

Indonesia Indian Ocean and Western Central Pacific Ocean tuna and large pelagics – longline Three-Year Evaluation Report

Version 1.3, November 2022

Purpose

The three-year evaluation report template was developed by FishChoice. The objectives of the three-year evaluation report are:

1. To assess the fishery's MSC performance indicator scores
2. To verify the results of the FIP's environmental workplan progress as reported on [FisheryProgress](#)
3. Optional: To provide recommendations to the FIP on environmental workplan actions that should be modified, including recommendations for additional actions/tasks that should be taken or suggested changes to timelines, to help the FIP achieve their stated objectives.

Completing and Submitting the Evaluation

FisheryProgress requires the use of this three-year evaluation report template and the information must be in submitted in English. FIPs should update the template below with evaluation results. **Note that text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section and should be removed from the final version of this document, and highlighted text should be replaced to reflect the information for your fishery.** Save this document as a PDF upon completion and submit to *FisheryProgress*. Once the evaluation is complete, FIPs should update all relevant data fields on *FisheryProgress* based on the evaluation report.

FIP Information

Fill in the following table. The management authority is the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur.

Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s) [state target stock(s), if relevant]	UoA 1 : Indian Ocean Bigeye tuna (<i>Thunnus obesus</i>) UoA 2 : Indian Ocean Albacore tuna (<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>) UoA 3 : Indian Ocean Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>UoA 4 : Indian Ocean Swordfish (<i>Xiphias gladius</i>)</p> <p>UoA 5 : WCPO Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)</p> <p>UoA 6 : WCPO Bigeye tuna (<i>Thunnus obesus</i>)</p>
Fishery location	<p>Indian Ocean (IO): WPP 572 and WPP 573 in Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Indonesia and International Waters (FAO Region 57)</p> <p>Western Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO): WPP 714 (Archipelagic Waters), and 716, 717 (EEZ (FAO 71))</p>
Gear type(s)	Longline
Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons)	8,734
Vessel type(s) and size(s)	Longline vessels, which weigh 14 gross tons or more, and longer than 12 meters.
Number of vessels	337
Management authority	<p>WCPFC</p> <p>IOTC</p> <p>Ministry of Marine Affairs & Fisheries (MMAF)</p>
Assessor name(s)	Ilham Alhaq
Assessor Organization/Affiliation	Independent Consultant
Date of report completion	11 January 2023

FIP Background (Optional)

This section is optional. If the assessor completes this section, use it to provide additional information about the context in which the FIP operates.

Stakeholder Consultation & Meetings

In-person and virtual interviews with stakeholders are meant to inform the assessor with regards to the fishery's performance and to elicit information regarding the contributions that the FIP's participants have provided in making environmental progress towards the FIP's objectives. Stakeholders represent the most critical source of information regarding a fishery independent of the FIP lead and FIP participants. Stakeholders can shed light on the diversity of perspectives on the fishery and can highlight any areas of controversy. The stakeholder consultation process allows an assessor to hear a range of perspectives and make an objective and balanced evaluation of the fishery against the MSC Fisheries Standard and the environmental workplan results.

A successful stakeholder consultation process will instill confidence in stakeholders that the assessment of a given fishery was well informed by a balanced, accessible, and equitable process to which they were able to contribute meaningfully. It should not be a forum to debate issues, but to identify the full range of relevant information and issues and bring them to the attention of the assessor. It should also help the assessor identify the improvements that have occurred in the fishery as a direct result of the FIP's activities and provide a foundation upon which the assessor can provide recommendations for potential adjustments that need to be considered for the FIP to fulfill the environmental objectives that they have set out to achieve. For additional guidance on conducting stakeholder consultation, see Section G4.2 of the [MSC Fisheries Certification Process Version 3.0](#)

Fill in the following table and include a high-level summary of the subjects that were discussed. Additional rows may need to be added or modified depending on number of participants and meetings completed. Stakeholders may include: official participants in the fishery improvement project, as well as government representatives, industry (fishers, processors, exporters, mid supply chain and end buyers, etc.), environmental and social NGOs, and the scientific community, or those who are impacted by the project or have a role in making changes to address environmental challenges in the fishery.

