

Work Plan for the Pacific Ocean tuna – longline (Sky Vision) fishery

Version 0.3

Prepared by

by Key Traceability Ltd.

January 2021, Updated August 2022



Key Traceability Ltd.

+44 7505 122728

info@keytraceability.com

England Registered Company 09730288

70 Londesborough Road, Portsmouth, PO4 0EX

Ref. KT0112, Report 01, January 2021

Contents

Introduction	3
Overview of pre-assessment results	6
Introduction to FIP workplan.....	7
Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks	9
Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts	17
Principle 3: Effective management	20
Additional Impacts	2
Social impacts	2
Actions by priority.....	3
Budget.....	4
Glossary.....	6
Appendix A – Scoring of the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision).....	7

August 2022 update

This workplan has been updated in various sections to take into account a scope extension for the FIP which includes the flag state of Taiwan and the coastal state of the Solomon Islands. The scoring of these elements has been conducted in an addendum to the FIPs original pre-assessment. The scoring of these two new UOAs share similarities to that of other UOAs already within assessment, so in general, workplan tasks remain the same, however they are now extended to include Taiwan or the Solomon Islands where appropriate.

Introduction

The Pacific Ocean tuna – longline (Sky Vision) fishery targets north and south Pacific albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) bigeye (*T. obesus*), and WCPO yellowfin and EPO (*T. albacares*) tuna. The longline vessels are flagged to China, Fiji, Tuvalu Cook Islands, Vanuatu, and Taiwan and fish on the WCPO and EPO high seas and within the Vanuatu, Fiji, Tuvalu and Cook Islands, and Solomon Islands Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs). The fishery is managed regionally by both the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). The vessels are broken down below in Table 1.

Table 1 - Number of vessels by flag included in the FIP

Flag	Number of Vessels
China	7
Fiji	1
Cook Islands	1
Vanuatu	2
Taiwan	1
Tuvalu	tbc
Total	12+

The fishery under assessment is within the scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard (7.4 of the MSC Certification Process v2.2):

- The target species is not an amphibian, reptile, bird or mammal;
- The fishery does not use poisons or explosives;
- The fishery is not conducted under a controversial unilateral exemption to an international agreement;

- The client or client group does not include an entity that has been convicted for a forced or child labour violation in the last two years;
- The fishery has not been convicted for a shark finning violation in the last two years;
- The fishery has in place a mechanism for resolving disputes, and disputes do not overwhelm the fishery;
- The fishery is not an enhanced fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.2.12; and
- The fishery is not an introduced species-based fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.2.13.

Pelagic longline gear is used throughout the world's oceans to capture tuna and tuna-like species. Longline gear is typically deployed from a single vessel across many miles of ocean. The vessel deploys a single mainline that is periodically buoyed with floatation devices and thinner branch lines (with baited hooks) are then attached to the mainline between the floats. Within this simple framework, a variety of configurations and operational practices can be employed to specifically target different depths and species of fish. It is assumed (going by similar fisheries) a single set by vessels in the client fleet usually consists of a mainline around 135 - 150km in length with ca. 20 - 50 m long branch lines attached at intervals along the length of the line. The distance between floats is about 1km, with about 17 - 30 hooks between floats. The depth of main line ranges between 220 – 260 metres in the water column. Currently it is unknown if wider circle hooks rather than J-hooks are consistently used in the fishery, and if shark lines and wire leaders are banned. This will need to be further investigated to update this work-plan, if needed, in the near future through the FIP process.

The fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The report considers the following Units of Assessment (UoA):

- North Pacific stock of albacore fished in north Pacific Ocean (WCPO) caught by longliners with Chinese, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands and Taiwan-flagged vessels (high seas) and managed regionally by WCPFC and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) (at least five UoAs).
- South Pacific stock of albacore fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) caught by longliners with Chinese, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu Cook Islands, and Taiwan-flagged vessels (Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands, Solomon Islands EEZs and high seas) and managed regionally by WCPFC (at least 20 UoAs).
- WCPO stocks of bigeye tuna fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by longliners with Chinese, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands and Taiwan-flagged vessels (Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands EEZs and WCPO high seas) and managed regionally by WCPFC (at least 20 UoAs).
- WCPO stocks of yellowfin fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) caught by longliners with Chinese, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands and Taiwan-flagged vessels (Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands, and Solomon Islands EEZs and WCPO high seas) and managed regionally by WCPFC (at least 20 UoAs).
- EPO stocks of bigeye tuna fished in Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by longliners with Chinese, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands and Taiwan-flagged vessels (EPO high seas) and managed regionally by IATTC (at least five UoAs).

- EPO stocks of yellowfin tuna fished in Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by longliners with Chinese, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Cook Islands and Taiwan-flagged vessels (EPO high seas) and managed regionally by IATTC (at least five UoAs).

These UoAs could be further broken down by area of operations, i.e., EEZ or high seas, but this is a task for the full assessment and is not considered here.

Table 2. UoAs considered for this FIP

Species	Gear Type	Stock	Area	Flag	Total UoAs
Albacore	Longline	North Pacific	High Seas	China	At least 6
				Fiji	
				Vanuatu	
				Tuvalu	
				Cook Islands	
				Taiwan	
Albacore	Longline	South Pacific	High Seas	China	At least 20
			Fiji EEZ	Fiji	
			Vanuatu EEZ	Vanuatu	
			Tuvalu EEZ	Tuvalu	
			Cook Islands EEZ	Cook Islands	
			Solomon Islands EEZ	Taiwan	
Bigeye	Longline	WCPO	High Seas	China	At least 20
			Fiji EEZ	Fiji	
			Vanuatu EEZ	Vanuatu	
			Tuvalu EEZ	Tuvalu	
			Cook Islands EEZ	Cook Islands	
			Solomon Islands EEZ	Taiwan	
Yellowfin	Longline	WCPO	High Seas	China	At least 20
			Fiji EEZ	Fiji	

			Vanuatu EEZ	Vanuatu	
			Tuvalu EEZ	Tuvalu	
			Cook Islands EEZ	Cook Islands	
			Solomon Islands EEZ	Taiwan	
Bigeye	Longline	EPO	High Seas	China	At least 6
				Fiji	
				Vanuatu	
				Tuvalu	
				Cook Islands	
				Taiwan	
Yellowfin	Longline	EPO	High Seas	China	At least 5
				Fiji	
				Vanuatu	
				Tuvalu	
				Cook Islands	
				Taiwan	

Overview of pre-assessment results

The pre-assessment only considered publicly available data and no site visits or consultations with stakeholders were carried out. Data were collected from the WCPFC website and other publicly available studies. Additional information was obtained from existing MSC fishery assessments.

WCPO stocks of yellowfin and bigeye tuna and both albacore stocks would pass Principle 1, with two conditions per stock. All stocks are well above the Point of Recruitment Impairment (PRI) but EPO yellowfin and bigeye are not currently fluctuating around FMSY and therefore subject to the rebuilding PI scoring (PI 1.1.2). The continued lack of HCRs for tuna species continues to be the main issue for P1. The recent stock assessments / indicator assessments for EPO yellowfin and bigeye showed a possible drop in biomass below MSY, meaning a rebuilding plan needs to be put in place.

For Principle 2, primary and secondary species score well. All primary species are thought to be above the point of recruitment impairment (PRI), with suitable management in place. The Risk Based Framework (RBF) was used to score secondary bait species, which all scored well using a Productivity Susceptibility Analysis (PSA). The WCPO species outcome and information PIs failed due to the poor or unknown stock status of multiple ETP shark species, the vulnerability of those species to be captured in longline operations in the Pacific and the lack of fishery specific data to provide evidence to accurately describe fishery impacts. There is management in place for ETP species such as marine turtles and some shark species within the WCPO.

