Some evidence that the Commission is responding to the issue of SP albacore catch rates, e.g. by progressing with the harvest strategy as per the agreed WCPFC workplan, or some other evidence.		
Year 2	Milestones for Action 4. to be developed with OPAGAC pending the outcomes of Task 4.1.		
	Solomon Islands either demonstrably improving transparency, or implementing the process to improve transparency of their decision-making processes. For example, publishing rationale on the regulator's website.		

9.3.4 Action 5: Principle 3 - Application of sanctions

Action Goal 5: WCPFC monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms ensure the management measures in the fishery are enforced and complied with (PI 3.2.3).

Outcome 10 from Table 6.

Timeline	Tasks	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones)	
Year 1	5.1	Request the USA and/or other relevant stakeholders to evaluate compliance and application of sanctions over the last 5 years. Collaborate with OPAGAC on this, as they may have requested the EU do this. The fishery must implement a MCS system consistent with RFMO and flag state requirements while meeting obligations that apply in third countries EEZ. Some longline fisheries transship much of their catch at sea. All transshipments should occur	Evaluation of application of sanctions the WCPFC commissioned with completion date by mid-way through Year 2.



		under the monitoring of an RFMO observer program and must be able to demonstrate it if requested.	
	5.2	Check transshipment monitoring is occurring as per WCPFC requirements.	All transshipments should occur under the monitoring of an RFMO observer program, which must be able to be demonstrated if requested.
	5.3	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.
Timeline	Evidence of completion / result (Milestones) - Tasks TBD		
Years 1-3	Some evidence that the Commission is responding to the issue of SP albacore catch rates, e.g. by progressing with the harvest strategy as per the agreed WCPFC workplan, or some other evidence.		
	Work with the Chinese and Taiwanese Governments on areas of non-compliance.		
	Conduct skipper and crew training on obligations arising from flag state, RFMOs, and licensing countries.		
Year 2	Pending the results of Task 5.1, development commenced on a proposal(s) to strengthen compliance by commencing development of sanctions for any instances where members repeatedly fall short in complying with WCPFC management measures.		
WCPFC plenary, 2021	Agree to enhance the reporting of member's non-compliance with management measures by the WCPFC, including the quality of member's reporting.		
Year 3	The WCPFC has commenced a process to develop sanctions for the WCPFC.		
Year 4	The WCPFC has adopted sanctions for non-compliance with WCPFC management measures.		
Year 5	<p>End of Year 5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The WCPFC has made a public in-depth summary of all non-compliances, including the quality of reporting; and II. sanctioned any member/s with repeated non-compliance with WCPFC management measures. 		



10. Workplan Implementation

Bumble Bee, FCF, O2, will work together to ensure the FIPs delivery of the Workplan although as noted above under Section 8.5. (Responsible Parties) this will depend on many actors outside of this project.

Bumble Bee will provide evidence that they have completed each Outcome Task at the end of the relevant year. If for some reason the milestones could not be met documented evidence of the progress will be provided, along with a rationale why the milestone was not met. And the milestone adjusted to meet the Outcome that fall behind schedule.

To this end, an MSC-accredited third-party will conduct a verification of progress every three years. O2 will report progress on implementation of the Workplan publicly every six months.