

Action Plan for the CAPSEN S.A. and GRAND BLEU S.A. Atlantic Tuna Purse Seine Fishery

Confidential Report
Version 2 (June 2025 update)

Originally prepared by

by Key Traceability Ltd.

March 2020



Key Traceability **KEY.TRACEABILITY**

+44 7505 122728

info @keytraceability.com

England Registered Company 09730288

70 Londesborough Road, Portsmouth, PO4 0EX

Project ref. 0082a

Contents

Introduction to the June 2025 workplan update.....	3
Introduction to the FIP.....	4
Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks.....	7
Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts	21
Principle 3: Effective management	34
Appendix	36

Introduction to the June 2025 workplan update

Due to the FIP surpassing the expected completion dates for some of the actions and associated tasks of the workplan, this updated workplan now includes more reasonable expectations of when these actions and tasks will be completed. Additionally, in November 2024, the MSC Public Certification Report (PCR) for the yellowfin and skipjack tuna portion of the fishery was published and outlined some improvements and changes to indicator scores across the Performance Indicators (PI). As bigeye tuna is the only stock of the FIP that is not currently certified by the MSC, the original workplan actions related to just bigeye tuna have been kept the same. However, elements of all Principles (1, 2, and 3), have been aligned with the Conditions and client action plan (CAP) from the MSC assessment. Therefore, the original workplan actions for the FIP have been replaced by the CAP actions and tasks.

Furthermore, as per the MSC assessment process, the number of Units of Assessment (UoAs) have been updated for the FIP to align with the MSC certification reports. Originally, the FIP included 24 UoAs, encompassing each coastal state licensed by the vessels to operate. However, the MSC assessment considered ICCAT and Senegal (the flag state) as the primary management authorities and discussed the other coastal states as secondary. Therefore, the UoAs for the FIP have also been updated to reflect this.

The following sections of the workplan will provide an overview of the FIP, and the supporting list of actions and tasks that now align with the CAP.

Introduction to the FIP

The fishery is the CAPSEN S.A. and GRAND BLEU S.A. Atlantic Ocean tuna purse seine fishery targeting skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*), yellowfin (*Thunnus albacares*), and bigeye (*T. obesus*) tunas. The fishing vessels are flagged to Senegal and operate in the following Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) and the high seas: Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia. The fishery is managed regionally by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) in the Atlantic Ocean.

Table 1: Workplan Overview

Workplan Version and Date	June 2025
Start date (expected)	End date (anticipated month/year)
April 2025	October 2028
FIP Lead (organization/individual responsible for Action Plan)	Improvements recommended by (meeting/group that supported the development)
CAPSEN S.A. Grand Bleu S.A.	Key Traceability
FIP Coordinator (organization/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	Workplan developed by (consultant or person)
Key Traceability	Key Traceability

The FIP encompasses six fishing vessels flagged to fishing in the Atlantic Ocean International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). These vessels are as detailed the table below.

Table 2. Vessels by flag included in the FIP

Vessel name	Call sign	IMO number	Flag	Areas of operation
Pont Saint Louis	6WLC	8222422	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Guinea EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ
Sea Defender	6WNF	8996190	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Guinea EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ
Granada	6WLH	8102907	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Guinea EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ
Western Kim	6WLN	8003242	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Guinea EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ

Xixili	6WMG	7413828	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Guinea EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ
Oriental Kim	6WNE	7827495	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Guinea EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ

The fishery under assessment is within the scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard (7.4 of the MSC Certification Process v2.1):

- The target species is not an amphibian, reptile, bird or mammal.
- The fishery does not use poisons or explosives.
- The fishery is not conducted under a controversial unilateral exemption to an international agreement.
- The client or client group does not include an entity that has been successfully prosecuted for a forced labour violation in the last two years.
- The fishery has in place a mechanism for resolving disputes, and disputes do not overwhelm the fishery.
- The fishery is not an introduced species-based fishery (ISBF) as per the MSC FCP 7.4.7;
- The free-school UoAs in this fishery are not classified as enhanced, but the FAD UoAs are, as per the MSC FCP 7.4.6.

The fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The report considers the following Units of Assessment (three in total):

- Bigeye tuna (one stock) caught by purse seine (FAD-associated sets) in the Atlantic (one UoAs).
- Eastern Atlantic skipjack tuna (one of two Atlantic stock) caught by purse seine (FAD-associated sets) in the Atlantic (one UoAs).
- Yellowfin tuna (one stock) caught by purse seine (FAD-associated sets) in the Atlantic (one UoAs).