Name	Affiliation	Date and Subjects Discussed
Nyoman Sudarta, Ivan Jorgih	Indonesia Tuna Longline Association (ATLI)	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>15 September 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scope of assessment & timeline
Gayatri Reksodihardjo,	Yayasan Alam Indonesia Lestari	
Dessy Anggraeni	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP)	
Ilham Alhaq	Independent (MSC Technical Consultant)	
Ilham Alhaq, various stakeholders	MMAF, Research Center, NGOs (MDPI, YKAN, YII), Fisheries Association (AP2HI, ATLI),	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>21 – 22 November 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expected implementation of tuna HS (action plan evaluation), challenges, gap & strategy to achieve management objectives

	Independent (MSC Technical Consultant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework and architecture of tuna HS in the Indonesian AW, feasible HCR and MMs • Partner update on data collection program
		<p style="text-align: center;"><u>23 – 24 November 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight on tuna Harvest Strategy Development Process • Potential update for the Interim Harvest Strategy Framework of Tropical Tuna in the IAW
Ilham Alhaq	Independent (MSC Technical Consultant)	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>9 January 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing operation of Longline vessels • Observer deployment
Gilang	PT. Kilat Maju Jaya	

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Summarize the environmental progress the FIP has made in the past three years. Optional: provide any recommendations for the FIP (e.g., regarding modifications to FIP actions, or potential gaps in the FIP’s workplan necessary to achieve the FIP’s objectives).

Most of the Performance Indicators (PI) scores are the same since the last FIP review conducted by SCS Global under In-Transition to MSC Program (ITM) at 2021. Except for PI 3.2.4 which have demonstrated the ability to enforce relevant management measures thus improving its score.

Two action plans have been completed, one is related to development of National Tuna Management Plan (NTMP), however since its related PI 3.2.1 & 3.2.2 are still under conditional passed, these have to be inserted into another active task as suggested in Environmental Workplan Result Section.

It is advised to complete reviewing observer report in order to get sufficient information and receive better scoring PIs under Principle 2, particularly before entering the full assessment process.

In October 2022 there were changes in the MSC Fisheries Certification Program with MSC Fisheries Standard and Guidance v.3.0. It has an effective date of the 1 May 2023. The FIP may consider the changes before deciding enter the full assessment process.

Summary of MSC Performance Indicator Scores

Fill in the “previous score” scoring category (<60, 60–79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) according to the most recent set of scores available on FisheryProgress (see the Improvement Progress tab of the FIP’s profile — the most recent scores will be on the right-most column).

Fill in the “current score” scoring category (<60, 60–79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) by referring to the [MSC Fisheries Standard v2.01](#) or [MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0](#). **Provide a rationale that explicitly addresses each of the performance indicator’s scoring issues (and references when applicable).**

Fisheries that contain combinations of multiple target species, gear types, and/or governing jurisdictions (UoAs) have the option to complete the [Multi-species/Gear/Jurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet](#) but **please note that the table below must provide the lowest score for each performance indicator**. For Multi-species/Gear/Jurisdiction FIPs, the assessor may choose to address only the scoring issues for the lowest scoring UoA(s) for that performance indicator in the rationale.

Principle	Component	Performance Indicator		Previous Score [2021]	Current Score [2022]	Rationale or Key Points
1	Outcome	1.1.1	Stock status	60-79	60-79	UoA 3 (IO YFT): The scoring remains harmonized with other certified fisheries. IO Yellowfin stock is highly likely to be above PRI.
		1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	<60	<60	UoA 3 (IO YFT): The scoring remains harmonized with other certified fisheries. The rebuilding timeframe has not been specified for the stock therefore SG 60 for SI 1.1.1a is not met.
	Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	60-79	60-79	UoA 3 (IO YFT): A harvest strategy for YFT has not been agreed nor adopted by IOTC. However, resolutions have been adopted and intended to ensure the stock is maintained around target limit reference points.
		1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools	60-79	60-79	UoA 3 (IO YFT): HCR are in place or available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached based on measures specified in Resolutions 12-01, 13-10 and 16-02.

		1.2.3	Information and monitoring	>80	>80	All stocks in IO and WCPO achieve SG 80 for information and monitoring. The information available is considered sufficient to support the HS.
		1.2.4	Assessment of stock status	>80	>80	All stocks in IO and WCPO achieve SG 80 for Assessment of stock status. The assessments are appropriate for the stocks.
2	Primary species	2.1.1	Outcome	<60	<60	UoA 1 – 4 (Indian Ocean): Striped marlin in particular is overfished and overfishing is occurring.
		2.1.2	Management strategy	60-79	60-79	UoA 1 – 4 (Indian Ocean): Current collection of measures through available CMMs and resolution represents as partial strategy to manage tuna and billfish adequately
		2.1.3	Information	>80	>80	Some quantitative information is available and is adequate to assess the impact on all of the UoAs.
	Secondary species	2.2.1	Outcome	60-79	60-79	RBF may be needed for small pelagics (bait species) & the fisheries will require more robust quantitative records of bait species specific to the UoA including multiple years of data for the UoA.
		2.2.2	Management strategy	60-79	60-79	Level of external validation needed as per SA2.4.4.1 in MSC Standard v 2.01 to achieve SG80 not met. Observer coverage only meets SG60, and the standard additionally requires other acceptable evidence of implementation of management measures (e.g. port sampling, dockside monitoring, port inspections, etc.). Observer coverage of 5% fails to meet SG80. At least 20% needed to indicate “good external validation” as per SA 2.4.1.1

