

Key Traceability,
Innovation Space, Halpern House,
1 Hampshire Terrace, Portsmouth,
PO1 2QF, UK

Ministry of Agriculture of the Peoples Republic of China,
Bureau of Fisheries,
No.11 Nongzhanguan Nanli,
Chaoyang District,
Beijing, China

December 2021

Via email to bofdwf@agri.gov.cn

RE: Principle 3 Assistance for Pacific Ocean Tuna Longline fishery (Thai Union) Fishery Improvement Project Vessels

Dear Sir or Madam,

The submission of this letter is a formal request for data pertaining to the MSC assessment of vessels included in the Fishery Improvement (FIP) '**Pacific Ocean Tuna Longline fishery (Thai Union)**'. The fishery targets albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*) and catches bigeye (*T. obesus*) and yellowfin (*T. albacares*). The pelagic longline vessels are flagged to China and Vanuatu and fish on the high seas in the Pacific. The fishery is managed regionally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and by the Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO).

To find more information on the present FIP [please view the FisheryProgress profile here](#).

Currently to meet the MSC Principle 3, additional information and evidence is required. The information laid out in this letter is where the Chinese Fisheries Management is currently observed to be lacking. We kindly ask if you could provide the required evidence for each PI as laid out. This will enable us to reassess the scoring of the fishery and meet the MSC Standard enabling a Chinese fishery to be globally recognised as sustainable.

If you require any further information that will help with the data request, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,



Tom Evans – FIP Manager
Key Traceability
t.evans@keytraceability.com

PI 3.1.1 - Legal and/or customary framework

This first PI of Principle 3 provides the legal foundation for all subsequent P3 questions. It requires that a management system exists within an appropriate and effective legal and/or customary framework which ensures that it:

- Is capable of delivering sustainable fisheries in accordance with MSC principles 1 and 2
- Includes cooperation where stocks are shared
- Observes the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food or livelihood, and
- Incorporates appropriate dispute resolution frameworks.

The legal framework plays a key role in delivering sustainable fisheries by ensuring that rules or the general terms and conditions under which the fishery is managed are appropriate and adequate to ensure the on-going health of the fisheries resources and ecosystem. At its most basic, the legal framework should clearly define who can fish, where, when, for what species and under what conditions. However, the legal framework needs to also provide for a diverse range of other governance issues, such as where responsibility for management lies and the power of management, the monitoring of compliance, how other ecosystem commitments are adhered to and how stakeholders may engage with or appeal management.

Because of the international nature of many fisheries in terms of stock dynamics, fleet composition and markets, fisheries management has been the subject of international agreements for many years. For stocks which are shared between jurisdictions, straddling, highly migratory or those on the high seas, there is a clear requirement for international cooperation in management. Consequently, a number of international and regional instruments have been developed to lay down principles and rules for sustainable fisheries management which must be implemented at the national level. These may cover the collection and sharing of scientific data, the assessment of stock status, the development of advice and the establishment and delivery of management actions and monitoring and control. When considering the legal framework, it is therefore important to consider all relevant jurisdictions.

The only fisheries which do not require this international element are those where the stock dynamics, fleet and market are not subject to international cooperation because the fishery is entirely within the internal waters, archipelagic waters or territorial sea of a sovereign state. An example would be a fishery that targeted a sedentary species found within a small coastal region, such as on the continental shelf. For these fisheries, the focus of consideration will be on national legislative structures. For these fisheries, although the international dimension maybe less, there remains the same need for appropriate and adequate legal frameworks and often cooperation between locally devolved agencies and national agencies will become more important.

The important role that informal and traditional management systems sometimes play are also recognised by the MSC Standard where more formally documented management systems may be absent. These may exist as accepted norms that are established across the fishery, commonly held values or agreed rules across the fishing communities. Further guidance is provided within the MSC Standard in these circumstances.