For Principle 3, the pre-assessment considered the WCPFC and IATTC management systems, which predicted scores of 80 or above for all PIs. All flag states were also assessed in this report with PNA being included to cover Tuvalu scoring. Fiji scored well and will pass Principle 3 without any conditions. Issues with lack of information hampered scoring for China and Taiwan. Likewise, the coastal states of Vanuatu, PNA, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands were assessed. Vanuatu, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands all received predicted scores that would currently be met at full assessment with conditions. PNA was predicted to receive a conditional pass on 3.2.3, Compliance and Enforcement.

In general, the key strengths of the fishery are:

- The regional governance and management of the fisheries is well documented and well implemented;
- Primary and secondary species stocks appear to be above PRI;
- Some flag states such as Fiji have very high observer coverage for longline operations (40% of vessel trips).

The key weaknesses in the fishery are:

- Lack of a formal harvest strategy and harvest control rules for the target stocks (bigeye, yellowfin and albacore);
- Lack of information on the ETP.
- Lack of information and possibly poorly managed flag states on the high seas in the case of China

In conclusion, two Performance Indicators in this assessment scored less than 60, which was for WCPO and EPO ETP species outcomes (PI 2.3.1) and ETP information (2.3.3) meaning this fishery would fail an MSC assessment. Likewise, China's aggregated scores are below 80 and would fail an MSC assessment without further information. Based on these results we would recommend that the fishery enters a Fishery Improvement Project to improve its scores in order to meet the MSC Fisheries Standard.

Introduction to FIP workplan

Based on the assessment, scoping document, and participant input, the fishery improvement project has developed this workplan with activities that will help it correct the deficiencies necessary to achieve its objectives. This addresses all of the gaps between fishery performance and the MSC Standard identified in the preassessment.

This workplan includes:

- FIP coordination to run the FIP by carrying out the actions listed below. Further to these actions, there are necessary FIP coordination tasks that need to be arranged such as hosting steering group and stakeholder meetings, updating FisheryProgress.org and supporting action implementation;
- Objectives - We recommend objectives focus on a time frame of five years (or less). Objectives will address all the fishery's environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of sustainability consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. We also recommend all fishery improvement projects work toward including traceability and addressing social issues as part of their objectives;

- A list of actions - Actions are major activities that must be completed to address the deficiencies identified in the need's assessment/pre-assessment. The workplan also includes tasks, which break actions down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished;
- Responsible parties - Organisations/people responsible for completing each action;
- Timeframes - An estimate of the timeframe needed to complete each action and/or task;
- An associated budget which estimates the main expenses for the FIP.

Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna
Action Goal	There is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Action Description	<p>This action has two goals associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sla – Having a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the EPO bigeye and yellowfin stock that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time. 2. Sib – There is evidence that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding the stock, or it is likely based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the stock within the specified timeframe so that SG80 is met. <p>Both require large levels of advocacy to the IATTC and flag states to conduct rebuilding scenarios and build robust, comprehensive rebuilding strategies to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.</p>
Expected Completion Date	January 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 8,000 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, to lobby the IATTC and WCPFC. Expenses to attend WCPFC and IATTC meetings estimated at a further \$6,000 per year.</p> <p>Year 2: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 5: As per year 1</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC, Flag state
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.1.1, 1.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.1a: Lobbying IATTC and flag state to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the IATTC in developing YFT re-building scenarios.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	March 2021		
1.1b: Lobbying IATTC and flag state for robust, comprehensive YFT rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	March 2021		
1.1c: Lobbying IATTC and flag state to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	March 2022		
1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the IATTC. Fishing mortality (F) is $<F_{MSY}$	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	March 2023		
1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually	FIP co-ordinator	IATTC	March 2022		

