



















UPDATED ACTION PLAN FIP SPINY LOBSTER OF HONDURAS

Document prepared by



Miguel Espíndola & Gonzalo Olea October, 2021





















Summary

For FIPs pursuing MSC sustainability certification or also called comprehensive FIPs, the fysheryprogress.org platform requires that for all those indicators of the MSC standard that are rated below 80, there must be at least one linked action to improve that indicator. It is expected that the implementation of these actions will lead to an improvement in the rating of the performance indicators of the standard.

For the case of the spiny lobster (*Panulirus argus*) fishery with traps from Honduras, a FIP was developed based on the gaps identified in the pre-assessment prepared in 2011 (Valle-Esquivel, 2011). A first version of the Action Plan was carried out in 2016 (Hervás, 2016), subsequently the fulfillment of the actions was reviewed in 2018 (Gozzer & Hernández, 2018). The present document corresponds to the updated version of the FIP work plan for the spiny lobster (*Panulirus argus*) fishery with traps from Honduras.

For the reading of this document, it is important to consider the elements included in the FIP work plan, which are:

- 1. **Actions:** Defined as a major activity in the FIP work plan to be completed to address specific deficiencies identified in the MSC pre-assessment. Actions are linked to the performance indicators of the MSC Fisheries Standard.
- 2. **Completion dates:** To ensure accountability, an expected completion date should be included for each action.
- 3. Priority: High, medium or low priority are defined considering the updated score defined in the 3-year audit report.
- 4. Estimated cost: Costs for each action.
- 5. **Responsible parties:** Organizations/individuals responsible for completing the actions agreed upon by the FIP stakeholders.
- 6. MSC PIs: All PIs to be addressed by the action.
- 7. **Tasks:** This section breaks down the actions identified into specific steps that describe how the action will be carried out. Tasks provide more clarity on how the FIP intends to complete each action. This allows participants to better track progress over time and communicate about progress made in the FIP.





















Table 1. Workplan Overview

| Version and date of the Work Plan | Version 3 - October 2021 |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Start date | End date |
| July, 2012 | December, 2023 |
| FIP Leader | Recommended improvements in |
| WWF | Meeting with stakeholders |
| FIP Coordinator | Workplan developed by |
| WWF | Centro de investigación Ecos |





















Acronyms

| APESCA | Fishing Industry Association |
|----------------|--|
| BCH | Central Bank of Honduras |
| CEM | Center for Marine Studies |
| CSA | Consequence Scale Analysis |
| DIGEPESCA | General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture |
| ECOLANGOSTA + | Subproject Ecosystem Approach to the Caribbean Spiny Lobster Fishery |
| ETP | Endangered, Threatened or Protected |
| FIP | Fishery Improvement Project |
| HCR | Harvest Control Rules |
| INDNR | Illegal Unregulated Unreported Fishery |
| INPESCA | Nicaraguan Institute of Fisheries and Aquaculture |
| MARPLESCA | Caribbean Spiny Lobster Subregional Management Pilot Project |
| SCV | Monitoring, Control and Surveillance |
| MSC | Marine Stewardship Council |
| OSPESCA | Organization of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector of the Central American isthmus |
| Plan MARPLESCA | Regional Fishery Management Plan for Caribbean Spiny Lobster (Panulirus argus) |
| RBF | Risk Assessment Framework |
| SICA | Central American Integration System |
| SICA | Scale Intensity Consequence Analysis |
| SIG | Geographic Information System |
| SIGMEPH | Honduran Fishing Vessel Monitoring System |
| UNAH | National Autonomous University of Honduras |
| UoA | Unit of Assessment |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |
| | |





















Unidad de evaluación

Table 2. Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)

| UoA | Description |
|--|---|
| Target species (common and scientific name) | Caribbean spiny lobster (Panulirus argus) |
| Stock | West Central Atlantic Caribbean Lobster |
| Geographical area | Atlantic Territorial Waters and Exclusive Economic Zone of Honduras |
| Fishing method or gear type | Traps |
| Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock | Industrial fishing fleet with traps |





















FIP actions

FIP Actions for Principle 1 - Sustainable populations

Table 3. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 1.2 Development of monitoring procedures for lobster biology and fishing activity.

