

# Fishery Progress Six Month Update for the Capsen S.A. and Grand Bleu S.A. Atlantic Ocean purse seine tuna Fishery Improvement Project

*Prepared by*

**by Key Traceability Ltd.**

**October 2021**

Project ref: 0082a



Key Traceability Ltd.

+44 7505 122728

[Info@keytraceability.com](mailto:Info@keytraceability.com)

England Registered Company 09730288

70 Londesborough Road, Portsmouth, PO4 0EX

## Action updates for the Atlantic Ocean purse seine fishery.

This report is a summary of the steps made by the Atlantic Ocean purse seine fishery improvement project (FIP) from April 2021 to date. This document will provide a summary of activities since the last annual update and updates on individual actions listed in the workplan.

The FIP was launched in April 2020 following an MSC pre-assessment and workplan conducted by Key Traceability Ltd. The FIP consists of two vessel owners, Capsen S.A. and Grand Bleu S.A., which operate out of Senegal, to which all the vessels are flagged. The fishery targets Atlantic Ocean bigeye and yellowfin and east Atlantic skipjack tuna stocks.

The steering group is comprised of Capsen S.A and Grand Bleu S.A., Dongwon Industries and the FIP coordinators, Key Traceability. WWF Korea is the supporting NGO and is also part of the steering group. Steering calls continue to be conducted every two weeks.

Due to COVID-19, it has not been possible to conduct any in-person site visits in 2021.

Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3. Through this review, there have been improvements to several scoring issues in some of the PIs. This has resulted in the allocation of SG80 for some PIs. In one case, the additional information led to a decrease in score to less than SG60.

The next part of the report will address the work completed towards completion of individual workplan actions.

### Principle 1 – Sustainable fish stocks

1.1 – Stock status and rebuilding for bigeye tuna	
1.1a: Lobbying ICCAT and flag states to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the ICCAT in developing bigeye re-building scenarios.	<p>This action has two parts associated with it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sla – a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the stock that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time.</li> <li>2. Slb – There is evidence that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding stocks, or it is likely based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates or previous performance that they will be able to</li> </ol>
1.1b: Lobbying ICCAT and flag states for robust, comprehensive BET rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	
1.1c: Lobbying ICCAT and flag states to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	

<p>1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the ICCAT. Fishing mortality (F) is <math>&lt;F_{MSY}</math>.</p>	<p>rebuild the stock within the specified timeframe so that SG80 is met. The FIP must be able to meet these two scoring issues to enable a score of a pass. The action therefore consists of the FIP advocating to the RFMO to provide evidence of Atlantic Bigeye stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.</p>
<p>1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually.</p>	
<p><b>Update as of October 2020</b> ICCAT: The FIP has a position statement public on FisheryProgress to the ICCAT ahead of the annual meeting (which has now been cancelled) advocating for stock status and rebuilding for Atlantic bigeye. FIP participants such as WWF are also advocating through their channels in line with our FIP advocacy.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b> ICCAT Advocacy/Position statement.</p> <p><b>Update as of April 2021</b> No further progress with this action.</p> <p><b>Update as of October 2021</b> Sla can be closed out because a position statement has been written, reviewed, and sent to ICCAT asking for the development of re-building strategies for shortfin mako sharks, as well as recommending a precautionary total allowable catch (TAC) for bigeye tuna at <math>&lt;61,500t</math>.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b> ICCAT Advocacy/Position statement. See here: Appendix 2</p>	

<p><b>1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy and stock assessment for bigeye, skipjack and yellowfin tuna</b></p>	
<p>1.2a: Develop a strategy for engaging with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna harvest developed.</p> <p>Milestone: FIP strategy paper agreed.</p>	<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 three parts associated with it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To address Sla, explicit harvest strategies for bigeye and yellowfin are to be designed.</li> <li>2. To address Slb, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put</li> </ol>
<p>1.2b: Advocate for a more robust stock assessment of Atlantic skipjack to remove the noted major sources of uncertainty so the Committee can be in a position to provide a reliable estimate of the Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) and therefore provide advice on the state of the eastern stock unlike previous attempts.</p>	
<p>1.2c: Apply engagement strategy. FIP participants to engage with flag state delegation members at least once per year.</p>	
<p>1.2d: RFMO briefing document on Harvest Strategies (2020). Prior to RFMO plenary 2020 produce a formal briefing document</p>	