Action Number and Name	1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for South Pacific albacore, East and Western and Central Pacific bigeye and East and Western and Central Pacific yellowfin.
Action Goal	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place
Action Description	<p>The fishery should detail how the performance of the harvest strategy is currently monitored, reviews and where necessary amended in response to the state of the stock. A harvest strategy can then be developed from this review.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address Sla, explicit harvest strategies for tuna are to be designed. 2. To address Sib, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for tuna.
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: There will be costs involved in this action related to coordinating and holding meetings. Further, it will be necessary to create related FIP white papers and engagement strategies. A budget of US\$ 3,000 per flag per year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity. Plus US\$ 3,000 for expenses</p> <p>Year 2: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 5: none</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, RFMOs, Flag state
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.2a: Monitor and report on the WCPFC workplan for the adoption of HCRs and monitor and report on, and if appropriate to participate with, existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	May 2021		
1.2b: Engage with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling ALB, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	May 2021		
1.2c: Hold meetings with delegation members with the following purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Continuing to emphasise the importance of the harvest strategy process and YFT stock rebuilding to the FIP industry partners and other fisheries in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. ii. Proposing practical ways that the governments could support the process, e.g., via liaison to support capacity-building with Flag state, or other activities. Reporting regularly to the delegations so that they are kept informed of current ideas and proposals at RFMO and within Flag state where the industry partners have links. iii. Request that delegates support HS at RFMO meetings. 	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	May 2021		
1.2d: RFMO briefing Document on Harvest Strategies (2020). Prior to RFMO plenary 2020 produce a formal briefing document regarding the status of the harvest strategy / stock rebuilding for each stock, the objective of RFMO, the position of key players and likely upcoming proposals, and the outcome preferred by the FIP, to brief the governments and other stakeholders.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	May 2021		
1.2e: Position paper for a harvest control strategy and HCRs. Prepare a position paper to submit to plenary in support of making significant progress in developing a harvest strategy and control rules for all three	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	November 2021		

species, including rebuilding for the YFT. Work with the governments delegations to obtain their support for the paper, as well as that of other member states as far as possible.					
1.2f: Promote best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding. Promote through the governments a process of consultation to inform RFMO members about best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding, to build consensus towards support of proposals of management measures prior to RFMO Sessions.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	November 2021		
1.2g: Continue to advocate for progression of harvest strategy development. Intersessional discussions to progress the harvest strategies between like-minded RFMO members and organisations, and formally at the relevant RFMO meetings.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	November 2021		

Action Number and Name	1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna
Action Goal	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for all stocks of albacore bigeye and yellowfin tuna
Action Description	<p>The seasonal closure is likely to be sufficient to control the exploitation rate to ensure that the PRI is not reached, meeting SG60 for Slc. However, it cannot be argued to be likely to achieve the exploitation rates set out in the HCR (i.e., the reference points). If there is a stock recruitment relationship, which is a common assumption in many other tuna stock assessments, then effort would have to be reduced significantly.</p> <p>The FIP must undertake an initial review of the tools which are used to set the exploitation rate in the fishery as determined by the HCRs. This we will then be used to amend the tools in use to control the exploitation rate as defined by the HCR. These should then be implemented and periodically reviewed.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address Slb, HCRs are determined to be robust to main uncertainties for bigeye. 2. To address Slc, HCR tools are determined to be effective in achieving the exploitation levels under the HCRs for bigeye and yellowfin.
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: An estimate of US\$ 6,000 to pay for associated fees and an additional \$3,000 in expenses should be budgeted to complete the year one tasks for this action.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 3,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 3,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	RFMOs, Flag state

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action

1.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IATTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IATTC meeting.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2021		
<p>1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development for the implementation of Res. C-17-02 (or other proposal for a harvest strategy) (see action 1.2) to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of a HCR for the three species, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2021		
<p>1.3c: If necessary, provide an independent paper on the scope and needs of HCRs. Conduct a study to identify candidate HCRs and tools for all three species that meet the objective of action 3 for submission to the IATTC. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing ALB, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2021		

