



Pacific Ocean tuna - longline (StarKist) Three-Year Audit Report

Version 1.2, September 2021

March 2023

Purpose

The three-year audit report template was developed by FishChoice. The objectives of the three-year audit 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.

FIP Information

Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s) [state target stock(s), if relevant]	Common Name: Bigeye Tuna Scientific Name: <i>Thunnus obesus</i> Common Name: Yellowfin Tuna Scientific Name: <i>Thunnus albacares</i> Common Name: Albacore Tuna Scientific Name: <i>Thunnus alalunga</i>
Fishery location	Area 61 (Pacific, Northwest) Area 67 (Pacific, Northeast) Area 71 (Pacific, Western Central)

	Area 77 (Pacific, Eastern Central)
	Area 81 (Pacific, Southwest)
	Area 87 (Pacific, Southeast)
	Within EEZ of
	Micronesia (Federated States of)
	Vanuatu
	Cook Islands (the)
	Fiji
	American Samoa
	French Polynesia
	New Caledonia
Gear type(s)	Longline
Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons)	16,372 metric tons
Vessel type(s) and size(s)	Fishing vessel - longliners
Number of vessels	300
Management authority	WCPFC IATTC
Auditor name(s)	Albert Arthur
Auditor Organization/Affiliation	Sea Strategies LLC
Date of report completion	March 2023

FIP Background (Optional)

The fishery targets albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*) and catches bigeye (*T. obesus*) and yellowfin (*T. albacares*). The pelagic longline vessels are flagged to Taiwan, China, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Vanuatu, Cook Islands, Fiji, American Samoa, French Polynesia, and Panama and fish on the high seas (and occasionally in the national Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs)) in the Pacific. The fishery is managed regionally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO).

At least 62 UoAs were identified for this assessment. They are divided by tuna stock and operating fleet flag; China, Vanuatu, Cook Islands, Samoa, French Polynesia, Panama, Fiji, and Taiwan. Taiwan, China, and Vanuatu-flagged vessels target stocks in the WCPO and EPO. Cook Islands, Fiji, America Samoa, and French Polynesia flagged vessels just operating in the WCPO, and Panama flagged vessels operating solely in the EPO. High seas operations are conducted by China, Taiwan, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), and Fiji-flagged vessels. All vessels are managed by StarKist.

Stakeholder Consultation & Meetings

In-person and virtual interviews with stakeholders are meant to inform the auditor regarding the fishery's performance and to elicit information regarding the contributions that the FIP's participants have provided in progressing 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 auditor 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 auditor. It should also help the auditor 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 auditor 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 Annex GPX of the [MSC Fisheries Certification Requirements and Guidance Version 2.0](#).

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
<p>Tom Evans</p> <p>Matt Hall</p>	<p>Director at Key Traceability</p> <p>Head of Global Sustainability, StarKist</p>	<p>The main action of the FIP is related to the installation of EMS.</p> <p>The stock status of the target stocks has been consistently increasing. The latest ISSF reports have new information.</p> <p>There have been many fisheries in assessment and certification of overlapping fisheries, demonstrating improved performance.</p> <p>Some flags were more cooperative than others in providing human observer data, and some was found to not be as robust as our expectations</p> <p>Starkist is participating company of ISSF and has implemented policies for shark finning and management of ETP species. In addition, we created and launched a bycatch strategy with formal agreement by suppliers.</p> <p>Pushing all vessels to be listed on the PVR</p> <p>We have done skipper training and currently recording the training in Chinese.</p> <p>On-vessel audits of bycatch equipment to ensure they have the equipment aligned with the policy</p> <p>The FIP has 300 vessels, and we have started shaping the UoA, the ones that will move to full assessment will be</p>

		removed from the FIP. The intent is to achieve the 20% requirement, with a long-term goal of 30%. Currently, only five vessels got the EMS installed. This is part of the TNC project.
Ben Gilmer	Associate Director, Corporate Engagement & Strategic Initiatives Large-Scale Fisheries Program. The Nature Conservancy	EMS Work with StarKist. Around 20 vessels total. Vessel reporting. Plan for the data review. Future progress reports.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The FIP has actively worked on advocacy and lobbying relevant RFMOs and management bodies to improve Principle 1 scores. The FIP has been consistently sending position statements that asked for implementing measures aligned with the MSC Standard. These actions had different results across the management bodies.