<p>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.</p> <p>Milestone: Briefing document drafted.</p>	<p>in place for bigeye and yellowfin.</p> <p>3. To address PI 1.2.4 to ensure a robust stock assessment is carried out for skipjack.</p>
<p>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 skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye. Work with the governments delegations to obtain their support for the paper, as well as that of other member states as far as possible.</p>	
<p>1.2e: Promote best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding. Promote through the government 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.</p>	
<p>1.2f: 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.</p>	
<p><b>Update as of October 2020</b></p> <p>ICCAT: The FIP has a position statement public on FisheryProgress to the ICCAT ahead of the annual meeting (which has now been cancelled) advocating for a well-managed harvest strategy and stock assessment for bigeye, skipjack, and yellowfin tuna. FIP participants such as WWF are also advocating through their channels in line with our FIP advocacy.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b> ICCAT Advocacy/Position statement (refer to action 1.1).</p> <p><b>Update as of April 2021</b></p> <p>No further progress with this action.</p> <p><b>Update as of October 2021</b></p> <p>Position statement written and sent to ICCAT recommending the adoption of a precautionary TAC for bigeye and yellowfin tuna to reach no more than 61,500t and 120,000t, respectively. Senegal signed a <a href="#">statement</a> in September 2021 pledging to uphold this TAC of 61,500t for bigeye across their fishery.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b> ICCAT Advocacy/Position statement. See here: Appendix 2 Senegal signed <a href="#">statement</a></p>	

**1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for eastern Atlantic skipjack, bigeye and yellowfin tuna**

<p>1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded ICCAT members and organisations and formally at each ICCAT meeting.</p> <p>Milestone: White paper on options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna harvest agreed.</p>	
<p>1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development 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>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 for submission to ICCAT. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.</p> <p>Milestone: Study agreed by FIP participants and advocacy begins.</p>	<p>To reach SG60 for Sla, harvest control rules are generally understood. HCRs are to be in place or available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached. Pending implementation of the ICCAT rebuilding plan, the HCR is provided through Rec. 16-01, which is extended through 2019 by Rec. 18-01. This is supplemented by some further provisions for the retention of tuna species in 17-01, which has the objective of achieving a substantial reduction in discards of tropical tunas by 2020. The PRI is being approached at the current level of effort, and F is not being reduced sufficiently (with the TAC being exceeded every year, for example catches in 2016-2017 exceeded the TAC by 20% and those in 2018 by 13% (ICCAT, 2019a)) and the TAC does not affect all countries that can catch bigeye (ICCAT, 2019a), so the ability for the TAC to be surpassed can still continue.</p>
<p>1.3d: On-going engagement with coastal States and ICCAT 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 ICCAT meeting process. To include intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded ICCAT members and organisations and formally at meetings at each ICCAT meeting.</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 will then be used to advocate for amendment of the tools in use to control the exploitation rate as defined by the HCR. These should then be implemented and periodically reviewed to ensure a reduction in catch so current projections do not materialise. The TAC needs to be all encompassing.</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><b>Update as of October 2020</b></p> <p>ICCAT: The FIP has a position statement public on FisheryProgress to the ICCAT ahead of the annual meeting (which has now been cancelled) advocating for development of HCRs and tools for eastern Atlantic skipjack, bigeye and yellowfin tuna. FIP participants such as WWF are also advocating through their channels in line with our FIP advocacy.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>ICCAT Advocacy/Position statement (see action 1.1).</p>	

**Update as of April 2021**

No further progress with this action.

**Update as of October 2021**

No further progress with this action.

## P2 – Ecosystem

### 2.1 – Secondary species outcome and management

2.1a: UoA observer data with associated forms obtained over at least a three-year period and analysed for shark finning incidents. Based on the findings of this analysis, a management strategy should be validated by the UoA that demonstrates shark finning is not taking place, as required.

Refer to workplan for description of this action as it encompasses multiple aspects of the fishery

2.1b: Determine the need for an Ecosystem Risk Assessment and if necessary, go out to tender to plan and organise that includes finding unknown parameters to complete a PSA.