PI	SI	SG60	SG80	SG100
3.1.1 - Legal and/or customary framework	(a) Compatibility of laws or standards with effective management	There is an effective national legal system and a framework for cooperation with other parties, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2.	There is an effective national legal system and organised and effective cooperation with other parties, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Princip	There is an effective national legal system and binding procedures governing cooperation with other parties which delivers management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2.
	(b) Resolution of disputes	The management system incorporates or is subject by law to a mechanism for the resolution of legal disputes arising within the system.	The management system incorporates or is subject by law to a transparent mechanism for the resolution of legal disputes which is considered to be effective in dealing with most issues and that is appropriate to the context of the UoA.	The management system incorporates or is subject by law to a transparent mechanism for the resolution of legal disputes that is appropriate to the context of the fishery and has been tested and proven to be effective
	(c) Respect for rights	The management system has a mechanism to generally respect the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food or livelihood in a manner consistent with the objectives of MSC Principles 1 and 2.	The management system has a mechanism to observe the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom of people dependent on fishing for food or livelihood in a manner consistent with the objectives of MSC Principles 1 and 2.	The management system has a mechanism to formally commit to the legal rights created explicitly or established by custom on people dependent on fishing for food and livelihood in a manner consistent with the objectives of MSC Principles 1 and 2.

Evidence required for each scoring issue are:

Scoring Issue	Evidence Required	Evidence supplied*
---------------	-------------------	--------------------

<p>(a) Compatibility of laws or standards with effective management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishery and relevant environmental legislation (Acts, Regulations) at all relevant jurisdictions – regional, national, international. • Relevant international instruments and evidence of domestic implementation. • Regional Fishery Management Organisations (RFMO) conservation and management measures. • Fisheries policy documentation. • Documents on fishery management arrangements, such as legal and policy research papers. • Accepted norms, values and agreed rules held across the fishery. 	
<p>(b) Resolution of disputes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries legislation. • Bilateral or multilateral fisheries agreements. • RFMO rules and policy documents. • Documents on fishery management arrangements, such as legal and policy research papers. 	
<p>(c) Respect for rights</p>	<p>Certifiers may review relevant legislation and decisions of legislatures (through statutes or national treaties relating to aboriginal or indigenous people) or courts to determine if rights have been conferred on any particular group or individual and that there is a mechanism to implement such rights.</p>	

*Column to be filled in with appropriate evidence, either in the form of a text description and/or a hyperlink

PI 3.1.2 – Consultation, roles and responsibilities

Fisheries management has been shown to be more successful where the management system identifies and actively engages with all parties with an interest in the fishery, sometimes referred to as ‘stakeholders’. Stakeholders may include people and organisations not directly related to fishery activities, but that interact with or have an interest in a fishery.

By effectively consulting with stakeholders at key stages in the management process, managers provide and obtain relevant information, and this helps to ensure that subsequent decisions are appropriate and that the process of decision-making is both transparent and well understood. If carried out effectively this should ensure that stakeholders are supportive (or at least understanding) of the management process, which may lead to an increased sense of stewardship and potentially increased compliance with fisheries laws and regulations. Effective consultation also assists management and stakeholders to adapt to changes in the fishery and is therefore recognised as a key aspect of sustainable fisheries management.

Additionally, successful fisheries management requires that the organisations and agencies involved in the fisheries management process, and ideally also the individuals within those bodies, are well known and that their roles and responsibilities are clearly understood by all stakeholders. These roles and responsibilities may be identified within existing fisheries management legislation or more likely in the fishery management plan, which should identify the function of the management authority, its objectives and the interested parties, while clarifying their respective roles, rights and responsibilities