<p>1.3d: On-going engagement with Flag state and IATTC over HCR development. Discussions held regarding the assessment of HCRs and tools for all stocks, including how to address the assessment's findings have occurred through inter-sessional discussions and formally through the IATTC meeting process. To include Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IATTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IATTC meeting.</p> <p>HCR options considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally through IATTC meeting processes. IATTC record reflect discussions and progress. The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>December 2022</p>		
<p>1.3e: Independent evaluation of HCR robustness and effectiveness. Conduct further study to evaluate progress made in developing HCRs, focussing on their potential effectiveness in reducing exploitation levels when required, and their ability to account for uncertainties that might affect their implementation.</p> <p>HCRs for all three species discussed and agreed within IATTC and formally adopted as part of the harvest strategy implementation approach. The main uncertainties are considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally through IATTC meeting processes. IATTC records reflect discussions and progress.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>June 2025</p>		

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	2.1 – ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information
Action Goal	Ensure that all ETP species interacted with are taken into account and the fishery causes minimal impact to ETP species.
Action Description	<p>Due to the uncertainties highlighted in the pre-assessment and the needs of the FIP, one of the initial and immediate tasks is to obtain UoA logbook and observer data. This will be the first step to give an accurate score for ETP PIs. The data will be collected in coordination with the vessel owners and authorities. The data will be used to build a robust picture of the fishing mortality as well as species interactions and on which to base FIP activities related to attaining the MSC Standard. Should any additional data collection needs be identified then solutions to these (for example via EM) will be recommended and also subsequently added to the workplan.</p> <p>Understanding the species encountered will then enable the FIP to build a ETP management plan to ensure best practices are being used. This plan could include delivering skipper training etc. There will be some quantitative information through some logbook entries but particularly from observer records. Longline fisheries are historically poorly observed when compared with the purse seine operations and even more so on the high seas (although it should be noted that some flag state are well-above the minimum 5% observer coverage for longline fleets, for example Fiji with 40% of fleet trips observed and American Samoa with 20% of the same). At best there will be information adequate to support measure to manage ETP species, but no higher score can be awarded, especially without fishery-specific data for this assessment.</p>
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer data is estimated to be US\$ 5,000 per flag state over the course of the first few months of the FIP. A brief report explaining the findings will be created and shared with the FIP Participants highlighting gaps and recommending changes to the FIP documents as well as amended improvement actions. A budget of \$7,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken.</p> <p>Year 2: Further data analysis will need to be conducted in Year 2 around ETP species interaction and a budget of US\$ 7,000 is recommended.</p>

	Year 3: Subsequently a budget of US\$ 5,000 is recommended per year to update and review data. Year 4: Same as year 3 Year 5: Same as year 3
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, Fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.1a: Collect fishery specific data from fisheries and states and analyse this to better understand the impacts on ETP species and any evidence that the measures are being implemented or reviewed. Collect and provide catch, discard and interaction data relating to the Fishery UoA. The data should be sufficient to determine performance against all relevant PIs including ETP and others such as P3 catch locations.	FIP co-ordinator	Flag state, fishery	April 2021		
2.1b: Use this information to build an ETP species management plan, including materials for on board vessels on best practices and buy any equipment needed, go to consultation if necessary.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	September 2021		
2.1c: Collect evidence from FIP participants that shark finning is not taking place and validate the public shark finning policies.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	May 2021		

