

Indonesia IOTC yellowfin tuna – handline (9012)

Three-Year Evaluation Report

FIP Information

Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s)	Yellowfin tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i> , Indian Ocean stock
Fishery location	Indonesia (Lombok, Flores, East and West Nusa Tenggara)
Gear type(s)	handline
Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons)	1892 t NB : These data date from 2020; an update was requested but did not come through in time. However the FIP can update the information at their convenience.
Vessel type(s) and size(s)	Handline vessels. See vessel list on FisheryProgress site.
Number of vessels	
Management authority	RFMO – IOTC; Indonesia EEZ FMA 573
Assessor name(s)	Jo Gascoigne
Assessor Organization/Affiliation	-
Date of report completion	12/10/24

FIP Background

Along with this FIP, there are five other connected FIPs on FisheryProgress, being run by the same team and with overlapping activities, but some differences. These are for the pole-and-line fishery (skipjack and yellowfin) in the same area (FIPs 8893 – skipjack, 8895 – yellowfin) and the pole-and-line and handline

fisheries in neighbouring FMAs 713-716; areas which come under WCPFC as the RFMO (FIPs 8863 – skipjack pole-and-line, 8885 – yellowfin pole-and-line, and 197 – yellowfin handline).

For the UoAs in FMAs 713-6 (not this FIP), including the handline fishery, there are elements (‘first tranche’) which are MSC certified:

<https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/indonesia-pole-and-line-and-handline-skipjack-and-yellowfin-tuna-of-western-and-central-pacific-archipelagic-waters/@@view>. Reportedly, the first / second tranche relates to the level of preparedness and enthusiasm of different FIP participants. None of these first tranche fishers are in the Indian Ocean UoAs, but there are some overlaps. However, because of the stock status and management of yellowfin in the wider Indian Ocean (IOTC), MSC certification cannot be achieved by this fishery for the moment.

Stakeholder Consultation & Meetings

Name	Affiliation	Date and Subjects Discussed
Herman, Ilham Alhaq	AP2HI	19/9/24
Martin Purves, Maskur Tamanyira	IPNLF	Different UoAs, FIPs and MSC certified fisheries, and how they relate to each other. Sources of data for scoring Principles 1 and 3 for each RFMO. Engagement with RFMOs. How these fisheries are managed in Indonesia. Main activities of FIP: port sampling, enumerators, co-management committees, ETP species monitoring and training. Engagement with local government. Translating national harvest strategy to concrete management on the ground. FADs. Compliance. Traceability. Communicating the work of FIPs and other NGOs.
Kai Garcia Neefjes, Putra Satria Timur	MDPI	
Hary Christijanto	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF)	
Shafa Garneta	AP2HI	Tuna Management Plan and Archipelagic Waters Harvest Strategy – differences, purpose / objectives and field of application of each, role of stakeholder consultation (including FIP participants) in preparation of each, role of FIPs and NGOs in engaging small scale fisheries in consultations, as well as data collection. Fisheries co-management committees – role, links to local and national government. Data collection and how to include small-scale fisheries; different data collection mechanisms. Data submissions to RFMOs. Shark bycatch and shark finning. Traceability. Engagement of government with FIPs and other stakeholders. Future priorities and role of FIPs and eco-certification in delivering them.
Herman, Ilham Alhaq, Maskur Tamanyira	As above	

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The range and extent of the activities of this FIP (and the other overlapping FIPs) are very impressive; particularly the data collection which uses a wide range of methods and has been innovative in terms of its development of web-based systems and apps. Note that although the actions related to data collection have mainly been completed, the work continues, and is important to the government to inform its own decision-making and to meet its obligations to IOTC (and WCPFC). The local co-management approach is also important.

The red and orange scores in MSC are for activities which are not in the direct control of the FIP; specifically the stock status of Indian Ocean yellowfin, and progress at IOTC on a harvest strategy. It might make sense to review the FIP timeline and end date – June 2026 is quite ambitious. Other than that, I don't have any particular recommendations.

Summary of MSC Performance Indicator Scores

Principle	Component	Performance Indicator		Previous Score 2023	Current Score 2024	Rationale or Key Points
1	Outcome	1.1.1	Stock status	60-79	60-79	There was a new yellowfin stock assessment this year, but it will not be finalised until after the WPTT meeting (October 28), so the scoring has not changed for the moment. The FIP could review the score in relation to the new assessment at next year's update.
		1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	60-79	<60	The FIP scoring agrees with the pre-assessment, but I think that the scoring in the pre-assessment is not correct (or possibly has changed). SG60 requires a specified rebuilding timeframe, which is not given in Res. 21/01 (which is interim). I do not know if there has been work by IOTC to evaluate how long the measures specified in 21/01 would take to rebuild the stock, but in any case this analysis should be revised based on the new stock assessment.
	Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	60-79	60-79	The harvest strategy for yellowfin at IOTC is the interim rebuilding plan, as above.
		1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools	<60	<60	