PI	SI	SG60	SG80	SG100
3.1.2 – Consultation, roles and responsibilities	(a) Roles and responsibilities	Organisations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles and responsibilities are generally understood.	Organisations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles and responsibilities are explicitly defined and well understood for key areas of responsibility and interaction.	Organisations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles and responsibilities are explicitly defined and well understood for all areas of responsibility and interaction.
	(b) Consultation processes	The management system includes consultation processes that obtain relevant information from the main affected parties, including local knowledge, to inform the	The management system includes consultation processes that regularly seek and accept relevant information, including local knowledge. The management system	The management system includes consultation processes that regularly seek and accept relevant information, including local knowledge. The management system

		management system.	demonstrates consideration of the information obtained.	demonstrates consideration of the information and explains how it is used or not used.
	(c) Participation		The consultation process provides opportunity for all interested and affected parties to be involved.	The consultation process provides opportunity and encouragement not for all interested and affected parties to be involved and facilitates their effective engagement.

Evidence required for each scoring issue are:

Scoring Issue	Evidence Required	Evidence supplied*
(a) Roles and responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries legislation, policy documents, sector studies, annual reports and reports by scientists describing the fishery. • Management plans for specific fisheries often have well defined stakeholder roles and responsibilities. • Rules of procedure. • Minutes of meetings of advisory groups. • Organisational chart and staff job descriptions. 	
(b) Consultation processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of past (recent) consultations, relevant to the fishery. • Fisheries legislation and policy documents which may state requirements for consultation with stakeholders or the need to have stakeholders involved in the management advisory process. • Stakeholder consultation may be specified in a co-management process or in respect of consulting with traditional fishers. • Records of consultation or committee meetings. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reports and specific stakeholder meeting reports. • Mechanisms in place to facilitate stakeholder engagement such as newsletters, broadcasts, invitation letters, posters, etc. 	
(c) Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented evidence of past participation in consultation exercises. • Sectoral representation in consultation committees as shown by committee membership and minutes. • Fishery legislation or other policy documents which detail a minimum level of consultation and the process by which this will be achieved 	

*Column to be filled in with appropriate evidence, either in the form of a text description and/or a hyperlink

PI 3.2.2 – Decision making processes

There are many key decisions involved in successful fisheries management. How many fish to catch, when, where, how and by whom are just a few of these. But there are many more complex decisions such as how to balance the needs of different stakeholders, how to incorporate meaningful ecosystem considerations, how to ensure the management system is robust and reviewed or how to share resources between parties. The process by which these decisions are informed and made, and against what criteria is therefore critical to the success of fisheries management in meeting its stated objectives. It is the process of decision-making, rather than the outcomes of decisions that is the focus of this PI.

The importance of effective decision-making in the fisheries context is highlighted in the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing, which states that countries should:

- “...ensure that decision-making processes are transparent and...facilitate consultation and the effective participation of industry, fish workers, environmental and other interested organizations in decision-making with respect to the development of laws and policies related to fisheries management...” (FAO Code of Conduct para. 6.13).
- “...recognise that responsible fisheries requires the availability of a sound scientific basis to assist fisheries managers and other interested parties in making decisions” (FAO Code of Conduct para. 12.1).

Fishery decision-making may occur at various jurisdictions. National fisheries decision making may be undertaken centrally within one organisation or regionally, among multiple organisations. Some fisheries-related decision making powers may also be delegated to local governments. For shared or straddling stocks, decisions may be taken at a bilateral or multilateral level or within the framework of RFMOs. The role of RFMOs in international fisheries decision-making is recognised under the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, particularly Article 10, which includes the obligation for States to ‘agree on decision-making procedures which facilitate the adoption of conservation and management measures in a timely and effective manner.’ (UN Fish Stocks Agreement, Article 10(j)).

Regardless of the government system, there are key features of decision-making processes that facilitate effective fisheries management. These include:

- An established and understood process for making decisions.
- A timely and adaptive process, responsive to changes in circumstance.
- Access to relevant information – up to date, reliable, accessible.
- Decisions informed by best scientific evidence available and following the precautionary principle where evidence is lacking.
- A transparent process that is accountable to stakeholders.
- A framework for resolving fisheries disputes. Most governmental decision-making frameworks have formal mechanisms for interest groups and the public to participate, which are based around advisory committees and working groups along with public comment periods. The decision-making framework at both domestic and regional levels is usually based around an annual cycle where stock status and fishing mortality are assessed and where in use, TACs and regulations are modified to take into account current trends.