| Action Number and Name | 1.2 Development of lobster biology and fishery monitoring procedures | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Goal of the action | Regularly monitor the biology of species and fisheries data to feed into development of stock assessment methods. | |
| | This action has been adapted in order to optimize the efforts made by DIGEPESCA to collect information on the | |
| | fishery. Thus, the "Catch Report" which gathers information on the fleet's landings is collected by the Statistics Unit, | |
| | while more specific information is collected by the Research Department through the "Fishing Logbook". In this sense, | |
| | to carry out tasks 3 and 4, these institutions should jointly design and coordinate the use of instruments for the | |
| | collection of information in order to simplify the fishermen's declaration and optimize the available resources. | |
| Description of the action | | |
| | To complement the collection of information from the fishermen, Task 41 has been proposed, which consists of | |
| | designing and implementing a socialization program to achieve adequate compliance with the declarations. | |
| | On the other hand, Task 5 refers to the collection of information to establish the size structure of the catches, which | |
| | is carried out in the processing plants and must follow the protocols already established in the Marplesca Plan. | |
| Expected compliance date | June, 2022 | |
| Priority | High | |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 150,000 | |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Shipowners, Processing Plants | |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 1.2.3 Information and monitoring | |





















| Action | Task/milestone | | Responsible | e Date | |
|--|---|-----------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| 1.2 Development of monitoring procedures for lobster biology and | M3: Implementation of a landing log system for the total catch of lobsters. | DIGEPESCA | Shipowners | Jul 21 | May 22 |
| fishing activity. | M4: Monitoring of Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE) | DIGEPESCA | Shipowners | Jul 21 | May 22 |
| | M5: Biological sampling of the catch | DIGEPESCA | Process plants | Jul 21 | Jun 22 |
| | M41: Socialization workshops | DIGEPESCA | Shipowners | Jul 21 | May 22 |

Table 4. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 1.3 Lobster Stock Assessment

| Action Number and Name | 1.3 Lobster stock assessment | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Goal of the action | Quantitatively evaluate the stock status and estimate reference points to be used to manage the fishery | |
| | From this action, the only remaining tasks are to carry out a stock assessment establishing the status of the spiny | |
| | lobster population based on Biological Reference Points. This should be done for the Honduras/Nicaragua platform. | |
| Description of the action | | |
| | It is worth mentioning that this action affects IC 2.5.1 since in the SICA ¹ analysis it is established that a good score of IC | |
| | 1.1.1 will help to ensure an unconditional pass in IC 2.5.1. | |
| Expected compliance date | June, 2022 | |
| Priority | High | |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 15,000 | |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, INPESCA, Binational Technical Group (Honduras Nicaragua) | |

¹ Hervás. 2020. Evaluación del riesgo de impacto de la nasa sobre los ecosistemas en Honduras mediante la aplicación del método de Análisis de Escala Intensidad y Consecuencia (SICA) del Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)





















| | | 1.1.1 Stock status |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N | MSC IDs associated with the action | 1.2.4 Assessment of stock status |
| | | 2.5.1 Ecosystem Outcome |

| Action | Action Task/milestone | | Responsible | | Date | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------|--|------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion | |
| 1.3 Lobster stock assessment | M7: Application of agreed assessment method for lobster stock at the Honduras-Nicaragua level. The status of the stock shall be assessed against limit and target reference points. | DIGEPESCA | INPESCA, Binational Technical Group (Honduras Nicaragua) | April, 2018 | December, 2021 | |
| | M34: Definition of limit and target reference points for the entire Honduras/Nicaragua Platform | DIGEPESCA | INPESCA, Binational Technical Group (Honduras Nicaragua) | January, 2021 | June, 2022 | |

Table 5. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 2.1 Review of the effectiveness of current conservation measures.