2.1d: Deliver skipper training to teach best practices, safe handling and release, species identification and other elements consistent with ISSF guidance.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	September 2021		
2.1e: Engage with RFMOs and flag state regarding improving the management of ETP species.	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Flag state	September 2021		
2.1f: Enhance scientific observer coverage of FIP participants through engaging with the human observer schemes or Electronic Monitoring. The aim is to ensure a representative sample of catch, discard and species interaction data is collected, reviewed and shared with relevant fishery authorities. The first milestone for this task is completion of an analysis of FIP vessels relating to human and electronic observers. This report should recommend scientifically robust levels of human and electronic observer coverage and review and include associated costs. Subsequent milestones for this task will be defined once the analysis has been carried out. They should include target levels of observer coverage and review across the fleets.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	RFMO, Flag state, fishery	September 2021		
2.2g: If necessary, carry out an Ecosystem Risk Assessment to determine if the fishery is making negative direct and indirect impacts and if so how to address them	FIP co-ordinator	External Fisheries Consultant	March 2022		
2.2h: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning ETP species.	FIP co-ordinator	Flag state, fishery	January 2022		

Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	3.1 Legal and/or customary framework for China
Action Goal	To fully understand the legal and/or customary framework for China and improve it to a level of SG80 if necessary.
Action Description	No evidence could be found on its transparency nor effectiveness so an initial fact finding is required to understand this, if not, advocacy must take place.
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: It is estimated that a budget of US\$ 15,000 is required to carry out the initial analysis plus extra US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, FIP participants and the national management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.1.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1a: Conduct a review of fishery dispute mechanisms of China with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan, as necessary.	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	October 2021		
3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of China with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan, as necessary.	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	October 2021		
3.1c: Hold regular stakeholder meetings to develop dispute mechanism where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2022		
3.1d: Hold regular stakeholder meetings to develop a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights into the management system where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2022		
3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is enshrined in legislation.	FIP coordinator	Ministry	June 2025		

3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is enshrined in legislation.	FIP coordinator	Ministry	June 2025		
---	-----------------	----------	-----------	--	--

Action Number and Name	3.2 Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for China, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands
Action Goal	To fully understand the Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for China, Cook Islands, and the Solomon Islands and improve it to a level of SG80 if necessary.
Action Description	No evidence could be found on Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for China, Cook Islands and the Solomon Islands, so an initial fact finding is required to understand this, if not, advocacy must take place.
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: It is estimated that a budget of US\$ 15,000 is required to carry out the initial analysis plus extra US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required. Year 2: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required Year 3: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required Year 4: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required Year 5: US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, FIP participants and the national management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	------------------------	----------------------------------

3.2a: Review the degree to which all roles and responsibilities within the fishery are clearly defined. Consult with industry and other stakeholders to ascertain how well the functions and responsibilities are understood.	FIP coordinator / FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	October 2021		
3.2b: Identify all relevant stakeholders to the fishery.	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	October 2021		
3.2c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework clearly identify the role publicly.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022		
3.1d: Develop a strategy to ensure and encourage wider engagement and representation in consultations.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022		
3.1e: Ensure the fishery management plan clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.	FIP coordinator	Ministry	October 2023		
3.1f: Periodically review the efficacy of the consultation process.	FIP coordinator	Ministry	October 2024		

Action Number and Name	3.3 Decision-making processes for China, Cook Islands, and the Solomon Islands
Action Goal	Decision-making processes for China, Cook Islands, and the Solomon Islands 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 (SIb).
Action Description	<p>The action potentially covers four scoring issues from PI 3.2.2. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard.</p> <p>Due primarily to limited information on the management process, we are unable to determine if the precautionary approach is to be applied in this fishery.</p>
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 10,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 10,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, national management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.3a: Conduct review of the decision-making processes in China and Cook Islands and the Solomon islands to fully understand gaps identified in pre-assessment. The reviews should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the process transparent, timely & evidence-based? 2. Does the decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation? 3. Does it include the precautionary approach and use of best science available? 4. Input from management authorities and other relevant stakeholders. 5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery. <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant		October 2021		
<p>3.3b: Define decision-making processes in the management plan. The process shall include, if necessary, how will evidence be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation). 2. Stakeholders be consulted. 	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022		