2.1c: Analyse, if necessary, the need for EM in the fleet to provide third-party coverage of fleet activities with regard to secondary species.

2.1d: Development of a fleet-level generic bycatch reduction strategy to minimise bycatch levels, especially for associated sets. Strategy should include best-practice handling procedures.

2.1e: Put in place additional management measures and data collection, if required.

2.1f: Review effectiveness of management strategy.

A short consultancy project to be initiated to review the effectiveness of the management plan for mitigating impacts on ETP species. This is to include the measures and implementation processes to assess implementation successes and barriers, including results of data analysis to provide feedback on best practice procedures.

Alternatives measures to be put in place as required.

**Update as of October 2020**

Fishery-specific information has been collated from the client for the vessels participating in the FIP, mostly via data logs in the Daily Catch Reports (DCRs). This catch data is a good first step of understanding key landings of the FIP, however this still needs to be cross-referenced with third-party observer data (see below) to fully understand potential ETP interactions in the fishery.

Additional human observer data is being requested to by flag state (Senegal) and ICCAT. The FIP has received word back from the Senegalese authorities and they are currently working on the observer data request. All vessels have been confirmed to be on the ISSF PVR.

**Evidence:**

- Catch data (raw file is confidential; if required for evidence it can be provided to FisheryProgress. Once observer data is obtained, the pre-assessment will be updated and for next steps regarding ETP management can be put in place.
- Observer data request (French translation for Senegalese authorities).

**Update as of April 2021**

To date it has not been possible to collect any human observer data. A letter was sent by Key Traceability to M. Seye at the Senegal Direction des Pêches Maritimes to again request information. The lack of data has raised questions for the FIP with respect to the MCS in place at the national level and alternative options for catch and operations verification is now being investigated (see appendix for evidence).

**Update as of October 2021**

No further progress with this action.

**2.2 – FAD management**

2.2a: Review current literature to understand the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem to frame the problem and necessary research. This shall then be used to advise task 2.2b.

Action addresses multiple Performance Indicators (PIs): ETP, Habitat, and, Ecosystem PIs. Refer to workplan for more detail.

2.2b: Define the approach to investigate the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP species such as sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem. The objective of this is to add to the information base on indirect effects of the UoAs on ETP species and main impacts of the UoA on these key ecosystem elements. This can then be used to update the pre-assessment and action plan.

2.2c: Verify the fishery has formally adopted best practice non-entangling FADs.

2.2d: Species identification training for skippers is needed to improve the accuracy of fishery-dependent recordings of non-target species interacting with the fishery and make sure best practice on board is happening. These species are normally not of commercial interest, so may have been previously overlooked. Training should cover the commonly encountered species (ETP and secondary species) and identification guides provided to each vessel.

<p>2.2e: Fishery-dependent recording of ETP species needs to be improved to allow cross-checking with observer data and EMS analysis to build a more accurate picture of fishery-specific impacts and identify potential 'hot-spots' for ETP interactions.</p>	
<p>2.2f: Define a fishery specific FAD management plan aimed at reducing the risk of derelict and impact of entangling FADs and to make sure best practice on board is happening</p>	
<p>2.2g: Implement investigation approach as outlined in task 2.2b.</p>	
<p>2.2h: Align work with relevant e-NGOs to the fishery to test the difference in the impacts of biodegradable and traditional non-entangling FADs in selected locations.</p>	
<p>2.2i: Reach out to e-NGOs in relevant countries to determine the potential risk to corals from derelict FADs and entanglement of ETP species. This information will be included to the assessment, and possible additional actions shall be added at a later date.</p>	
<p>2.2j: Analyse fishery reporting on ETP species in conjunction with observer data to quantify direct effects of the fishery operations and FAD-use (entanglement). This analysis should be done annually to build an information base on the fishery.</p>	
<p>2.2k: Improve FAD management strategies at the fishery level, where necessary to fill gaps through advocacy to necessary states. Further advocate for the implementation of sustainable FAD management strategies at the RFMO level.</p>	
<p>2.2l: Implement the FAD management plan (2.2f) and ensure sure best practice (covering points described in the management plan).</p>	
<p>2.2m: Verify application of the FAD management plan in the fishery of through observer data</p>	
<p>2.2n: Present a report that provides evidences that the collected information has been analysed with the identification of the main impacts of derelict FADs on coral reefs, and an understanding of the spatial extent and timing of the interactions (as per 2.2f).</p>	
<p>2.2o: Present a report on investigation as outlined in 2.2b. Report will cover: (i) the potential impact of the UoAs FADs on the behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem (including ETP species); and (ii) any other main consequences of the UoAs FADs for the ecosystem that may be inferred (i.e. indirect effects).</p>	