The most significant improvement in Principle 1 was the revision of the stock assessment methodology for assessing yellowfin tuna. Another key milestone was the conservation measure established by the IATTC (Resolution C-21-04) that sets a multiannual management measure for tropical tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean during 2022-2024. The revision of the stock assessment methodology and the management measures implemented triggered the increase of all P1 scores for yellowfin to a level consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC.

The FIP also made improvements in Principle 2 actions. The FIP has implemented a policy for implementing best practices to minimize the bycatch of sharks, sea turtles, and seabirds consistent with ISSF requirements. The policy includes gear and bait restriction and management practices to minimize the mortality of bycatch of seabirds, sea turtles, and sharks. The FIP provided signed policies and indicated they verified the implementation of such measures across the vessels. Finally, the FIP has installed electronic monitoring system (EMS) in a few vessels, with the projection of installing EMS in at least 20% of vessels consistent with MSC requirements. This will enable the collection and analyzing data to identify the impacts of the fishery on ETP species. While the FIP has made progress on the implementation of EMS, limited progress was observed on data collection and analysis to determine interactions with ETP and that the UoA is highly likely not to hinder the recovery of ETP.

There has been significant progress in actions in Principle 3, where several PIs scores have increased. In 2021, Panamar reviewed the Panamanian Fishing Law in response to the yellow card imposed by the EU for non-cooperation in fighting illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing. The FIP has been directly engaged in revising the new law to ensure alignment of the law with the MSC standard.

Strengths:

- Extensive data collection systems exist at the WCPFC and IATTC for all P1 UoAs. The available information supports regular robust stock assessments.
- Except for EPO bigeye stock, all stocks have been assessed as being well above the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) and at a level consistent with MSY.
- The fishery has implemented measures to minimize the bycatch of sharks, sea turtles, and seabirds.
- An effective national legal system and binding procedures governing cooperation with other parties deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2 and the precautionary approach.

Weaknesses

- No harvest strategies of the form required by MSC are in place at the WCPFC level, and no agreed harvest control rules have been adopted to control fishing across the target species stocks. Scores for 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 could even fall below 60.
- EPO bigeye stock status does not meet the unconditional pass in PI 1.1.1. The spawning biomass likely fluctuates around the MSY level, and F has probably fluctuated around MSY.
- More information about bait will be needed to enter the Full assessment.
- Low observer coverage. EMS is being installed across the UoA but is only implemented in a few vessels. Therefore, it is impossible to determine interactions with ETP, and the UoA is highly likely not to hinder the recovery of ETP.

Recommendations

- Continue working on installing EMS to gather sufficient data about ETP interactions and impacts. To meet MSC Standard V3 is recommended to implement EMS in 30% of the vessels
- While the FIP has already in place actions for data collection, it is recommended to include actions to analyze the data to determine interactions with ETP and that the UoA is highly likely not to hinder the recovery of ETP.
- Continue advocacy with RFMO and management bodies to improve Principle 3 and Principle 1 score of UOA below 80.
- Some of the UoAs are performing to a level consistent with the MSC Standard. The client could select the EPO stocks to start the full assessment.
- Update scores in FP.org, as some scores, have increased in the past year.
- The MSC has recently released the MSC Fisheries standard V3.0. CABs shall conduct an initial assessment that is announced on or after 1 May 2023 in conformity with the MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0. It is recommended to undertake a PA against Standard V3.0 to assess compliance of the FIP against the latest version of the standard.