| Action Number and Name | 2.1 Review of the Effectiveness of current conservation measures |
|---------------------------|--|
| Goal of the action | Carry out an analysis of the effectiveness of conservation measures in place for the lobster fishery in Honduras. |
| Description of the action | This action refers to an analysis of the current management measures, which in practice implies research studies to update the information on the reproductive cycle of lobster in the Honduras-Nicaragua platform to establish the suitability of the biological closure and minimum legal size. On the other hand, it is necessary to define the measure that will allow the establishment of a Harvest Control Rule, which is typically used to control fishing mortality (quota) or effort control. Given the complexity of this research, this action should be proposed within the framework of regional work with the support of OSPESCA. |
| Expected compliance date | May, 2022 |
| Priority | Low |





















| Estimated cost (\$US) | 90,000 | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Binational Technical Group (Honduras Nicaragua), OSPESCA | |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 2.3 Information and monitoring | |
| | 1.2.1 Harvest strategy | |
| | 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools | |

| Action Task/milestone | | Responsible | | Date | |
|--|---|-------------|---|------------|---------------------|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| 2.1 Review of the effectiveness of current conservation measures | M8: Analysis of the effectiveness of the measures implemented for the conservation of the lobster population. | DIGEPESCA | Binational Technical Group (Honduras Nicaragua, OSPESCA | July, 2021 | May, 2022 |
| | M9: Selection of conservation measures to be used for the implementation of Harvest Control Rules and tools. | DIGEPESCA | Binational Technical Group (Honduras Nicaragua, OSPESCA | July, 2021 | May, 2022 |

Table 6. Performance indicator action plan for action 2.2 Harvest control rules.

| Action Number and Name | 2.2 Harvest control rules |
|---------------------------|--|
| Goal of the action | Development and implementation of Harvest Control Rules |
| Description of the action | This action refers to carrying out a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE), which implies generating an Operational Model of the fishery that simulates the behavior of the population, considering the main sources of uncertainty, in the face of Harvest Control Rule (HCR) that are applicable to the fishery, and on the other hand, the formal implementation of the HCR. If a status lower than B _{MSY} is established, the HCR should consider a recovery strategy in a period less than one generation of the lobster population. |





















| | At present, it is expected to have the HCR in force through the fishery management plan (priority task) and subsequently carry out the MSE that could be an input to adapt the HCR already implemented, after a fishing season |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | is in force. |
| Expected compliance date | June, 2023 |
| Priority | High |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 30.000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, National group |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 1.1.1 Stock status |
| | 1.1.2 Stock rebuilding |
| | 1.2.1 Harvest strategy |
| | 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools |
| | 1.2.4 Assessment of stock status |

| Action | Task/milestone | Responsible | | Date | |
|---------------------------|--|-------------|---|------------------|---------------------|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| 2.2 Harvest control rules | M10: Design and evaluation of harvest control rules. | DIGEPESCA | Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group | June, 2021 | December, 2022 |
| | M11: Implementation of harvest control rules | DIGEPESCA | | December 2021 | June, 2023 |





















FIP Actions for Principle 2 - Minimization of environmental impact

Table 7. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 3.4 Collect necessary information and evaluate the impact of the fishery on bycatch and ecosystem (New action to replace Action 3.2 and part of Action 3.3 (M15)).

| Action Number and Name | 3.4 Collect necessary information and evaluate the impact of the fishery on bycatch (New action to replace Action 3.2 and part of Action 3.3 (M15)). |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Goal of the action | Understand the impact of the fishery on bycatch and the interaction with ETP species. |
| Description of the action | During the stakeholder meeting, it was stated that there was a very low feasibility of implementing an on-board observer program as originally proposed in the FIP Workplan. Because of this, it was agreed to replace this activity (3.2) with an investigation to establish the list of species that are caught as bycatch in the fishery and the proportion of catch of these species with respect to the total catch, in addition to gathering information about the existence of interactions with ETP species and the nature of these interactions, if any. This requires a sampling design that is representative of the habitats where the fishery operates. The study should generate the necessary inputs to clarify that the fisheries bycatch is not composed of primary or secondary main species. In addition, this information should ensure that the impacts of the UoA on ETP species are negligible, as has been observed in other trap lobster fisheries operating on the same stock. Finally, the information gathered should be used as a basis for the development of a risk-based analysis (RBF) to understand the impacts that the UoA generates on non-target species. |
| Expected compliance date | June 2023 |
| Priority | High |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 50,000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 2.1.3 primary species information 2.2.1 Secondary species outcome 2.2.3 Secondary species information 2.3.3 ETP species information |





















| Action | Task/milestone | Responsible | | Date | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| 3.4 Collect necessary information and evaluate the impact of the fishery on bycatch and ecosystem (New action to replace action 3.1 and part of action 3.2 (M15)). | M42: Scientific study to generate a list of species present in the bycatch and their proportion of the total catch. | DIGEPESCA | MAR2R, UNAH | January, 2022 | June 2023 |
| | M43: Conduct risk-based analysis (RBF) of species that make up the bycatch. | DIGEPESCA | MAR2R | December, 2022 | January, 2023 |