<p>2.2p: If necessary, the FIP shall advocate to the authorities to update this document to include the latest guidelines on FAD design as well as other FAD measures.</p>	
<p><b>Update as of October 2020</b></p> <p>Fishery-specific information has been collated from the Client for the vessels participating in the FIP and has not showed large amounts of ETP interactions in the fishery. This still needs to be cross-checked with third-party observer data which we are currently in the process of receiving from Senegalese authorities.</p> <p>The FIP has agreed to a FAD Policy of intent which has been made public on FisheryProgress, which identifies the FIP objectives regarding FAD management and the work towards ISSF best practice. Currently the fishery policies in use already go above the ICCAT requirements.</p> <p>The FIP is also currently in talks with ISSF for potential partnerships/collaboration going forward in the FIP. This partnership is currently being discussed internally between FIP participants.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Client catch data (confidential-please request if needed).</p> <p>Capsen and Grand Bleu fisheries policy (confidential-please request if needed).</p> <p>Capsen &amp; Grand Bleu S.A. FAD Statement of Intent.</p> <p><b>Update as of April 2021</b></p> <p>2.2a has been completed with a study conducted by Key Traceability. The work will go towards evidence and knowledge-based fishery management, such as FAD management plans for the fishery that consider findings in this literature review.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Report on the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ published on Fishery Progress.</p> <p><b>Update as of October 2021</b></p> <p>2.2k – the <a href="#">African State signatory</a> from Senegal stated their compliance with an initiative to maintain FAD closures for three months of a year, and to set a limit on the number of FADs to 300 per vessel.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Senegal signed <a href="#">statement</a></p>	

## P3 – Fishery management

<p><b>3.1 - Legal and customary framework for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia</b></p>	
<p>3.1a: Collect information and conduct a review of fishery dispute mechanisms of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia with input from relevant</p>	<p>Please see workplan for further details regarding this task.</p>

<p>stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.</p>	
<p>3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.</p>	
<p>3.1c: Engage regularly with coastal State management to develop dispute mechanism where absent in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.</p>	
<p>3.1d: Engage regularly with coastal State management to develop a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia into the management system where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.</p>	
<p>3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is enshrined in legislation in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.</p>	
<p>3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is enshrined in legislation in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.</p>	
<p><b>Update as of October 2020</b></p> <p>Without being able to travel to Senegal and other coastal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance of the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (please request if these are required).</p> <p><b>Update as of April 2021</b></p> <p>Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.</p> <p><b>Update as of October 2021</b></p>	

Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.

In 2020, Senegal was evidenced to be in correspondence with ICCAT, demonstrating their responsiveness to issues raised. The Sla score was updated to SG80 and closes out this action.

The Slc score for Mauritania was increased to SG80 after it was determined that subsistence fishing to feed fishers and their families is permitted by the country's fishing code.

**Evidence:**

Principle 3 report document.

**3.2 - Consultation, roles and responsibilities for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau and Guinea**

3.2a: Conduct investigation and 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.

See workplan for further details.

3.2b: Identify all relevant stakeholders in the fishery.

3.2c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework clearly identify the role publicly.

3.2d: Develop a strategy to ensure and encourage wider engagement and representation in consultations.

3.2e: Ensure the fishery management plan clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.

3.2f: Periodically review the efficacy of the consultation process.

**Update as of October 2020**

Without being able to travel to Senegal and other coastal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance with the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.

**Evidence:**

Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (Please request if these are required).

**Update as of April 2021**

Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.

**Update as of October 2021**

Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.