P	PI	Previous Score [2020]	Current Score [2023]	Rationale or Key Points	
1	1.1.1	Stock Status	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 3. EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 4. EPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 5. South Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 3. EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 4. EPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 5. South Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 7. WCPO skipjack tuna ≥ 80 8. EPO skipjack tuna ≥ 80 	Results from the 2020 benchmark yellowfin tuna assessment indicated that the stock is not overfished or experiencing overfishing (Minta-Vera et al., 2020), while for bigeye tuna, there was a 53% probability the stock is overfished and a 50% probability that overfishing is taking place.
	1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 EPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79	EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79	
	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 3. EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 	The main conservation measure established by the IATTC for yellowfin is

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. EPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 5. South Pacific albacore tuna 60 – 79 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 4. EPO yellowfin tuna ≥80 5. South Pacific albacore tuna 60 – 79 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥80 7. WCPO skipjack tuna 60 – 79 8. EPO skipjack tuna 60 – 79 	<p>Resolution C-21-04, which sets a multiannual management measure for tropical tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean during 2022-2024. This measure calls for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A 72-day closure for purse seiners greater than 182 tons capacity through 2024; 2. Additional days of closure for vessels exceeding a particular bigeye annual catch limit (i.e., eight days more in 2022 if a vessel exceeded 1200 tons in 2017-2019, and 10-13-16-19-22 days more in 2023-2024 if a vessel has exceeded 1200-1500-1800-2100-2400 tons, respectively, in the previous year. 3. Strengthen the monitoring and control system for tropical tuna species (particularly bigeye) catches through onboard observers, logbooks, port sampling, and information from tuna processing facilities to control individual vessel bigeye catches. 4. A seasonal closure of the purse seine fishery in an area known as "El Corralito," west of the Galapagos Islands, where catch rates of small bigeye are high; 5. A full retention requirement for all purse seine vessels regarding bigeye, skipjack, and yellowfin tunas; 6. Limits on the number of active FADs that each purse seiner can have at any time, ranging from 66 FADs/vessel for the smallest ones to 400 FADs/vessel for Class 6 vessels (1,200 m3 capacity). These numbers will decrease to 64 to 340
--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>in 2023 and 50 to 340 in 2024.</p> <p>7. All purse seines are also required not to deploy FADs 15 days before the selected closure period, and Class 6 vessels are to recover within 15 days before the closure period a number of FADs equal to the number of FADs set upon during that same period.</p> <p>8. And in order to support the scientific analysis of FAD fisheries, the measure requires that CPCs or vessels report daily information on all active FADs (position and echosounder biomass data) as well as Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data to the Secretariat</p>
1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 3. EPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 4. EPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 5. South Pacific albacore tuna 60 – 79 6. North Pacific albacore 60 – 70 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna 60 – 79 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 3. EPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 4. EPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 5. South Pacific albacore tuna 60 – 79 6. North Pacific albacore 60 – 70 7. WCPO skipjack tuna 60 – 79 8. EPO skipjack tuna 60 – 79 	<p>In 2016, IATTC adopted HCR for the tropical tuna purse-seine fishery based on the interim target and limit reference points adopted in 2014 (Resolution C-16-02). The HCR aims to prevent fishing mortality from exceeding the MSY level for the tropical tuna stock (bigeye, yellowfin, or skipjack), requiring strict management. Suppose fishing mortality or spawning biomass are approaching or exceeding the corresponding limit reference point as measured by an estimated 10% or greater probability of exceeding the limit. In that case, the HCR also triggers the establishment of additional management measures to reduce fishing mortality and rebuild the stock.</p> <p>ISSF report 2023</p>	