PI	SI	SG60	SG80	SG100
-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	--------------

3.2.2 – Decision making processes	(a) Decision making processes	There are some decision making processes in place that result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific objectives	There are established decision making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific objectives.	
	(b) Responsiveness of decision making processes	Decision making processes respond to serious issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take some account of the wider implications of decisions.	Decision making processes 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.	Decision-making processes respond to all 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.
	(c) Use of precautionary approach		Decision making processes use the precautionary approach and are based on best available information.	
	(d) Accountability and transparency of management system and decision making process	Some information on the fishery’s performance and management action is generally available on request to stakeholders	Information on the fishery’s performance and management action is available on request, and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendation on emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity	Formal reporting to all interested stakeholders provides comprehensive information on the fishery’s performance and management actions and describes how the management system responded to findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring,

				evaluation and review activity.
	(e) Approach to disputes	Although the management authority or fishery may be subject to continuing court challenges, it is not indicating a disrespect or defiance of the law by repeatedly violating the same law or regulation necessary for the sustainability for the fishery	The management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges.	The management system or fishery acts proactively to avoid legal disputes or rapidly implements judicial decisions arising from legal challenges.

Evidence required for each scoring issue are:

Scoring Issue	Evidence Required	Evidence supplied*
(a) Decision making processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries legislation – indicating powers and responsibility. • Management policy documentation, including the fisheries management plan – may set out decision-making process. • Scientific advice – may refer to decision making process. • Sector studies or economic and social studies or papers 	
(b) Responsiveness of decision making processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries legislation – may detail the range of decisions and requirements for consideration of wider implications. • Management policy documentation – the fishery management plan may detail what issues should be responded to and what implications of decisions should be taken. • Evidence of management taking decisions in response to issues raised in scientific advice, research, management evaluations or consultancy. • Evidence of assessments of potential impact of decisions (i.e. social or environmental impact 	

	<p>assessments) being undertaken, prior to decisions being finalised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic and social studies or papers. 	
(c) Use of precautionary approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International conventions that the county has ratified, which may commit them to the precautionary approach. • Fisheries legislation – if this is more recent it may include an explicit commitment to the precautionary approach. • Fisheries policy papers of fisheries management plans – may make formal commitment to the precautionary approach. 	
(d) Accountability and transparency of management system and decision making process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management policy documentation – does this detail how management decisions will be communicated? • Minutes of advisory group meetings – are these publicly available? • Fishery performance data (stock assessments and management advice etc.) – are these widely communicated and available? • Other means of stakeholder communication – annual fishery meetings, websites, direct mailing, notice boards? • Descriptions of past fishery issues and their resolution, 	
(e) Approach to disputes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceedings of courts or other judicial processes relating to the fishery. • Evidence of dispute avoidance and resolution mechanisms built into the management system as detailed in a fishery management plan. • Evidence of implementation of any legal decisions 	

*Column to be filled in with appropriate evidence, either in the form of a text description and/or a hyperlink

PI 3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement

PI 3.2.3 assesses whether the Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) mechanisms are adequate to ensure the management and conservation measures in a fishery are enforced and complied with, and that illegal, unreported or unregulated (IUU) fishing is avoided or minimised. MCS systems are considered one of the key principles of effective fisheries management. The scoring for this PI considers the effectiveness of the overall system, the appropriateness of any sanctions for noncompliance and the overall record of compliance and cooperation within the fishery.