The Slb score for Guinea has been updated to SG60 after it was discovered that there is a national technical committee in charge of tuna fishing issues brings together fisheries administration and research to share ICCAT resolutions and recommendations.

**Evidence:**

Principle 3 report document.

**3.3 – Long-term objectives for Senegal, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau**

3.3a: Conduct a review of long-term objectives in Senegal, Mauritania, and Guinea Bissau with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.

See workplan for further details.

3.3b: Engage with national management authorities of Senegal, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of long-term objectives in relation to MSC. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including a list of participants.

3.3c: The stakeholder group shall meet annually to discuss progress and formulation objectives where not in place.

3.3d: Embed these explicit long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed during meetings with stakeholders into a tuna management plan.

3.3e: Review and report on appropriateness of the objectives implemented and amend as necessary.

**Update as of October 2020**

Without being able to travel to Senegal and other coastal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance of the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.

**Evidence:**

Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (please request if these are required).

**Update as of April 2021**

Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.

**Update as of October 2021**

Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.

Senegal has implemented new management measures and conservation aims for marine ecosystems, which demonstrates clear long-term objectives to guide decision-making and therefore, increases the Sla score to SG80 and closes out this action.

Mauritania have a principle recognised by Mauritanian law, which aims to implement effective and prudent management measures for the environment and resources. This constitutes long-term management objectives and therefore increases its Sla score to SG80.

**Evidence:**

Principle 3 report document.

**3.4 - Fishery Specific Objectives for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia**

3.4a: Conduct a review of fishery specific management legislation of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.

See workplan for further details.

3.4b: Engage with national management authorities of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of a specific fisheries management plan for tuna fisheries. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including a list of participants.

3.4c: The stakeholder group shall meet annually to discuss progress and formulation of tuna management plan where not in place.

3.4d: Promote the production of a tuna management plan for Senegal which explicitly lists the short- and long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed with stakeholders.

3.4e: Review appropriateness of tuna management plan implemented and advocate for amendments as necessary.

**Update as of October 2020**

Without being able to travel to Senegal and other coastal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance of the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.

**Evidence:**

Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (Please request if these are required).

**Update as of April 2021**

Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.

**Updata as of October 2021**

Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.

This report can allow task 3.4a can be closed out

*Evidence:*

Principle 3 report document.

**3.5 – Decision-making process for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia**

3.5a: Conduct review of decision-making processes in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia to fully understand gaps identified in pre-assessment.

See workplan for further details.

3.5b: Define decision-making processes in the management system.

3.5c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate above into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held.

3.5d: 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.

3.5e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.

**Update as of October 2020**

Without being able to travel to Senegal and other coastal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance of the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.

**Evidence:**

Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (Please request if these are required).

**Update as of April 2021**

Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.

**Updates as of October 2021**

Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.

Annual reports are submitted to the ICCAT website regarding individual tuna fisheries, which include catch statistics by species, gears and FAD use. Inspections and controls are carried out to ensure compliance with procedures, laws and regulations. This increases the SId score for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, and Guinea to SG80.

In Mauritania and Cape Verde, assessments on resources are conducted during workshops from the ICCAT scientific committee. Annual conservation plans for tropical tunas are established and catch declarations for monitoring levels of resource exploitation are in place. This raises the SIa score to SG80 for both states and closes out this action task

**Evidence:**

Principle 3 report document.

Mauritania and Cape Verde have mechanisms in place to resolve disputes regarding IUU fishing and no legal challenges to date could be found, therefore SG80 is met for SIe.

Cape Verde has established a ban on shark fishing for whale, great white, basking, hammerhead, shortfin mako, and bigeye thresher sharks. This provides demonstrable evidence of their successful management systems and as a result, SIb has been awarded SG80.

Guinea Bissau did not submit an annual report to ICCAT in 2020 and no reply was received after chasing letters were sent. This means that SId has been reduced to SG<60, which also reduces the overall score for this PI.