	1.2.3	Information and Monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 3. EPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 4. EPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 5. South Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 3. EPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 4. EPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 5. South Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 7. WCPO skipjack tuna ≥ 80 8. EPO skipjack tuna ≥ 80 	Aligned with certified fisheries and ISSF report.
	1.2.4	Assessment of stock status	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 3. EPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 4. EPO yellowfin tuna 60 – 79 5. South Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 2. WCPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 3. EPO bigeye tuna ≥ 80 4. EPO yellowfin tuna ≥ 80 5. South Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 6. North Pacific albacore tuna ≥ 80 7. WCPO skipjack tuna ≥ 80 8. EPO skipjack tuna ≥ 80 	The 2020 benchmark assessment of yellowfin tuna in the EPO represents a new approach (Minte-Vera et al., 2020). Previously, a 'best assessment' approach was used to evaluate stock status using a single 'base-case' model. The new approach is based on 'risk analysis' methodologies, which use several reference models to represent various plausible states of nature (assumptions) about the fish's biology, the stocks' productivity, and/or the operation of the fisheries. It considers the different results, thus effectively incorporating uncertainty into the formulation of management advice.
2	2.1.1	Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	.
	2.1.2	Management strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	.
	2.1.3	Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	.
	2.2.1	Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	.
	2.2.2	Management strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	.
	2.2.3	Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥ 80 2. EPO ≥ 80 	.
	2.3.1	Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO < 60 2. EPO < 60 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO < 60 2. EPO < 60 	.

	2.3.2	Management strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO 60-79 2. EPO ≥60-79 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO 60-79 2. EPO 60-79 	
	2.3.3	Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO <60 2. EPO <60 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO <60 2. EPO <60 	
	2.4.1	Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	
	2.4.2	Management strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	.
	2.4.3	Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	
	2.5.1	Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	
	2.5.2	Management strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. WCPO ≥80 EPO ≥80	.
	2.5.3	Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPO ≥80 2. EPO ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. WCPO ≥80 4. EPO ≥80 	
3	3.1.1	Legal and customary framework	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama 60-79 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama ≥80 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	Panama laws reviewed. Law N° 204, which regulates fishing in Panama, was issued. The new law incorporates a dispute resolution framework and elements considering sustainability.
	3.1.2	Consultation, roles, and responsibilities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands 60-79 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama 60-79 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama ≥80 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	Panama laws reviewed. Law N° 204, which regulates fishing in Panama, was issued. The new regulation incorporated a consultation process for affected stakeholders. The roles and responsibilities of organizations and individuals are included in the new regulation.
	3.1.3	Long term objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China ≥80 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China ≥80 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 	Under the National Fisheries and Aquaculture Law (2021), Articles 9 and 10 cover clear long-term

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama 60-79 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama ≥80 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	objectives consistent with MSC Fisheries Standard.
3.2.1	Fishery specific objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China NA 4. Taiwan NA 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia 60-79 9. Panama NA 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China NA 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia 60-79 9. Panama ≥80 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	
3.2.2	Decision-making processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands 60-79 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama <60 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan 60-79 5. Vanuatu ≥80 6. Cook Islands 60-79 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama ≥80 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<p>It is not clear whether the domestic fishery management system responds to serious and other issues in a transparent, timely, and adaptive manner outside of the annual WCPFC and IATTC pre-meeting (Taiwan MSC Principle 3 Analysis and Scoring Update November 2021)</p> <p>As Panama is a member of IATTC, its management measures apply equally inside its EEZ and on the high seas. Panama must follow IATTC management directives as IATTC is the primary body tasked with developing and implementing management arrangements in the EPO. IATTC has established decision-making processes that are responsive to tuna fishery issues and largely transparent (Medley et al. 2019).</p>
3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu 60-79 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama 60-79 10. Fiji ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu 60-79 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama 60-79 10. Fiji ≥80 	

		11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80	11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80	
3.2.4	Management performance evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan ≥80 5. Vanuatu 60-79 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama 60-79 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPFC ≥80 2. IATTC ≥80 3. China 60-79 4. Taiwan 60-79 5. Vanuatu 60-79 6. Cook Islands ≥80 7. American Samoa ≥80 8. French Polynesia ≥80 9. Panama ≥80 10. Fiji ≥80 11. Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) ≥80 	<p>It is unclear whether external reviews are conducted on Taiwanese fisheries, so SIb cannot meet SG80 (Taiwan MSC Principle 3 Analysis and Scoring Update November 2021).</p> <p>Panama is a member of the IATTC and therefore is a party to any internal and external reviews. Panama was included in a global assessment of fisheries, monitoring, control, and surveillance in 84 countries (Pramod 2018).</p>

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](#). **Provide a rationale that explicitly addresses each of the performance indicator's scoring issues (and references when applicable) only if the current score given is different than the previous score.**

Fisheries that contain combinations of multiple target species, gear types, and/or governing jurisdictions (UoAs) should complete the [Multi-species/Gear/Jurisdiction Indicator Score spreadsheet](#) and use the table below to provide the lowest score for each performance indicator. If a rationale is provided, the auditor may choose to address only the scoring issues for the lowest scoring UoA for that performance indicator.