The design of the MCS system will depend upon the scale and nature of the fishery. Different fisheries will have different areas of risk of non-compliance, so the MCS system should be designed to recognise these. Typically, the MCS system for a fishery will comprise a variety of tools which may include logbook systems, port and dockside monitoring, VMS, fisheries observer programs, at sea monitoring, boarding and inspection, IUU vessel listing and nominated landing ports and times.

The MCS system should apply at all relevant jurisdictions of the fishery. In most cases, MCS measures such as logbooks and port monitoring are undertaken by National Authorities within their EEZs. Domestic fisheries legislation should clearly stipulate the scope of permitted activities and violations for both domestic and foreign fishers and fishing vessels, as a basis for the application of penalties and fisheries enforcement. Where a fishery occurs on the high seas the system should also be designed to address the risk of non-compliance. For example, for fisheries on the high seas many RFMOs require the application of fisheries observer programs, VMS and transshipment regulation. This will be combined with enforcement requirements of the flag state to adopt measures necessary to ensure that vessels do not undermine the effectiveness of international conservation and management measures. These measures include fishing vessel registration, authorisation to fish, record of fishing vessels, application of sanctions of sufficient severity, and monitoring, control and surveillance.

Since the application of MCS systems in small scale fisheries can present a challenge due to large number and widely dispersed participants, fostering local awareness and increased involvement in fisheries management offers an effective way of addressing enforcement. It is recognised that compliance with fisheries regulations may not in all cases only depend on fisheries enforcement by national authorities. The MSC gives some recognition to the role of more informal or traditional approaches to MCS – in particular in smaller scale coastal fisheries. This recognises that the design of the management system may increase the sense of stewardship over the resource and incentivise compliance with regulations, for example where fishers have greater participation in the management process, through consultations and decision-making. Factors influencing the success of these more informal aspects include prevailing social norms and social disapproval, which in turn may be influenced by factors such as accessibility of the resource, mobility of the fisheries, access to landing sites and market opportunities.

Another important component of an effective enforcement system is the application of consistent and transparent sanctions to provide effective deterrence against non-compliance. Effective sanctions should be clearly stipulated in regulatory provisions and mechanisms. Penalties should outweigh the benefits derived from conducting illegal fishing and sanctions should be applicable at all relevant jurisdictions for the fishery. Sanctions may include administrative and criminal penalties ranging from fines, withdrawal of fishing licence or other fishing opportunities and gear, denial of port landing and trade-related sanctions.

Finally, this PI considers the overall record of compliance of fishers with the controls and regulations in the fishery. This also includes an examination of the degree of cooperation of fishers with management authorities in providing accurate fisheries data or additional information that may assist managers in adopting appropriate fisheries management measures.

PI	SI	SG60	SG80	SG100
3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement	(a) MCS implementation	Monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms exist, and are implemented in the fishery and there is a reasonable expectation that they are effective.	A monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery and has demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules	A comprehensive monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery and has demonstrated a consistent ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules.
	(b) Sanctions	Sanctions to deal with noncompliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied.	Sanctions to deal with noncompliance exist, are consistently applied and thought to provide effective deterrence	Sanctions to deal with noncompliance exist, are consistently applied and demonstrably provide effective deterrence.
	(c) Compliance	Fishers are generally thought to comply with the management system under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery.	Some evidence exists to demonstrate fishers comply with the management system under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery.	There is a high degree of confidence that fishers comply with the management system under assessment, including, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery.
	(d) Systematic noncompliance		There is no evidence of systematic noncompliance.	

