

Indonesia WCPO skipjack tuna – pole and line (8863) Indonesia WCPO yellowfin tuna – pole and line (8885)

Three-Year Evaluation Report

FIP Information

Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s)	FIP 8863: skipjack tuna <i>Katsowonus pelamis</i> , Western Central Pacific Ocean stock FIP 8885 : yellowfin tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i> , Western Central Pacific Ocean stock
Fishery location	Indonesia (Maluku, Sulawesi, West Papua, Flores)
Gear type(s)	pole and line
Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons)	11,577 t – skipjack, 5970 t - yellowfin Note: These data are from 2020; an update was requested but did not come through in time. The FIP can update the site at their convenience.
Vessel type(s) and size(s)	Pole and line vessels, 10-100 GT (according to the vessel list in GTC 2021)
Number of vessels	See vessel list on FisheryProgress site
Management authority	RFMO – WCPFC; Indonesia EEZ FMAs 713, 714, 715 and 716
Assessor name(s)	Jo Gascoigne
Assessor Organization/Affiliation	-
Date of report completion	12/10/24

FIP Background

From the pole-and-line fishery in this area, some elements are already MSC certified ('first tranche') while others are not yet considered ready ('second tranche'). This second tranche make up these FIPs. The two FIPs in the report cover the same fishery but two different target species – they are essentially the same FIP, but have been written up separately on FisheryProgress. (Although, oddly, they have different scores on FisheryProgress, with yellowfin given an A and skipjack a C, despite the fact that I cannot see any differences in the FIP activities for each species in the pole-and-line fishery.)

MSC certified elements of this fishery: <https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/indonesia-pole-and-line-and-handline-skipjack-and-yellowfin-tuna-of-western-and-central-pacific-archipelagic-waters/@@view>

There are also four 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) but in FMA 573, meaning that the area is considered the Indian Ocean and IOTC is the RFMO (FIPs 8893 and 8895) and also for the handline yellowfin fishery in the two areas (Pacific and Indian Ocean FMAs) (FIPs 197 and 9012).

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	
Herman, Ilham Alhaq, Maskur Tamanyira	As above	

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The range and extent of the activities of this FIP are very impressive. The FIP has achieved MSC-certification for the first tranche of vessels, for both the pole-and-line and the handline fishery in these FMAs, which is presumably the best measure of the success of their activities. The remaining ‘orange’ scores in MSC are for activities which are not in the direct control of the FIP (notably progress towards a harvest strategy at stock level at WCPFC, and implementation of the strategy across Indonesia). Both of these are very challenging, but there has been recent progress on both fronts.

Summary of MSC Performance Indicator Scores

Note: The scores for this fishery on FisheryProgress all agree with the scores for the MSC-certified component of the same fishery (GTC 2021, GTC 2023a,b), except for the score for PI 3.2.1 (fishery-specific objectives) where the MSC condition was closed at the Year 1 surveillance audit in 2023. (For reasons which I am unclear about, despite being part of the surveillance audit team, the first and second surveillance audits for this fishery took place at the same time, in October 2023.) Since this was a year ago, the scores for P1 have also been reviewed against recent developments at WCPFC.

Principle	Component	Performance Indicator		Previous Score 2023		Current Score 2024		Rationale or Key Points
				skj	yft	skj	yft	
1	Outcome	1.1.1	Stock status	>80	>80	>80	>80	There was not a new stock assessment for WCPO skipjack or yellowfin in 2024, so the conclusions of the most recent assessment, set out in the 2023 audit reports, still hold.
		1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	-	-	-	-	
	Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	60-79	60-79	60-79	60-79	A Management Procedure for WCPO skipjack (CMM 2022-01) came into force in February 2023, and sets a maximum catch or effort (depending on the fleet) aiming to keep the stock within a target range of 40-60%SB _{F=0} (reference points B and C in the MP). The MP is run every three years – initially to apply in 2024-26 and is applied on the ground with CMM 2023-01 (replacing 2021-01 in 2024).
		1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools	60-79	60-79	60-79	60-79	For yellowfin, there is not as yet a MP, but 2023-01 applies; this is not a big change from previous management.

								<p>It may be that these changes to skipjack management have an impact on MSC scoring of PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. Given that there is a MSC audit approaching for the first tranche fisheries in this UoA which are already assessed (scheduled for November I believe), I am reluctant to pronounce here on a change in the score, before it has been through this more formal and robust process.</p> <p>Therefore I am not proposing any change in the scoring for skipjack, but this should not be taken as a statement that the management is not sufficient for SG80 to be met, but rather that the review of the scoring is better done at the forthcoming MSC audit. The scores can be adjusted to align with the MSC scores at the next annual update.</p>
		1.2.3	Information and monitoring	>80	>80	>80	>80	No change
		1.2.4	Assessment of stock status	>80	>80	>80	>80	No change in scoring. The 2020 yellowfin stock assessment was peer reviewed (Punt et al. 2023) which led to some improvements.
2	Primary species	2.1.1	Outcome	>80	>80			The MSC assessment (GTC 2021) scores all the PIs in P2 at 80 or above, with no change at subsequent audits (GTC 2023a,b). I was also not given any information during this review that would lead me to question any of these scores.
		2.1.2	Management strategy	>80	>80			
		2.1.3	Information	>80	>80			
	Secondary 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	>80	>80				