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 on the FIP's FisheryProgress profile) and summarizing the results that have been achieved over the past three years (or since the last audit 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 auditors 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
Yellowfin in healthy status	Action 1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Yellowfin Tuna	1.1.1	The overall risk analysis results were presented, expressed in terms of the probabilities of exceeding the reference points specified in the HCR. For yellowfin, the overall risk analysis results indicate only a 9% probability that the fishing mortality corresponding to the maximum sustainable yield (FMSY) has been exceeded. Aires-da-Silva et al. (2020) conclude that the risk analysis unambiguously shows that the yellowfin stock in the EPO is "healthy." To capture the uncertainty about the population dynamics of yellowfin in the EPO, the 48 reference models, each reflecting a different hypothesis, were considered when evaluating the status of the stock.
Stock assessment methodology reviewed	Action 1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Yellowfin Tuna	1.2.4	Before 2020, stock assessments were based on a 'best assessment' approach consisting of defining a single stock assessment model (the 'base case') for each of yellowfin and bigeye, which IATTC staff believed represented the most plausible ('best') assumptions and data about the biology and fisheries (IATTC_SAC, 2020b). In 2018 IATTC staff concluded that the results of its stock assessment of bigeye in the EPO were not reliable enough to be used as a basis for management advice to the Commission (in 2019, this conclusion was extended to the

		<p>assessment of yellowfin; IATTC (2019c)). A significant problem with these assessments is that their results became overly sensitive to including new data, particularly recent observations for the indices of relative abundance from the longline fishery (IATTC_SAC, 2020b). A workplan was adopted to improve the stock assessments for tropical tunas, including external reviews of the assessments for bigeye and yellowfin, which suggested various alternatives to be considered. In 2020, due to the workplan, a new benchmark assessment was produced for yellowfin (MinteVera et al., 2020). Rather than the base case approach of previous assessments, a 'risk analysis' approach was adopted in which reference models are adopted to represent alternative assumptions about the species' biology, stock productivity, and/or the operation of the fisheries (IATTC_SAC, 2020b).</p>
<p>Management measures</p>	<p>1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all four tuna species</p>	<p>The main conservation measure established by the IATTC is Resolution C-21-04, which sets a multiannual management measure for tropical tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean during 2022-2024. Measures include:</p> <p>A 72-day closure for purse seiners greater than 182 tons capacity through 2024;</p> <p>2. Additional days of closure for vessels exceeding a particular bigeye annual catch limit (i.e., eight days more in 2022 if a vessel exceeded 1200 tons in 2017-2019, and 10-13-16-19-22 days more in 2023-2024 if a vessel has exceeded 1200-1500-1800-2100-2400 tons, respectively, in the previous year.</p> <p>3. Strengthen the monitoring and control system for tropical tuna species (particularly bigeye) catches through onboard observers, logbooks, port sampling, and information from tuna processing facilities to control individual vessel bigeye catches.</p> <p>4. A seasonal closure of the purse seine fishery in an area known as "El Corralito," west of the Galapagos Islands, where catch rates of small bigeye are high;</p> <p>5. A full retention requirement for all purse seine vessels regarding bigeye, skipjack, and yellowfin tunas;</p> <p>6. Limits on the number of active FADs that each purse seiner can have at any time, ranging from 66 FADs/vessel for the smallest ones to 400 FADs/vessel for Class 6 vessels (1,200 m3 capacity). These numbers will decrease to 64 to 340 in 2023 and 50 to 340 in 2024.</p> <p>7. All purse seines are also required not to deploy FADs 15 days before the selected closure period, and Class 6 vessels are to recover within 15 days before the closure period a number of FADs equal to the number of FADs set upon during that same period.</p> <p>8. And to support the scientific analysis of FAD fisheries, the measure requires that CPCs or vessels report daily information on all active FADs (position and echosounder biomass data) as well as Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data to the Secretariat</p>