<p>3. Utilised from best-available information to ensure the precautionary approach</p> <p>4. Outcomes be communicated (information should be made available on request and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity).</p> <p>5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary.</p> <p>6. Precautionary approach in management plan.</p>					
<p>3.3c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate above into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>December 2023</p>		
<p>3.3d: Implement the decision-making process, ensuring stakeholder are consulted and informed (for example via email, website, formal report etc.) best-available information (from RFMOs, research etc.) and the precautionary approach are included.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>March 2024</p>		
<p>3.3e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2025</p>		

Action Number and Name	3.4 Compliance and enforcement for China, PNA, Vanuatu and Taiwan
Action Goal	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence.
Action Description	Based on the information available, sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied, SG60 requirements are therefore met. However, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude they are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence. The FIP will need to provide this evidence and if lacking work with authorities to improve enforcement.
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: Costs for the first year are estimated to be higher than later years in order to carry out the analysis for all three countries¹. Subsequent follow-ups and advocacy costs in later years should be lower. Budget for year one is estimated to be US\$ 10,000.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 5,000 (performance review)</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 1,000</p>
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

¹ See note in introduction regarding flag states and this current workplan.

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.6a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries. This should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MCS plans and strategies. 2. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.). 3. Interviews with enforcement personnel. 4. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions and/or court proceedings. 5. Any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems. <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	October 2021		
3.6b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022		
3.6c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2023		

<p>3.6d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP coordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2024</p>		
<p>3.6e: Review effectiveness of MCS system implemented and adjust where necessary. A report should be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary (i.e., 9c).</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP coordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2025</p>		

Action Number and Name	3.5 Monitoring and management performance evaluation for China and Vanuatu
Action Goal	The fishery-specific management systems of China and Vanuatu are subject to regular internal and occasional external review.
Action Description	<p>The management system has internal processes to evaluate management performance. These include evaluations of policy, research, operations, compliance and enforcement. These are carried out on a regular basis. SG80 is therefore met for Sla.</p> <p>There is no evidence of any external reviews, which is not to say that there have not been any. In the absence of information SG80 cannot be met for Sib. The action covers one scoring issue from PI 3.2.4. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard (Sib).</p> <p>For Vanuatu, 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 that the sanctions are either effective and provide effective deterrence or insufficient to identify offenders. Observer reports from 2014 were the most recent that the Fisheries Division had available. The observer coverage was only 2.7% which is well below the 5% regional requirement. SG80 could not be awarded on this basis for Sic.</p>
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 10,000</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 2,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.4
---------------------------------------	-------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.7a: Review fishery-specific management processes currently in place. Ascertain whether these systems are subject to internal and/or external review, the format, the areas already reviewed (tuna management plan, performance, decision-making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these occur.</p> <p>A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant		October 2021		
3.7b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on findings of report.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	October 2022		
3.7c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	June 2023		

progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.					
3.7d: Implement finalised plan with binding commitment and requirements to undertake reviews where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure regular internal and occasional external reviews from relevant bodies.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	October 2024		
3.7e: Review effectiveness of review system implemented and adjust where necessary. A report should be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	October 2025		

Additional Impacts

Some FIPs include objectives that go beyond the MSC PIs.

Social impacts

As social issues become a larger issue within the fishery world, we view FIPs should take a holistic approach and include social elements. This additional impact can be seen below:

Addition Impact	Labour rights
Status Summary	Currently labour conditions are unknown, an additional fact-finding operation will take place to better understand any possible issues and how we could resolve them.
Improvement Recommendation	Await results from the fact finding to better understand improvements needed. Implement work to ensure compliance such as grievance procedures in place etc.