		1.2.3	Information and monitoring	>80	>80	No major change to information base, monitoring or stock assessment, as far as I know
		1.2.4	Assessment of stock status	>80	>80	
2	Primary species	2.1.1	Outcome	>80	>80	For Principle 2, all the PIs score ≥ 80 except for PI 2.3.2 (see below). I am, however, reluctant to write 'no change' here since the FIP continues to work on multiple elements of P2, as part of the MSC certification, so presumably there have been improvements in various elements – notably the information PIs. I am satisfied that the scores remain ≥ 80 – I just wanted to make that point clear.
		2.1.2	Management strategy	>80	>80	
		2.1.3	Information	>80	>80	
	Second-ary species	2.2.1	Outcome	>80	>80	
		2.2.2	Management strategy	>80	>80	
		2.2.3	Information	>80	>80	
	ETP species	2.3.1	Outcome	>80	>80	
		2.3.2	Management strategy	60-79	>80	This PI has been scored at 60-79 due to potential interactions with ETP species – mainly sharks and turtles as far as I can tell. The various updates to the associated action list a huge amount of work which has gone into first of all evaluating the rate of interactions (via on-board cameras, on-board observers and port sampling with a specific ETP species questionnaire), with a large quantity of vessels sampled over the last three years. The data provided suggest that rates of interaction are low (occasional). In addition, fishers have been provided with handling training and asked to sign a code of conduct, including a shark-finning policy.

						There is no condition on the certified tranche of the handline fishery on this PI, so clearly the MSC CAB are satisfied with the quantity and quality of data. I suggest that the score could be increased to ≥ 80 here.
		2.3.3	Information	>80	>80	
	Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome	>80	>80	
		2.4.2	Management strategy	>80	>80	
		2.4.3	Information	>80	>80	
	Eco-system	2.5.1	Outcome	>80	>80	
		2.5.2	Management strategy	>80	>80	
		2.5.3	Information	>80	>80	
	3	Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and customary framework	60-79	60-79
3.1.2			Consultation, roles and responsibilities	>80	>80	No change
3.1.3			Long term objectives	>80	>80	

	Fishery specific management system	3.2.1	Fishery-specific objectives	60-79	60-79	<p>The pre-assessment notes in the scoring that this PI is scored here in the same way as for the WCPO UoAs. The condition on this PI for the MSC-certified tranche of these UoAs was closed by the MSC CAB at the annual audit last year (GTC 2023a). However, this was based on the harvest strategy for Archipelagic Waters (IAW) (Indonesia 2023) which does not apply to this FMA.</p> <p>I suggest that, given that there is no particular evidence (as far as I know) of separate yellowfin stocks in this FMA (unlike in IAW), and given that IOTC, unlike WCPFC, has set clear management targets consistent with MSC requirements (Res. 15/10, Btarg=40%B₀), there are in fact fishery-specific objectives at the stock level.</p> <p>There is, however, the same issue as raised under 3.1.1, i.e. objectives at the individual fishery level associated with implementing whatever catch allocation system IOTC eventually come up with. For the sake of precaution, I suggest maintaining the score at 60-79 here and aligning it with 3.1.1 and the Principle 1 conditions – i.e. when there is a complete IOTC harvest strategy being implemented in Indonesia, all these scores can be reviewed together.</p>
		3.2.2	Decision-making processes	60-79	60-79	<p>The condition (also applied to the MSC-certified Indian Ocean skipjack fisheries) relates to decision-making processes at IOTC, and notably the slow process of establishing an allocation procedure. In other words, this condition is essentially the same one as the others in P3, and can be closed at the same time.</p> <p>I am tempted to argue that this scoring is a bit unfair, but scoring PIs differently to MSC CABs can only result in confusion, so I won't change the scoring. However, I note in passing that the MSC requirement is for decision-making 'in a timely manner' and I suggest that the definition of what constitutes 'timely' needs to take into account the intractability of the issue, the number of interested parties with (potentially) conflicting interests and the need for unanimity. Implementing agreed catch limits by fleet or CPC across the whole Indian Ocean is massively more complex and difficult than is decision-making in most fisheries. It is clear from reviewing the minutes of TCAC meetings going back several years (e.g. IOTC TCAC 2023) that massive effort has been made to reach a solution, and that progress is being made for skipjack, which may in turn provide a route-map for yellowfin.</p>

		3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	>80	>80	The score was increased to >=80 as a result of the previous 3-year review.
		3.2.4	Management performance evaluation	>80	>80	No change