<p>Fisheries law in Panama updated</p>	<p>See below for specific actions.</p>	<p>See below.</p>	<p>Panama laws reviewed. Law Nº 204, which regulates fishing in Panama, was issued.</p>
<p>The new law incorporates a dispute resolution framework and elements considering sustainability.</p>	<p>Action 3.1 Legal and/or customary framework for China and Panama</p>	<p>3.1.1</p>	<p>Article 8 establishes that the Authority will exercise its management by considering general principles of the fisheries and aquaculture sector, with particular attention to Sustainability, Precautionary criterion, Participation, Cooperation, Prevention, and Ecosystem approach.</p>
<p>The new regulation incorporated a consultation process for affected stakeholders. The roles and responsibilities of organizations and individuals are included in the new regulation.</p>	<p>Action 3.5 Consultation, Roles, and Responsibilities for China, Taiwan, Cook Islands, Panama, and New Caledonia</p>	<p>3.1.2</p>	<p>Law 204 identifies organizations and individuals involved in the management process. Functions, roles, and responsibilities are explicitly defined and well understood for critical areas of responsibility, including data collection, research, licensing, decision-making, monitoring, and surveillance. As a result, Sla scores higher than SG80.</p> <p>Article 150 of the Law establishes the Board of Directors of the fishing Authority, which comprises eleven members (4 of them from civil society). Also, Article 8, Number 3 establishes, "Citizen participation: Organizations in the fishing and aquaculture sectors, communities and families directly related to fishing and aquaculture activities will have space for opinion and action in the implementation of this law, policies and consequent actions</p>
<p>Long-term objectives included in new fisheries law in Panama.</p>	<p>Action 3.4 Long-Term Objectives for Panama</p>	<p>3.1.3</p>	<p>Article 10 of Panama fisheries law establishes general objectives of the law, "1. To administer and promote the sustainable use of aquatic and fishing resources. 2. Support and facilitate scientific and technological research in fisheries, aquaculture, and related activities. 3. Establish and define the principles to order, promote and regulate the integral management and sustainable use of fishing and aquaculture, considering social, economic, technological, productive, biological, and environmental aspects. 4. Regulate and order the sustainable development of fishing, aquaculture, and related fishing activities." Article 8 definitions support article 10 by defining: "1. Sustainability. Aquatic ecosystems, whether marine or continental, must be used with responsible fishing and aquaculture practices, guaranteeing</p>

			benefits for current and future generations. 2. Precautionary criterion. Considering the most reliable scientific data available, the criterion is applied in the conservation, management, and exploitation of living aquatic resources to protect them and preserve the aquatic environment. In the absence of adequate scientific information, the corresponding measures will be taken in attention to the principle of environmental precaution established in the norms of international environmental law."
EMS installed in a few vessels	Action 2.1 – ETP Species Outcome, Management, and Information	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3	FIP started installing vessels through a project led by partners TNC in French Polynesia. Three vessels within the FIP had EM systems installed, and data is currently being collated. The data will be sent and analyzed when the vessels come into port. The other vessels within the group are part of the ongoing bulk procurement project.
Policy for mitigation of bycatch of sharks, turtles and seabirds were adopted. Shark finning policy implemented.	Action 2.1 – ETP Species Outcome, Management, and Information	2.3.1, 2.3.2	A policy for implementing best practices for mitigating bycatch of sharks, turtles and seabirds was adopted. The policy includes gear and bait restriction and management practices to minimize the bycatch of seabird sea turtles and sharks. The FIP provided signed policies and verified the implementation. In addition, the FIP implemented a shark finning policy that requires all sharks to be landed with fins naturally attached if retained.