		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	The most recent MSC surveillance report (GTC 2024b) sets out a range of significant improvements in data collection and provision and national and regional level, the finalisation of the Indonesian Archipelagic Waters (IAW) harvest strategy, the functioning of co-management committees and vessel registration, but they do not re-score the PI for the moment. Overall, the situation is continuing to progress, but it does not seem as if all the requirements of the MSC condition are yet met. In any case, as noted above, any rescoring here just adds confusion to the formal MSC process, so I would not propose changing the score in advance of the MSC audit.
		3.1.2	Consultation, roles and responsibilities	>80	>80	No change identified at MSC audits
		3.1.3	Long term objectives	>80	>80	
	Fishery specific manage-	3.2.1	Fishery specific objectives	60-79	80	The condition on this PI was closed by the MSC CAB at the annual audit last year (GTC 2023a). The PI was scored at <80 due to the lack of a management objective (target reference point) for either stocks. For skipjack, the MP provides a clear stock objective, albeit

	ment system					<p>as a range rather than a point target (but this is OK). For yellowfin, the audit team concluded that the Indonesia harvest strategy provides an implicit TRP (a management objective of avoiding the LRP with at least 90% probability), which, together with the interim management objective for yellowfin in CMM 21-01 (now 23-01 but this still applies) was sufficient for the requirements of this PI at SG80 to be met. The key paragraph of the rationale is given below (GTC 2023a, Section 5.2.2):</p> <p>Regarding SG80, the Indonesian harvest strategy for tropical tuna in AW was finalised in 2023 (Govt. of Indonesia 2023), after extensive stakeholder consultation, and implementation is starting. The plan does not fix specific target reference points for skipjack or yellowfin, pending completion of the MSE process and agreement on management targets at WCPFC both the tropical tuna stocks. However, it does state a clear management objective, which is to avoid the LRP with a probability of 90%. This provides an implicit TRP, in as much as there will be a certain value of $SB/SB_{F=0}$ above which this is met, although its value depends on the uncertainty in these estimations (which is perhaps appropriate, since higher uncertainty should lead to more precautionary management). Nevertheless, although this is not an explicit TRP, it is an explicit management objective which is consistent with Principle 1 (maintaining the stock at or above B_{msy}), since B_{msy} is estimated to be close to the LRP these stocks.</p> <p>In addition to this, the new skipjack harvest strategy, agreed by WCPFC (CMM 2022-01) sets a management target for skipjack which, in practice when the HCR is applied is in the range $0.4-0.6SB_{F=0}$ (if the stock is within this range, the catch multiplier is set to 1, while below it is <1 and above it >1). While not a fixed value, maintaining the stock in this range seems appropriate and precautionary as a management objective for the stock. CMM 2022-03 restates WCPFC's commitment to the process of establishing similar harvest strategies for all their key stocks, including yellowfin, and lists a TRP as a component of a harvest strategy. WCPFC19 (Dec. 2022) rescheduled agreement on bigeye and yellowfin TRPs to 2024 and agreement of a MP for these stocks to 2026, because (among other reasons) the yellowfin model now needed updating to reflect the 2023 stock assessment, including the results of the external peer review (Punt et al. 2023) (see WCPFC19 summary report para. 272 and harvest strategy workplan Attachment M).</p> <p>On this basis, there are explicit long- and short-term fishery-specific objectives, both at regional / stock level and at Indonesia / AW level. SG80 is met.</p>
--	-------------	--	--	--	--	---

		3.2.2	Decision making processes	>80	>80	No change identified at MSC audits
		3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	>80	>80	
		3.2.4	Management performance evaluation	>80	>80	

Environmental Workplan Results

Result	Related Action on Fishery Progress	Related MSC Performance Indicator	Explanation
First tranche MSC certified	Deploy observers for first tranche UoAs	2.2.3, 2.3.3	The first and most obvious achievement of these FIPs, which is a huge one, is that the first tranche of UoAs (the most advanced and enthusiastic participants) have received MSC certification for their fishery. Presumably this is the ultimate result for a FIP.
	Estimate effect of FADs on species distribution	2.5.3	
	Estimate effect of FADs on habitats for first tranche UoAs	2.4.3	
	Harvest strategy for IAW	3.1.1, 3.2.1	
	Minimise unwanted catch and ETP interactions for first tranche	2.3.2	
	Review national and provincial regulations for first tranche	2.3.2	
	Support harvest strategies and control rules at WCPFC	1.2.1, 1.2.2	
Harvest strategy for IAW	Harvest strategy for IAW	3.1.1, 3.2.1	This was finalised in 2023 (Indonesia 2023). It is important for two reasons: i) there is evidence particularly for yellowfin that there may be a separate stock or sub-stock in this area, so a management focus on this area specifically is