Environmental Workplan Results

Result	Related Action on FisheryProgress	Related MSC PI	Explanation
Implementing a data collection system	Data collection system in place for handline fisheries Integrated vessel database Baitfish management	2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3 3.2.3, traceability 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.5.3	A wide range of tools are being used to collect catch, effort and bycatch data from the vessels, including: port sampling, on-board observers, cameras and vessel tracking. At the start of the FIP, the project was a leader in developing online systems and apps for catch data entry and reporting, which has been copied elsewhere and which has very much facilitated consistent data collection and high coverage. The Ministry representative made it clear how much this was appreciated by the authorities. The FIP has also supported vessel registration, which has also been a logical challenge for the authorities in remote areas. Overall, I would say that this is one of the most impressive achievements of the FIP.
Management / mitigation of ETP interactions	Minimise unwanted catch and ETP interactions	2.3.2, 2.3.3	The FIP has recruited and trained observers and put cameras and vessel tracking onboard handline vessels. The port sampling also includes a questions around ETP interactions. The FIP also provided training and training material to captains on ETP handling, and asked them to sign a code of conduct. They have also conducted wider awareness raising work, such as talking to students.
Shark finning policy			The code of conduct includes a shark-finning policy (i.e. no shark finning), which is an important requirement for MSC certification.
Improved compliance	Review national and provincial regulations	3.2.2, 3.2.3	Aside from the work the FIP has been carrying out on data (logbooks etc.), work has been done to improve vessel registration, vessel tracking and FAD management

	Compliance report Integrated vessel database		
Better knowledge on the impact of anchored FADs in this area	Estimate effect of FADs on species distribution	2.5.3	The observer programme also collected data on whether (anchored) FADs were used during fishing. The MSC full assessment of the first tranche in the WCPO FMAs (GTC 2021) evaluates the potential role of FADs in the ecosystem in some detail, and concludes that impacts are not at all likely. Hence this action was considered complete in 2023. However, the FIP continues to run 'FAD forums' and support the registration of FADs.
Working to improve management at IOTC	Support decision-making process Support HS development within IOTC	3.3.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.2	<p>The FIP is working to support the government in implementing current and future IOTC requirements in several ways, including continuing the data collection activities summarised briefly above. These data feed into the national database, and FIP participants take part in the process of data preparation for submission to the RFMOs.</p> <p>As well as data collection, another important elements is local fisheries co-management (Fisheries Co-Management Committees). These provide a structure for local small-scale fishers to participate in national consultations, as well as to discuss local issues and concerns. At the stakeholder meeting, the MMAF representative characterised these as sitting at a more local level than the government system (hence complementing it and feeding into it), and noted that stakeholder consultation has been vital in defining the National Tuna Management Plan and other management frameworks (such as the IAW harvest strategy). This is also the forum where work in underway to develop and consult on the system for implementing quotas, as part of the IOTC catch allocation process. This is important because once IOTC agree a system, it will still have to be implemented on the ground in Indonesia (as per the conditions on PIs 3.1.1 and 3.2.1).</p> <p>The FIP organisations are also working to improve management at IOTC, including lobbying for progress on catch allocations and for better control and management of drifting FADs (e.g. as cosignatories to a letter to the European Commission on FADs).</p>

Supporting References

GTC 2023a. Indonesia pole-and-line and handline, skipjack and yellowfin tuna of Western and Central Pacific archipelagic waters. Surveillance Audit Report Year 1. October 2023. <https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/indonesia-pole-and-line-and-handline-skipjack-and-yellowfin-tuna-of-western-and-central-pacific-archipelagic-waters/@@assessments>

GTC 2023b. Indonesia pole-and-line and handline, skipjack and yellowfin tuna of Western and Central Pacific archipelagic waters. Surveillance Audit Report Year 2. October 2023. <https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/indonesia-pole-and-line-and-handline-skipjack-and-yellowfin-tuna-of-western-and-central-pacific-archipelagic-waters/@@assessments>

GTC 2023c. Maldives pole-and-line skipjack fishery. Public Certification Report. 25 May 2023. <https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/maldives-pole-line-skipjack-tuna/@@assessments>

GTC 2021. Indonesia pole-and-line and handline, skipjack and yellowfin tuna of Western and Central Pacific archipelagic waters. Public Certification Report. January 2021. <https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/indonesia-pole-and-line-and-handline-skipjack-and-yellowfin-tuna-of-western-and-central-pacific-archipelagic-waters/@@assessments>

IOTC TCAC 2023. Report of the 12th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria. Seychelles, 16 – 19 October 2023. IOTC–2023–TCAC12–R[E]