**3.6 - Compliance and enforcement for Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia**

3.6a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries.	See workplan for further details.
3.6b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.	
3.6c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting	

<p>minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.</p>	
<p>3.6d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.</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.</p>	
<p><b>Update as of October 2020</b></p> <p>Without being able to travel to these costal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance of the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (Please request if these are required).</p> <p><b>Update as of April 2021</b></p> <p>Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.</p> <p><b>Updates as of October 2021</b></p> <p>Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.</p> <p>In Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, and Sierra Leone, a monitoring, surveillance and control (MCS) policy at sea is the main task of the Coast Guard. Demonstrable benefits to these MCS systems have been made, therefore, Sla has been increased to SG80 and closes out this task.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Principle 3 report document.</p> <p>In Guinea, the Guinea Fisheries Code is in place to categorise the different intensity of offences, with respective fines associated with each. Therefore, Slb has scored SG60.</p>	

**3.7 - Management performance evaluation for Senegal, Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia**

<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-</p>	<p>See workplan for further details.</p>
--	--



<p>making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these occur.</p>	
<p>3.7b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on findings of report.</p>	
<p>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 progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p><b>Update as of October 2020</b></p> <p>Without being able to travel to Senegal and other coastal states of interest of this action and conduct stakeholder interviews due to Covid-19 it has been a challenge to conduct this review. Thus, we are currently looking into consultants with the relevant experience/on the ground in the target countries to conduct this review so we can formulate next steps in accordance with the workplan. We have been in close talks with one consultant and currently looking for funding regarding this review.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Email correspondence and FIP meeting minutes (please request if these are required).</p> <p><b>Update as of April 2021</b></p> <p>Covid-19 has continued to present challenges for the remainder of 2020 and into the first quarter of 2021. The Principle 3 consultant work is yet to produce a management review document to publish.</p> <p><b>Update as of October 2021</b></p> <p>Key Traceability prepared a report in September 2021 to review the coastal states associated with the fishery, against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to address the actions listed under Principle 3.</p> <p>Assessments carried out across Senegal, Mauritania, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia, identify the yields per trip, size of individuals, and fishing capacity. Sla has now met SG80 and closes out this task.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p>Principle 3 report document.</p>	

## Conclusion

To conclude, the fishery has made some progress in its FIP action plan since the last update. For Principle 1, a position statement was sent to ICCAT to lobby for rebuilding stocks of bigeye and the secondary species, shortfin mako shark. For Principle 2, a Statement by African Coastal Communities was drafted and sent on behalf of Senegal, in September 2021, highlighting their support for maintaining and implementing FAD management strategies across the fishery. A series of improvements across some of the flag states have also increased the individual Principle 3 SIs for some countries. However, Guinea Bissau actually decreased in scoring for one PI.

In September 2021, a report was prepared by Key Traceability and external consultants, Pierre Failler and Moustapha Deme, reviewing the Atlantic Ocean tuna purse seine fishery against the MSC fisheries standard for Principle 3. The review was conducted remotely as a result of travel restrictions imposed during the COVID-19 pandemic, so it was not possible to establish if information, processes and procedures were implemented within the fishery. The review concluded that small improvements were made across six of the seven PIs. However, one of the PI scores was decreased for Guinea Bissau because of failing to submit an annual report to ICCAT and ignoring follow-up emails from the RFMO. Overall PI scores cannot be changed across the FIP because there wasn't significant progress made across the entirety of the different flag states. However, some of the flag state's SIs across different Principles were improved and reached SG80.

There are issues facing this fishery that were unaided by the COVID-19 pandemic and the project would benefit greatly from in-person meetings with important stakeholders. Cooperation between the managing bodies is paramount to the FIP moving forward. It is planned that when travel restrictions are lifted a site visit would be conducted.

## Appendix 1

PA1\_SEP

Doc. No. PA1\_06\_SEP /i 2021

August 31, 2021 (4:05 PM)

Original: French

**STATEMENT BY AFRICAN COASTAL COUNTRIES  
TO THE SECOND INTERSESSIONAL MEETING OF PANEL 1 (1-3 SEPTEMBER 2021)**

*(Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Ghana, Morocco, Senegal and South Africa)*

The African States signatories of this statement would like to express to Panel 1 their following common positions:

1. We are concerned by the lack of robust data and information that have been made available to Panel 1 to support our discussions and decision taking. In order to assess the efficacy of the measures introduced through Rec. 19-02, we request aggregated and accessible data on tropical tuna catches and effort for 2020, the provisional results of the bigeye tuna stock assessment and data capable of indicating changes in FAD use since implementation of Rec. 19-02.
2. Until the bigeye tuna stock assessment update is available, we support maintaining the current bigeye TAC of 61,500 t for 2022.
3. We support the provisional result of the First Intersessional Meeting of Panel 1 regarding FAD management, to maintain the FAD fishery closure at three (03) months and a limit on number of FADs at three hundred (300) per vessel.
4. We continue to express our concern regarding the lack of consideration given to the set of allocation criteria provided for in *Resolution by ICCAT on criteria for the allocation of fishing possibilities* (Res. 15-13). While a considerable number of criteria are detailed in Res. 15-13, allocation of bigeye tuna catch limits has been virtually entirely based on just one of these criteria, the historical catch of qualified participants (criterion A.4), almost completely ignoring the numerous criteria on status of qualified participants. We maintain that non-compliance with these important allocation criteria violates our rights as developing coastal States, with a small-scale subsistence artisanal fishery, compromising the needs of the communities of coastal fishers and their means of subsistence as well as the economies dependent on Atlantic tropical tuna resources that are exclusively present along our coasts.
5. Therefore it is our opinion that the catch limits contained in paragraph 4 of Rec. 19-02 should be amended for more objective implementation of the set of allocation criteria to which the ICCAT CPCs committed through Res. 15-13. As per the commitment contained in the text of the preamble of Rec. 19-02, these catch limits must be revised to achieve a fairer distribution of fishing possibilities for developing coastal States, in particular those of Africa that are still considerably disadvantaged by this allocation system.
6. We propose that a capacity limit be imposed on support vessels, one (01) for every four (04) purse seiners, except for CPC fleets with only one (01) to three (03) purse seiners which would be authorised to have one (01) support vessel to support their fleet.
7. We also request greater acknowledgement of the limited capacity of the administrations of developing coastal States and the need to reduce the administrative burden imposed by numerous obligations and ICCAT reporting requirements. In this spirit, we request that the obligations and reporting requirements of Rec. 19-02 be reviewed to identify which are necessary for sustainable management of the stocks and that associated reporting requirements and their submission be streamlined.
8. We continue to support implementation of a regional observer programme with involvement of qualified observers from developing coastal States. We request enhanced efforts to support capacity building and technology transfer to enable developing coastal States to contribute to this programme and to implement electronic monitoring and other advances in data collection and management.

## Appendix 2

# Atlantic Ocean Purse Seine Tuna FIP Position Statement for ICCAT 2021

On behalf of all Atlantic Ocean tuna - purse seine (Capsen & Grand Bleu) FIP Participants -  
October 2021

### **ATTN: ICCAT and delegations**

The submission of this position statement is regarding the Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) currently being undertaken by the Atlantic Ocean tuna - purse seine (Capsen & Grand Bleu) fishery. The fishery targets Atlantic bigeye (*Thunnus obesus*), eastern Atlantic skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*) and Atlantic yellowfin (*T. albacares*) tunas through free-school and floating objects (FOB)-associated purse seine sets. The fishing vessels are flagged to Senegal and operate in the high seas and the following Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs): Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia. The fishery is managed regionally by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) in the Atlantic Ocean.

To find more information on the present FIP, please view the public Fishery Progress profile [here](#).

It is clear that the impacts of COVID-19 have presented challenges to regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs), like ICCAT, in conducting meetings and addressing important conservation and management issues in 2021. However, we do not believe current circumstances should prevent ICCAT from taking action to ensure the uninterrupted sustainable management of the tuna stocks and marine ecosystems under its purview. Therefore, there are several critical measures and issues that require immediate attention by ICCAT this year, and others that need to be advanced in 2022. We strongly urge ICCAT acts in November 2021 to ensure that Recommendations that are about to partially or fully expire, continue to be effective in 2022. Other priority issues are listed below:

### **Management measures for tropical tunas**

Of importance during this year's work within ICCAT is the adoption of harvest strategies, including reference points, clearly defined Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and monitoring mechanisms.

**Ask 1:** Work on the adoption of harvest strategies for tropical tunas consistent with SCRS advice. This includes the adoption of well-defined HCRs rules during 2022 and tools development for managing skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna, along with harvest strategies which are responsive to the state of the stocks.