Table 8. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 3.3. Implementation of impact mitigation measures (Bycatch and ETP).

| Action Number and Name | 3.3 Implementation of impact mitigation measures (if necessary) |
|---------------------------|--|
| Goal of the action | Implementation of measures to reduce bycatch, as well as minimize interactions with ETP species (if necessary). |
| Description of the action | In case it is determined that the UoA generates a moderate or high risk on any of the species that make up the bycatch (RBF result), management measures must be designed and implemented with the objective of minimizing the mortality of these species. On the other hand, if the research defined in M42 reports interactions with ETP species, management measures should be designed and implemented to minimize their mortality. |
| Expected compliance date | June, 2023 |
| Priority | High |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 10,000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, National |





















| MSC IDs associated with the action | 2.1.2 Primary species - Management Strategy |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | 2.2.2 Secondary species - Management Strategy |
| | 2.3.2 ETP species - Management Strategy |

| Action | Task/milestone | Responsible | | Date | |
|---|--|-------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| Implementation of impact mitigation measures (Bycatch and ETP). | M16: Design and implement management measures with the objective of minimizing the mortality of bycatch species, as well as minimizing interactions with ETP species (if necessary). | | MAR2R, UNAH | January, 2023 | December, 2023 |

Table 9. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 4.1. Monitoring the impact of lobster traps on habitats and ecosystems

| Action Number and Name | 4.1. Monitoring the impact of lobster traps on habitats and ecosystems |
|---------------------------|--|
| Goal of the action | Generate information for habitat and ecosystem |
| Description of the action | For this Action, M17: Review of available information/literature on the impact of lobster traps in other areas and M18: a) Development of habitat map b) Mapping of fishing effort distribution for lobster trap fleet were completed in 2017 as reported in the 2018 Revised FIP Action Plan. The 2018 FIP Action Plan also added one additional milestone: M35: Review of information on the impact of traps on the ecosystem of the Honduran Caribbean Sea, which is still yet to be completed. |
| | Before carrying out the SICA, it was anticipated that the disposition of traps in coral reefs could have a relevant impact on the ecosystem. However, the SICA report, completed in December 2020, shows that fishing is the activity that could be generating the greatest impact, mainly on the food web and not on coral reefs. |





















| | Therefore, the remaining task of the action (M35) aims to Identify lobster predators and prey and their roles in the ecosystem. In this way, it will be possible to understand the effect of fishing on the food chain and will help to fully understand the key elements of the ecosystem and the main impacts of UoA on these elements. |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Expected compliance date | December, 2023 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 10,000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 2.4.3 Habitat Information |
| | 2.5.3 Ecosystem Information |

| | Task/milestone | Responsible | | Date | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Action | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| 4.1. Monitoring the impact of lobster traps on habitats and ecosystems | M35: Review of information on the impact of traps on the ecosystem of the Honduran Caribbean Sea. | DIGEPESCA | MAR2R, WWF | January, 2022 | December, 2023 |

Table 10. Performance indicator action plan for action 4.3. Implementation of impact mitigation measures (habitats and ecosystems).

| Action Number and Name | 4.3. Implementation of impact mitigation measures (habitats and ecosystems) |
|---------------------------|---|
| Goal of the action | Implementation of measures to mitigate the impact on habitats and ecosystems. |
| | This action consists of designing and implementing management measures with the objective of minimizing the |
| Description of the action | impact on habitats and ecosystems. The results and recommendations of the CSA and SICA analyses should be |
| | considered (M17 and M36). |
| Expected compliance date | July, 2022 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 10,000 |





















| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group |
|------------------------------------|--|
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 2.4.1 Habitat Outcome |
| | 2.4.2 Habitat sp. Management Strategy |
| | 2.5.1 Ecosystem Outcome |
| | 2.5.2 Ecosystem sp. management strategy |

| | | Responsible | | Da | Date | |
|--|--|-------------|---|------------|---------------------|--|
| Action | Task/Milestone | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion | |
| 4.3. Implementation of impact mitigation | M20: If necessary, implement conservation measures to minimize impacts on habitats and ecosystems. | DIGEPESCA | Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group | June, 2021 | July, 2022 | |