			<p>desirable and precautionary; ii) it sets clear and precautionary management objectives for Indonesian fisheries in IAW, which have so far not been forthcoming from WCPFC, and which have allowed the condition on PI 3.2.1 to be closed. During the stakeholder meetings, the MMAF representative noted that stakeholder input was crucial in creating the harvest strategy, and emphasised the role that these FIP play in engaging these small-scale fishers from remote areas in the consultation process.</p> <p>During 2023 and 2024, the discussion has moved towards how to implement quota-based fisheries management in Indonesia, and the FIP has played a role in explaining the system and its implications to their participants, and allowing them to put their views forward.</p>
Harvest strategy (MPs) at WCPFC	Support harvest strategies and control rules at WCPFC	1.2.1, 1.2.2	<p>IPNLF is a strong advocate at WCPFC and IOTC for improved management of these stocks (e.g. Birdlife International et al. 2023). Although progress at WCPFC has been quite slow for the tropical stocks (noting that it is not easy), there is now a MP for WCPO skipjack (CMM 2023-01), which is a big deal.</p> <p>The FIP supports the Ministry in preparing for these meetings (i.e. in supporting preparation of data submission and putting forward objectives, which at the last meeting included advocating for more progress on yellowfin).</p>
Improved catch data and data on bait use	<p>Deploy onboard observers for second tranche UoAs</p> <p>(The logbooks are not really covered by a species Action, but they are important nevertheless.)</p>	2.2.3, 2.3.3	<p>The FIP organisations, working with local government, have recruited and trained observers. For the first tranche fisheries, 244 observed trips were sufficient to provide enough information to enter MSC assessment. For the second tranche fisheries, the FIP recruited and trained 100 observers in West Papua, Maluku and Sulawesi, with a total of 53 trips reported on FisheryProgress before the action was considered completed. The data demonstrate that ETP interaction rates are very low, while bait makes up <5% of the total catch weight.</p>
Improved ETP data showing no impacts	<p>Deploy onboard observers for second tranche UoAs</p> <p>Minimise unwanted catch and ETP interactions for second tranche UoAs</p>	<p>2.2.3, 2.3.3</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>also 2.3.1</p>	<p>Port sampling also continues, and at the stakeholder meeting, the MMAF representative noted that they continue to rely on FIPs and other NGO projects to support data collection from small-scale fisheries in remote areas, given that a national fisheries data collection system is extremely costly in Indonesia, as can be imagined. The FIP data is appreciated as it is regular and consistent.</p>

			<p>The FIP has also participated with MMAF and international experts in a process of improving and standardising logbooks and observer protocols across Indonesia.</p> <p>The FIP also provided training and training material to captains on ETP handling, and asked them to sign a code of conduct (signed by the majority according to the action update).</p> <p>The only ETP interactions were a very small number of birds and sharks, which were released alive.</p>
Shark bycatch and shark finning	Minimise unwanted catch and ETP interactions for second tranche UoAs	2.3.2	The FIP has developed a code of conduct for sharks, which includes a shark-finning policy (i.e. no shark finning), and have also provided training to fishers in safe handling and release of accidentally-caught sharks. (This might protect fishers as well as sharks.)
Better knowledge on the impact of anchored FADs in this area	<p>Estimate effect of FADs on species distribution</p> <p>Estimate effect of FADs on habitats for second tranche UoAs</p>	<p>2.5.3</p> <p>2.4.3</p>	The observer programme (described above) also collected data on whether (anchored) FADs were used during fishing. The MSC full assessment of the first tranche (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 2021. However, the FIP continues to run 'FAD forums' and support the registration of FADs.
Fisheries co-management committees	In general most of these actions require a structure for engagement between fishers and government	e.g. 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.2, 2.3.3	As I understood it, the FCMCs play a role in the management system which sit below government, in that government consultation process (national and local) tend to be at the level of the FMA, i.e. covering a large number of communities. The FCMC allow meaningful discussion at a properly local level, and provide a conduit to channel this information up to the government structures, as well as bringing information back down, and interpreting it for communities. They are also important in discussing and agreeing on local issues (e.g. bycatch).

Supporting References

Birdlife International, Conservation International, International Pole and Line Foundation, Monterey Bay Aquarium, The Ocean Foundation, Ocean Outcomes, Pew Charitable Trust, Sharkproject, Sustainable Fisheries Partnership, World Wide Fund for Nature 2023. 18 Environmental Organizations and 48 Supply Chain Companies Call for Progress at the Upcoming WCPFC Meeting. WCPFC20-2023-OP10.

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 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>

Indonesia 2023. Indonesia Archipelagic Waters: Harvest strategy. June 2023. (Bilingual version).

Punt André E., Mark N. Maunder, and James N. Ianelli 2023. Independent Review of Recent WCPO Yellowfin Tuna Assessment. WCPFC-SC19-2023/SA-WP-01

SPC-OFP 2024. Scientific data available to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission. WCPFC-TCC20-2024-IP04_rev11. 13 September 2024.