Actions by priority

Table 3 - High priority actions for the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision)

Action Number and Name		Priority	PI addressed
2.1	ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information	High	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Table 4 – Medium priority actions for the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision)

Action Number and Name		Priority	PI Addressed
1.1	Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna	High	1.1.1, 1.1.2
1.2	Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for South Pacific albacore, East and Western and Central Pacific bigeye and East and Western and Central Pacific yellowfin.	Medium	1.2.1
1.3	Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna	Medium	1.2.2
3.1	Legal and customary framework for China	Medium	3.1.1
3.2	Consultation, roles and responsibilities for China, Cook Islands, and Solomon Islands	Medium	3.1.2
3.3	Decision making process for China, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands	Medium	3.2.2
3.4	Compliance and enforcement for PNA, China, Vanuatu and Taiwan	Medium	3.2.3
3.5	Management performance evaluation for China and Vanuatu	Medium	3.2.4

Budget

The below table lays out the budget as suggested in this workplan. Assumptions were made and this budget is inclusive of possible costs, note electronic monitoring is not included and would be a separate budget stream.

Table 5 - Budget for the Pacific Ocean longline tuna (Sky Vision) fishery

Action Number and Name		Year 1 (US\$)	Year 2 (US\$)	Year 3 (US\$)	Year 4 (US\$)	Year 5 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
FIP Coordination		39,000	39,000	39,000	27,000	27,000	171,000
1.1	Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	75,000
1.2	Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for South Pacific albacore, East and Western and Central Pacific bigeye and East and Western and Central Pacific yellowfin.	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	0	72,000
1.3	Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna	9,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	15,000
2.1	ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information	32,000	7,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	54,000
3.1	Legal and/or customary framework for China	15,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	35,000
3.2	Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for China, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands	15,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	35,000
3.3	Decision-making processes for China, Cook Islands and Solomon Islands	10,000	10,000	0	1,000	0	21,000
3.4	Compliance and enforcement for China, PNA, Vanuatu and Taiwan	10,000	4,000	0	5,000	1,000	20,000
3.5	Monitoring and management performance	10,000	2,000	0	1,000	0	13,000

	evaluation for China and Vanuatu						
Total (US\$)		173,000	105,000	90,000	82,000	61,000	511,000

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](#)).

Basic FIP: A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing a specific set of the fishery's environmental challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. Basic FIPs complete a needs assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery

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: A performance indicator evaluates the success of a particular activity when compare 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.

Appendix A – Scoring of the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision)

Table 6 - Principle 1 list of scoring for the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision)

Component	PI number	Performance Indicator	WCPO BET	WCPO YFT	EPO BET	EPO YFT	SP ALB	NP ALB
Outcome	1.1.1	Stock Status						
	1.1.2	Stock Rebuilding	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A
Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy						
	1.2.2	HCR and Tools						
	1.2.3	Information and Monitoring						
	1.2.4	Assessment of Stock Status						

Key

Pass without conditions	
Pass with conditions	
Fail	

N/A – Not Applicable

Table 7 - Principle 2 list of scoring for the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision)

Component	Performance Indicator number	Performance Indicator	Predicted scores
Primary Species	2.1.1	Outcome	
	2.1.2	Management	
	2.1.3	Information	
Secondary Species	2.2.1	Outcome	
	2.2.2	Management	
	2.2.3	Information	
ETP Species	2.3.1	Outcome	
	2.3.2	Management	
	2.3.3	Information	
Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome	
	2.4.2	Management	
	2.4.3	Information	
Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome	
	2.5.2	Management	
	2.5.3	Information	

Table 8 - Principle 3 list of scoring for the Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery (Sky Vision).

			WCPFC	IATTC	PN A	China	Vanuatu	Cook Islands	Fiji	Solomon Islands *	Taiwan *
Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and Customary Framework									
	3.1.2	Consultation, Roles & Responsibilities									
	3.1.3	Long Term Objectives									
Fishery Specific Management System	3.2.1	Fishery Specific Objectives				N/A					
	3.2.2	Decision Making Process									
	3.2.3	Compliance and Enforcement									
	3.2.4	Management Performance Evaluation									

*The Solomon Islands and Taiwan scoring added as of August 2022.