FIP Actions for Principle 3 - Effective management

Table 11. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 5.2 Consultation procedures.

| Action Number and Name | 5.2 Consultation procedures |
|---------------------------|--|
| Goal of the action | Develop inclusive consultation procedures for stakeholder participation. |
| | The pre-assessment concluded that consultation processes are not transparent, so it will be important to ensure that |
| Description of the action | stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process to obtain an unconditional pass. |





















| | The objective of this activity is to establish inclusive stakeholder participation processes, which should be integral into the management decision-making process. To improve the participation process, the implementation of Consultative Committee for the Honduran spiny lobster fishery is proposed. This mechanism is planned to incorporated as part of the Management Plan. Because of this, a new task is included to provide a regulate framework for these processes (M44). Although it was not an original objective of this action, the foregoing would make it unnecessary to reform the fish law (M37) since with the development of the regulation it is expected to improve the conflict resolution processes. | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Expected compliance date | December, 2021 | |
| Priority | High | |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 10,000 | |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group | |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 3.1.1 Legal and customary framework 3.1.2 Consultation, roles and responsibilities 3.2.2 Decision-making processes | |

| | | Re | esponsible | Date | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------|
| Action | Task/Milestone | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| | M23: Establishing a participation group for stakeholders | DIGEPESCA | Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group | December, 2021 | June, 2022 |
| 5.2 Consultation procedures | M24: Stakeholder working group (Consultant Committee for sustainable management of Honduras spiny lobster) to implement management measures | Consultative Committee | DIGEPESCA | December, 22 | June, 2023 |





















| M44 Establish a regulation that considers mechanisms for stakeholder participation (Consultative Committee). | DIGEPESCA | | July, 2021 | July, 22 |
|--|-----------|--|------------|----------|
|--|-----------|--|------------|----------|

Table 12. Performance Indicators Action Plan for Action 6.1 Adaptation of OSPESCA's Regional Fisheries Management Plan

| Action Number and Name | 6.1 Adaptation of the regional Fishery Management Plan of OSPESCA |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Goal of the action | Development of Spiny Lobster Fishery Management at National level adapted from Regional Lobster Fisheries Management (MARPLESCA-OSPESCA) |
| Description of the action | This action is at an advanced stage and consists of the promulgation of a Management Plan for the fishery that considers the recommendations contained in the MARPLESCA Plan, as well as CSA and SICA reports. |
| Expected compliance date | December, 2022 |
| Priority | High |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 10,000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Honduras National Spiny Lobster Working Group |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 1.1.2 Stock rebuilding 1.2.1 Harvest strategy 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools 2.4.2 Habitat management strategy 2.5.2 Ecosystem management strategy 3.2.1 Specific fishery objectives 3.2.2 Decision-making processes |

| | | Re | sponsible | Da | te |
|--------|----------------|--------|-----------------|----------|------------|
| Action | Task/Milestone | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected |
| | | | | | completion |





















| 6.1 Adaptation of the OSPESCA Regional Fishery Management Plan | M25: Development of a Lobster Fishery Management Plan | DIGEPESCA | OSPESCA | June, 2021 | December, 2022 |
|--|--|-----------|---------|------------|-------------------|
|--|--|-----------|---------|------------|-------------------|

Table 13. Performance Indicator Action Plan for Action 6.2 Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS).