Evidence required for each scoring issue are:

Scoring Issue	Evidence Required	Evidence supplied*
(a) MCS implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries legislation. • Records of court cases. • MCS plans and strategies. • Information on MCS mechanisms in place such as VMS, vessel inspections (both at sea and on landing), logbook, sales note and landing declarations, landing restrictions, etc. • Regional MCS reports – including reviews/ evaluations of MCS efficacy. • Conservation and management measures adopted by RFMOs. • Fishery management plans. • Any agency reports, such as fishery meetings, annual reports and stakeholder committee minutes which may detail compliance information and details of fishery offences and prosecutions. 	
(b) Sanctions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions in fisheries legislation about penalties. • Court cases as evidence of level of sanctions. • Past records of regional fisheries management arrangements (delisted vessels etc.), and reports from national fisheries. • Stock modelling may in some cases provide an indication of ‘unaccounted mortality’ which may provide an indication of IUU fishing. • Reviews and evaluations (both internal and external) of the monitoring, control and enforcement system in the relevant jurisdictions of the fishery. 	
(c) Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional and national fishing licencing records. • Access permission documents (observer/ scientific trips). • Logbooks – evidence of inspections. • Documents/records indicating past vessel and crew conduct. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records of past infringements. • Reviews/evaluations of the effectiveness of the MCS system. 	
(d) Systematic noncompliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports from stakeholders of possible illegal practices that should be verified by the agencies MCS system. • Evaluations of the MCS system. • Records of infringements indicating persisting enforcement controls including the same offence occurring overtime. 	

*Column to be filled in with appropriate evidence, either in the form of a text description and/or a hyperlink

PI 3.2.4 – Management performance evaluation

Transparent and accountable fisheries institutions and decision-making processes allow for on-going internal and external evaluation that ensure effective and improving management performance. This is the focus of the final PI of Principle 3.

The design of the evaluations and reviews should be appropriate to the cultural context, scale and intensity of the fishery. The focus of the evaluation should be both overarching (the overall performance against objectives) and also focused on particular components of the management system. The component parts evaluated may include the performance of the compliance and enforcement system, the effectiveness of scientific and research feedback and the effectiveness of consultation and decision-making processes.

The status of the resource, management priorities and stakeholder focus are dynamic. As such regular evaluation by the management institutions or agency will consider the suitability and cost effectiveness of current management practices and regulations to determine when appropriate modifications are required. Where there has been considerable investment in building management capacity, it is also good practice to carry out an evaluation of whether this investment has resulted in intended changes.

The process of evaluation or review should ideally be stated in legislation or regulation or be stated in an underlying business or corporate plan. Fishery management plans should also state the intended duration of the plan, the timing and process of evaluation and whether it is to be internal or external. Internal review has the advantage of being quicker and cheaper but may be less well suited to identifying more systemic issues. For this reason, it is good practice to have periodic external evaluations. Depending upon the scale and intensity of the fishery, the external review, which is required to meet good practices, could be:

- By another department or agency
- By another agency or organisation
- Through a government audit that is external to the fisheries management agency
- By a peer organisation nationally or internationally
- By external expert reviewers and consultants

PI	SI	SG60	SG80	SG100
3.2.4 – Management performance evaluation	(a) Evaluation coverage	There are mechanisms in place to evaluate some parts of the fishery-specific management system.	There are mechanisms in place to evaluate key parts of the fishery-specific management system.	There are mechanisms in place to evaluate all parts of the fishery-specific management system.
	(b) Internal and/or external review	The fishery specific management system is subject to occasional internal review.	The fishery specific management system is subject to regular internal and occasional external review.	The fishery specific management system is subject to regular internal and external review.

Evidence required for each scoring issue are:

Scoring Issue	Evidence Required	Evidence supplied*
(a) Evaluation coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level evaluations of the overall fisheries management framework within the relevant jurisdictions. • Evaluations of fishery-specific laws and regulations. • Evaluations of the monitoring, control and surveillance system. • Evaluations of any fisheries sector development plans or funding programs. • Evaluations of the performance of stock assessment (benchmark assessments). • Evaluations of performance in meeting environmental objectives and international commitments and targets. 	
(b) Internal and/or external review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fishery management plan. • The regulation or order which enshrines the management plan in law. • Past evaluations of the fishery-specific management system. 	

*Column to be filled in with appropriate evidence, either in the form of a text description and/or a hyperlink