		2.2.3	Information	>80	>80	<p>Some quantitative information is available and adequate to assess the impact of the UoA on main secondary species with respect to status.</p> <p>More accurate estimates of bait species volume specific to each UoA will be needed to characterize as part of the overall catch composition and fishery impact.</p> <p>Information on non-ETP bird species catch will be needed.</p>
ETP species		2.3.1	Outcome	60-79	60-79	<p>Given the availability of ETP interactions data, the potentially low number of interactions based on the limited data provided the SG 60 score may be achievable.</p> <p>An analysis of all data would be required to determine their adequacy to meet the SG 80 scoring guideposts.</p>
		2.3.2	Management strategy	60-79	60-79	<p>Turtle, shark, cetacean, seabird, and mobulid ray conservation measures aimed at reducing ETP interactions with fisheries and ensuring their survival upon release have been adopted by WCPFC and Indonesian government. Reducing the removal of animals from populations generally benefits the population and is the rationale behind many of the conservation measures. These measures are considered likely to work based on theory, as well as past experience; requirements for the SG60 level are met.</p> <p>There is measures to mitigate bycatch including birds, however there is no objective basis for confidence that the measures/strategy will work. For this reason the SG80 level is not met.</p>
		2.3.3	Information	60-79	60-79	<p>Fate Codes and life status information needed to achieve SG80 which is only available via observer records. Post-release mortality studies also needed for ETP species caught and discarded/released.</p>

	Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome	>80	>80	The fishery takes place in deep water and does not interact with the benthos or other habitats
		2.4.2	Management strategy	>80	>80	The operational characteristic of the LL fishery would mean that SG80 at least would be met.
		2.4.3	Information	>80	>80	There is adequate information available to illustrate that the fishery does not interact with the benthos or other habitats.
	Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome	>80	>80	It is unlikely that the UoAs disrupts the key elements underlying ecosystem structure and functioning in causing serious and irreversible harm.
		2.5.2	Management strategy	>80	>80	Management measures described in relation to each ecosystem component are sufficient to address potential impacts.
		2.5.3	Information	>80	>80	The main impacts of the UoAs on key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information.
3	Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and customary framework	60-79	60-79	There are international agreements in place (via WCPFC and IOTC) which provide a framework for cooperation to deliver sustainable management. Indonesia is a CMM and cooperates with the RFMO to produce scientific advice. However, SG 80 is not met as this requires organized and effective cooperation with other parties to deliver management outcomes consistent with Principles 1 and 2.
		3.1.2	Consultation, roles and responsibilities	>80	>80	Organizations and individuals involved in the management process have been identified. Functions, roles and responsibilities are explicitly defined and well understood for all important areas of responsibility and interaction. There is a demonstrated consultation processes which regularly seeks and accepts relevant information and demonstrates consideration of the information received.

						There is a national, of also often local, consultation process which shows opportunity and encouragement for all parties to be involved and facilitates effective engagement.
		3.1.3	Long term objectives	>80	>80	At both regional and national level, there are clearly stated long-term objectives that guide decision making, consistent with MSC fisheries standard and application of the precautionary approach.
	Fishery specific management system	3.2.1	Fishery specific objectives	60-79	60-79	Short and long-term objectives consistent with outcomes of MSC's Principle 1 and 2 are implicit within fishery specific management plan. Some elements also explicit within the fishery specific management system. However, there is no explicit objectives around stock status relative to the target reference point (TRP) in the management plan.
		3.2.2	Decision making processes	60-79	60-79	UoA 1 – 4 (IO): Generally, the internal mechanisms of the IOTC support the conclusion that issues identified in the fishery are taken into account in the decision-making process. However, recent high catches are considered an important rather than a serious issue and measures are not yet in place to effect appropriate limits. SG80 is not met. UoA 5 – 6 (WCPO): >80 There are decision making processes within WCPFC and Indonesian Government ministries and agencies which result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific objectives and decisions take account of serious and other important research, monitoring and evaluation, as well as the wider implications of decisions. Information on the fishery's performance and management action is available on request at regional and national level and explanations are provided for actions and lack of actions. SG80 is met.
		3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	60-79	>80	Monitoring, control and surveillance systems have been implemented in the fishery relevant to UoAs and have

						demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures or rules e.g., inspection before or after the fishing trip.
		3.2.4	Management performance evaluation	>80	>80	Various internal and external review for RFMOs and national structures are in place, particularly within newly revised National Tuna Management Plan (NTMP) for 2020 – 2025 under decree No. 121 year 2021

Environmental Workplan Results

Fill in the following table by reviewing the latest FIP's environmental workplan (see the FIP's Documents section on the Details tab of the FIP's FisheryProgress profile) and summarizing the results that have been achieved over the past three years (or since the last evaluation report was completed) by the FIP. A result is defined as:

- A regulatory policy change or regulatory action to improve the fishery (e.g., a new bycatch provision), or fishing practice change (e.g., a change in fishing gear developed voluntarily and implemented by the FIP) to improve the fishery
- A publicly verifiable positive change in the water (e.g., an increase in biomass of target stock, an increase in population of impacted protected species, a decrease in habitat or ecosystem impacted)
- An activity that led to an MSC performance indicator score change in the fishery

It is advised that assessors determine results through stakeholder consultation, however the FIP's Action Progress tab on FisheryProgress may also be a useful resource. For results to be valid, FIP participants must have directly worked on or contributed to the improvement through one or more actions/tasks in the FIP's environmental workplan. For each result:

1. Summarize the result in a short sentence
2. Identify the most closely related action(s), as they are listed on the FIP's Action Progress tab on the FisheryProgress profile
3. Identify the most closely related MSC performance indicator(s) impacted by the result
4. Provide an explanation of steps that the FIP participants took, or the how the FIP's work played a role in supporting and achieving the result

Result	Related Action on FisheryProgress	Related MSC Performance Indicator	Explanation
This action is completed	Development of the National Tuna Management Plan (2020 – 2024) to include objectives for each fishing methods	3.2.3, 3.2.2, 3.2.1, 3.1.1	The MMAF have issued Ministerial Decree No. 121 year 2021 concerning Tuna, Skipjack and Neritic Fishery Management Plan (RPP) 2021 – 2026. The plan includes objectives & target for tuna management both for WCPFC & IOTC.
Support HS and HCR development within Indonesia Archipelagic Waters. This action is in progress.	Engage with the Indonesian Government and relevant organisations for the development of HS and HCR in Archipelagic waters	1.2.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.3, 1.1.2, 3.2.1	There were action plans developed to update the interim HS that have been announced in 2018. The announcement of this update would be conducted around mid of year 2023. Stakeholders' consultation related the developments were regularly conducted. PI 3.2.1 was added to this action as it relates to the fisheries management objectives.

This action is on progress.	Engage with the Indonesian Government to improve catch and efforts data	1.2.3, 1.1.2, 1.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.3	E-logbook implementation and observer deployment are the main focus of the FIP to improve the data collection. Some trainings and coordination meeting related these activities were conducted regularly.
This action is on progress.	Gather data and support the analyses to support management strategies for primary, secondary and ETP species	2.3.3, 2.3.2, 2.3.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.2, 2.1.1, 2.2.3, 2.2.2, 2.2.1	The FIP were conducted several captains' trainings related to ETP identification and release techniques. The on-board observer deployment is still continuing at the moment.
This action is completed.	Improve compliance and enforcement and strengthen the application of control measures and sanctions	3.2.3	Monitoring, control and surveillance systems have been implemented in the UoAs and have demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures or rules e.g., inspection from the authorities before and after the fishing trip. Some points of inspection were crew list, sailing permits (SLO) and arrival notification (STBLK).
This action is behind schedule and the timeline need to be updated.	Indonesian Delegation contributes effectively to WCPFC/IOTC meetings, ensuring compatibility of management measures	1.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.2	The FIP support the government by providing data (such as observers) regularly as reference prior WCPFC/IOTC meetings. PI 3.2.2 was added to this action as it relates to the decision-making process particularly within IOTC.
This action is on progress.	Strengthening the shark finning mitigation	2.3.3, 2.3.2, 2.3.1, 2.2.3, 2.2.2, 2.2.1	Trainings, socialization, studies and monitoring of the shark finning were conducted by the FIP along with ETP interactions.
This action is on progress.	Support the development and implementation of Harvest Strategies and Harvest Control Rules for IO Yelowfin Tuna, Bigeye, Albacore and Swordfish	1.2.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.3, 3.2.2	The FIP support the development of HS/HCR by providing data (production, observer and port sampling) to the government. PI 3.2.2 was added to this action as it relates to the decision-making process particularly within IOTC.

Supporting References

Provide a list of references that are referred to within this document.

Hough, Andy (2021): Indonesia Pole&line and Handline Three-year audit report

Global Trust (2021): Public Certification Report Indonesia pole-and-line and handline, skipjack and yellowfin tuna of Western and Central Pacific archipelagic waters
MMAF (2021): Ministerial Decree No. 121 year 2021 concerning Tuna, Skipjack and Neritic Fishery Management Plan (RPP) 2021 – 2026
MMAF (2022): Indonesian Archipelagic Waters Technical & Stakeholders Harvest Strategy Workshop meeting report
Tindal, Charlotte (2022): Indian Ocean Tuna Large Pelagics – Longline (Afrifex) Three-year audit report