| Action Number and Name | 6.2 Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) |
|---------------------------|---|
| Goal of the action | Implementation of MCS to ensure the application and enforcement of management measures for the fishery. |
| | MCS implementation to ensure the application and enforcement of management measures for the fishery. |
| | As part of the 2012 Action Plan for the improvement of the lobster fishery, a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities |
| | and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the MCS system has been conducted (Occhiena Pineda, 2016) ² . The analysis provides |
| | a series of recommendations to improve the implementation capacity of the MCS system for the Honduran lobster |
| | fishery. The milestones included in this activity are based on the recommendations of Pineda Occhiena (2016). |
| | M26 consists of including in the programming of the DIGEPESCA Annual Operational Plan MCS activities the following: |
| | - Surveillance activities at sea with the support of patrol boats and Naval Officers of the FNH (Fuerza Naval Honduras). |
| Description of the action | - Inspection activities in the main landing ports of the industrial lobster fleet and mother ships. |
| Description of the action | - Inspection activities to the main lobster commercial establishments (hotels, restaurants, supermarkets, markets, |
| | fishmongers, plants) in La Ceiba, Roatan, Guanaja Tegucigalpa and San Pedro Sula, during the closed and fishing seasons. |
| | - Training activities for naval officers who carry out inspection tasks in fishing grounds. |
| | |
| | M27 consists of strengthening inter-institutional cooperation between actors such as DIGEPESCA, the Navy, the Ports |
| | and civil society observers (fishermen), which will allow for greater inter-institutional cooperation. Currently there is |

² Pineda-Occhiena, M. P. 2016a. Análisis FODA de la actual Estrategia de Monitoreo, Control y Vigilancia (MCV) aplicada a la pesquería de la langosta espinosa *Panulirus argus* de Honduras y recomendaciones para el mejoramiento. WWF Mesoamérica, Marzo, 2016. 15pp.





















already cooperation between these institutions during the fishing season and closed season, therefore it is considered that these institutions have been functioning as a proper committee, so this task is considered complete.

M28 consists of developing a training program for fisheries inspectors. The training program will aim to strengthen the inspectors' capacities in the use of data collection forms in establishments (supermarkets, hotels, restaurants, fish markets and markets, processing plants) and the compilation of inspection reports and data entry. It is important to mention at this point those inspectors are trained periodically, but it is recommended that a program be drafted to define the objectives of the training process, as well as the frequency of these actions.

M29 uses the Geographic Information System (GIS) and the Monitoring of Fishing Vessels of Honduras (SIGMEPH) as a tool for the MCS System. Occhiena Pineda (2016)³ recommends that SIGMEPH be part of the Department of Control and Surveillance. This will facilitate the use of SIGMEPH in the application of sanctions that will provide effective deterrence. Regarding this point, it was indicated in the meeting with stakeholders that the SGMEPH was operational in DIGEPESCA, but that licenses have expired, so in order to move forward on this matter, reactivation of the license by DIGEPESCA is required.

M30 addresses the need to achieve a high level of compliance by the fishing fleet. This requires the development of a training program in the prevention of IUU fishing. Fishermen should receive information on lobster fishing regulations through an educational campaign.

| | regulations through an educational campaign. |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Expected compliance date | December, 2022 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 10,000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA, Navy, Merchant Marine |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 3.2.3. Compliance and enforcement |

³ Pineda-Occhiena, M. P. 2016b. Diseño de Estudio Nacional para la Evaluación de la Pesca Ilegal, No Declarada, No Reglamentada (INDNR) de la Langosta Espinosa (*Panulirus argus*) en Honduras. Pp. 35





















| Action | Task/Milestone | Responsible | | Date | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | | Leader | Supporting role | Starting | Expected completion |
| 6.2 Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) | M26: Inclusion of DIGEPESCA's Annual Work Plan for MCS activities programming. | DIGEPESCA | Navy, Merchant Marine | December, 2021 | July, 2022 |
| | M27: Strengthened inter- institutional cooperation- COMPLETED | DIGEPESCA | | COMPLETED | August 2017 |
| | M28: Developing a training program for fisheries inspectors | DIGEPESCA | Navy, Merchant Marine | June, 2021 | December, 2021 |
| | M29: Implementation of SIGMEPH as a tool of the MCS system. | DIGEPESCA | Navy, Merchant Marine | June, 2021 | December, 2022 |
| | M30: IUU fishing training | DIGEPESCA | Navy, Merchant Marine | June, 2021 | December, 2022 |
| | M39: Design and implementation of methodology to estimate undeclared fisheries by DIGEPESCA, preparation of periodic reports of the request and presentation to interested parties | DIGEPESCA | | June, 2021 | December, 2023 |
| | M40: Systematization in databases of infractions for illegal fishing of hydrobiological resources in Honduras. | DIGEPESCA | | June, 2021 | December, 2023 |