**Ask 2:** Review the [Monitoring, Strategy, and Evaluation \(MSE\)](#) roadmap for tropical tunas to ensure that during 2022 the major sources of uncertainty to be considered for the multispecies MSE could be identified. Ensure the adherence to the roadmap to ensure the implementation of effective management measures for tropical tunas for all fishing gear.

**Ask 3:** ICCAT to develop and implement specific scientifically based catch limits on tropical tuna stocks. Effort-based limitations such as limits, fishing days and total FAD closures can only be made available to CPCs to achieve catch reduction targets to allow the recovery of stocks but are not substitutes for setting catch limits. Particularly noting for bigeye that in the 2021 SCRS report<sup>1</sup> that “The TAC was again reduced to 65,000 t in Recommendation 15-01 which entered into force in 2016 and Rec. 18-01, and in Rec. 19-02 to 62,500 t and 61,500 t for 2020 and 2021 respectively. Catches exceeded the TAC every year from 2016-2019 some years by more than 20%. Note that because TACs do not limit catches of all countries and fleets that can catch bigeye tuna, the total catch removed from the stock can exceed the TAC.” Opting for an effort management regime rather than a catch-based fisheries management regime with fishing effort measures, ICCAT would incentivise a FAD fishing strategy.

### **Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs)**

**Ask 4:** Keep to the endeavoured timeframe identified in Rec. 19-02 and further updates recovering FADs.

**Ask 5:** Require buoy companies to submit FAD position data and acoustic records from echosounder buoys to national fisheries departments and national research institutes on a time delay basis of three (3) months, where requested.

**Ask 6:** Adopt a FAD marking scheme based on the FAO Guidelines on the Marking of Fishing Gear to apply to all FAD deployments, regardless of vessel type.

### **Bycatch and Sharks**

Protect shortfin mako sharks (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) by heeding scientists’ warnings about North Atlantic depletion and South Atlantic imminent risk. Specifically:

**Ask 7:** Adopt a new recommendation for shortfin mako sharks will result in gradual zero retention of shortfin mako and, ensures specific scientific advice for minimising incidental mortality is developed and implemented in 2022.

**Ask 8:** Adopt a Recommendation to prohibit deliberate purse seine setting around whale sharks and cetaceans, as has been done in WCPFC, IATTC and IOTC.

### **Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS)**

**Ask 9:** The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in some difficulties to implement human observer programmes such as the policy of preventing distance from COVID 19. Adopting minimum standards of electronic monitoring (EM) for the different gears operating in the ICCAT Convention Area by the end of 2021, so to be able to require 100% observer coverage (human or electronic) for all major ICCAT fisheries. Therefore, the adoption of EM should be considered as alternative of human observer for the compliance with paragraph 58 in Rec. 19-02.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.iccat.int/Documents/Meetings/Docs/2021/REPORTS/2021\\_SCRS\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.iccat.int/Documents/Meetings/Docs/2021/REPORTS/2021_SCRS_ENG.pdf)

**Ask 10:** Adopt a new binding measure to ensure human observer safety, as has been done by IATTC and WCPFC.

**Ask 11:** Some of the more recent efforts to reduce IUU fishing include a ban on transshipment at-sea. ICCAT should prohibit at-sea transshipment for industrial fleets. If at-sea transshipments are not finally prohibited, 100 % observer coverage should be required. This is to provide greater clarity on catch and bycatch, support effective management, reinforces traceability, and supports ICCAT data collection requirements.

### **Compliance**

**Ask 12:** Codify Resolution 16-17 (Establishing an ICCAT schedule of actions to improve compliance and cooperation with ICCAT measures) into a binding Recommendation, as soon as possible.

**Ask 13:** Develop information-exchange mandates and systems between the ICCAT Compliance Committee and the Commission regarding measures with unclear obligations and/or reporting requirements.

For any further information, please contact the FIP manager Charles Horsnell at [c.horsnell@keytraceability.com](mailto:c.horsnell@keytraceability.com)

*Signed on behalf of the Atlantic Ocean tuna - purse seine (Capsen & Grand Bleu) FIP, October 2021*