Supporting References

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

Key Traceability 2019, Pre-assessment of the Panama Purse Seine Tuna Fishery against the Marine Stewardship Council Fisheries Standard

IATTC 2015. Tunas, Billfishes and Other Pelagic Species in the Eastern Pacific Ocean In 2014. 89th Meeting of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, Document IATTC-89-04a. 29 June-3 July 2015, Guayaquil, Ecuador. 136p.

IATTC. 2018. Tunas, billfishes, and other pelagic species in the Eastern Pacific Ocean in 2017. 93rd Meeting of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, Document IATTC-93-01, 24 and 27-30 August 2018. 117 pp.

IATTC 2019. Report on the tuna fishery, stocks, and ecosystem in the Eastern Pacific Ocean in 2018. 94th Meeting of the IATTC, Bilbao, Spain 22-26 July 2019. Document IATTC-94-01.

[https://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2019/IATTC-94/Docs/_English/IATTC-94-](https://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2019/IATTC-94/Docs/_English/IATTC-94-01_The%20tuna%20fishery%20stocks,%20and%20ecosystem%20in%20the%20Eastern%20Pacific%20Ocean%20in%202018.pdf)

[01_The%20tuna%20fishery%20stocks,%20and%20ecosystem%20in%20the%20Eastern%20Pacific%20Ocean%20in%202018.pdf](https://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2019/IATTC-94/Docs/_English/IATTC-94-01_The%20tuna%20fishery%20stocks,%20and%20ecosystem%20in%20the%20Eastern%20Pacific%20Ocean%20in%202018.pdf)

IATTC. 2019b. *The tuna fishery in the Eastern Pacific Ocean in 2018. 10th Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, Document SAC-10-03, 13-17 May 2019. 52 pp.*

IATTC. 2019c. *Staff activities and research plan. 10th Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, Document SAC-10-01a, 13-17 May 2019. 110 pp.*

IATTC 2020. *Stock status indicators (SSIs) for tropical tunas in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. IATTC SAC-11. Virtual. Document SAC-11-05.*

[http://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2020/SAC11/Docs/_English/SAC-11-05_Stock%20status%20indicators%20\(SSIs\)%20for%20tropical%20tunas%20in%20the%20EPO.pdf](http://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2020/SAC11/Docs/_English/SAC-11-05_Stock%20status%20indicators%20(SSIs)%20for%20tropical%20tunas%20in%20the%20EPO.pdf)

IATTC 2020b. *Staff recommendations for management and data collection, 2020. IATTC SAC-11. Virtual. Document SAC-11-15. http://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2020/SAC-11/Docs/_English/SAC11-15_Staff%20recommendations%20to%20the%20Commission.pdf*

IATTC 2020c. *Report on the Tuna Fishery, Stocks, And Ecosystem in the Eastern Pacific Ocean In 2019. 95th Meeting of the IATTC, Video Conference. 30 November – 04 December 2020. Document IATTC-95-05. 149p.*

ISSF. 2023. *Status of the world fisheries for tuna. Mar. 2023. ISSF Technical Report 2023-01. International Seafood Sustainability Foundation, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.*

<https://www.iss-foundation.org/research-advocacy-recommendations/our-scientific-program/scientific-reports/download-info/issf-2023-01-status-of-the-world-fisheries-for-tuna-march-2023/>

Minte-Vera, C., Mark N. Maunder, Haikun Xu, Juan L. Valero, Cleridy E. Lennert-Cody, and Alexandre Aires-da-Silva. 2020. *Yellowfin tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean, 2019: benchmark assessment. IATTC SAC-11, Virtual.*

http://www.iattc.org/Meetings/Meetings2020/SAC11/Docs/_English/SAC-11-07_Yellowfin%20tuna%20benchmark%20assessment%202019.pdf

SCS. 2022 -*Eastern Pacific Ocean tropical tuna – purse seine (TUNACONS) fishery MSC Fishery Assessment Report,*

<https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/eastern-pacific-ocean-tropical-tuna-purse-seine-tunacons-fishery/@@assessments>

<https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/dfc-hec-western-and-central-pacific-longline-biqeye-yellowfin-and-albacore-tuna-fishery/@@assessments>