Table 14. Performance indicators action plan for action 6.3. Monitoring and management of performance evaluation





















| Action Number and Name | 6.3. Monitoring and management of the performance evaluation. |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Goal of the action | Monitor and evaluate performance of the fishery management system. |
| Description of the action | The pre-assessment concluded the absence of a system to monitor and evaluate the performance of the management system. However, in one of the sectoral meetings it was reported that DIGEPESCA maintains regular internal audits to evaluate parts of the fishery-specific management system. Detailed information on the audits was not available. To determine if this system considers an evaluation of the key parts of the management system and if it is performed periodically, it is recommended to review the audited components and the history of the audits, thus concluding this action. |
| Expected compliance date | December, 2022 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Estimated cost (\$US) | 1,000 |
| Responsible parties | DIGEPESCA |
| MSC IDs associated with the action | 3.2.4 Management performance evaluation |

| Action | Task/Milestone | Responsible | | Date | |
|--|---|-------------|---------|------------|-------------------|
| | | Leader | Support | Beginning | End |
| Action 6.3: Follow-up and management of performance evaluation | M31: Evaluation of the key parts of the management system | DIGEPESCA | | June, 2021 | December, 2022 |
| | M32: Evaluation review by external | DIGEPESCA | | June, 2021 | December, |
| | stakeholder | | | | 2022 |





















Report on activities completed during the development of the FIP

| Principle | Action | Milestone | Status | End Date |
|-----------|---|--|--|------------|
| 1 | 1.1. Creation of a national and binational working | M1: National lobster stock assessment working group. | Completed | Aug, 2017 |
| | group for the lobster stock assessment. | M2: Binational working group for lobster stock assessment. | Completed | Jun, 2019 |
| | 1.3 Lobster stock assessment. | M6 : Presentation of the preliminary assessment to the binational working group and the proposed and agreed assessment method to be used. | Completed | Sept, 2017 |
| | | M33: Training of the Honduran spiny lobster stock assessment work on the application of the stock assessment model. | Completed | Dec, 2020 |
| 2 | 3.1 Incorporate non-target species in landing logbooks. | No specific tasks. | Completed | Dec, 2017 |
| | 3.2: Onboard observer program for long term monitoring of bycatch and ETP species | All tasks are replaced with action 3.4 | Replaced | |
| | 3.3. Implementation of impact mitigation measures (if necessary) | M15: Analysis of the bycatch monitoring results | Replaced with Action 3.4 and M16 | |
| | 4.1. Monitoring the impact of lobster traps on habitats and ecosystems. | M17 : Review of available information/literature on the impact of lobster traps in other areas. | Completed | Mar, 2017 |
| | | M18: a) Development of habitat map b) Mapping of fishing effort distribution for lobster trap fleet. | Completed | Mar, 2017 |
| | 4.2 Apply the risk-based analysis methodology "Consequence Scale Analysis" (CSA) and Scale | M19: Estimating the impact of trapping on affected habitats. | Completed | Mar, 2017 |
| | Intensity Consequence Analysis (SICA) to estimate the risk of fishery impacts on habitat and ecosystem. | M36: Conduct a Scale Intensity Consequence Analysis (SICA). | Completed | Dec, 2020 |
| 3 | 5.1 Update of the Fisheries Law. | M21: Publication of fisheries legislation in the Official Gazette. | Completed | Aug, 2017 |





















| | M37: Submission and sharing of proposal for the amendment of Fishery Law in Honduras | Eliminated | |
|---|---|------------|-----------|
| | M38: Official Publication of the New Fisheries and Aquaculture Law and corresponding regulations. | Eliminated | |
| 5.2 Consultation procedures. | M22: Stakeholder selection in participatory processes. | Completed | Mar, 2018 |
| 6.2 Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS). | M27: Strengthening inter-institutional cooperation. | Completed | Mar, 2018 |