These UoAs are separated in the tables below:

Table 3: UoA 1 (FIP and MSC)

Species	Skipjack (<i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>)
Stock	East Atlantic Ocean
Geographical range of fishery	Eastern Central Atlantic Ocea (FAO area 34): high seas and EEZs of Senegal, Mauritania, Republic of Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cape Verde, and Guinea Bissau
Fishing gear type, and if relevant, vessel type(s)	Purse seine – FAD and Free-school
Client group	CAPSEN S.A. and Grand Bleu S.A.
Other eligible fishers	No other eligible fishers

Table 4: UoA 2 (FIP and MSC)

Species	Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)
Stock	Atlantic Ocean
Geographical range of fishery	Eastern Central Atlantic Ocea (FAO area 34): high seas and EEZs of Senegal, Mauritania, Republic of Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cape Verde, and Guinea Bissau
Fishing gear type, and if relevant, vessel type(s)	Purse seine – FAD and Free-school
Client group	CAPSEN S.A. and Grand Bleu S.A.
Other eligible fishers	No other eligible fishers

Table 5: UoA 3 (FIP only)

Species	Bigeye tuna (<i>T. obsesus</i>)
Stock	Atlantic Ocean
Geographical range of fishery	Eastern Central Atlantic Ocea (FAO area 34): high seas and EEZs of Senegal, Mauritania, Republic of Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cape Verde, and Guinea Bissau
Fishing gear type, and if relevant, vessel type(s)	Purse seine – FAD and Free-school
Client group	CAPSEN S.A. and Grand Bleu S.A.
Other eligible fishers	No other eligible fishers

Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	1.1 – Stock status for bigeye tuna
Action Goal	There is evidence of Atlantic bigeye stock is above the point where recruitment would be impaired, and the stock is fluctuating around MSY.
Action Description	The FIP will continue advocating to the RFMO, ICCAT, to provide evidence of Atlantic Bigeye stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Expected Completion Date	April 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: US\$ 2,500 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, using it to lobby ICCAT. Expenses to attend ICCAT meeting estimated at a further \$2,000 per year. Year 6: Same as year 5 Year 7: Same as year 5 Year 8: same as year 5
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, ICCAT, Flag States of FIP vessels
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.1.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

1.1a: Lobbying ICCAT and flag states to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the ICCAT in developing Bigeye re-building scenarios.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP Participants	Coastal States, ICCAT	March 2020	April 2028	
1.1b: Lobbying ICCAT and flag states for robust, comprehensive BET rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP Participants	Coastal States, ICCAT	May 2020	April 2028	
1.1c: Lobbying ICCAT and flag states to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP Participants	Coastal States, ICCAT	January 2021	April 2028	
1.1d: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually	FIP co-ordinator and FIP Participants	ICCAT	March 2021	April 2028	

Action Number and Name	1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye tuna
Action Goal	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy and stock assessment in place for Atlantic bigeye
Action Description	<p>The fishery should detail how the performance of the harvest strategy is currently monitored, reviewed and where necessary amended in response to the state of the stock. A harvest strategy can then be developed from this review.</p> <p>This action has three parts associated with it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address SIa, explicit harvest strategies for bigeye are to be designed. 2. To address SIb, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for bigeye tuna.
Expected Completion Date	April 2028

Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: \$5,000 Year 6: As per year 5 Year 7: As per year 5 Year 8: none
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, ICCAT, Flag States of FIP vessels
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.2a: Develop a strategy for engaging with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling bigeye tuna harvest developed. Milestone: FIP strategy paper agreed.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, ICCAT	March 2020	April 2028	
1.2b: Advocate for a more robust stock assessment of Atlantic skipjack to remove the noted major sources of uncertainty so the Committee can be in a position to provide a reliable estimate of the Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) and therefore provide advice on the state of the eastern stock unlike previous attempts.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, ICCAT	March 2020	April 2028	

<p>1.2c: Apply engagement strategy. FIP participants to engage with flag state delegation members at least once per year with the following purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Continuing to emphasise the importance of the harvest strategy process and stock rebuilding to the FIP industry partners and other fisheries in the Atlantic Ocean. ii. Proposing practical ways that the governments could support the process, e.g. via liaison to support capacity-building with coastal States, or other activities Reporting regularly to the delegations so that they are kept informed of current ideas and proposals at RFMO and within coastal States where the industry partners have links. iii. Request that delegates support HS at RFMO meetings. iv. Clarify what is understood by a harvest strategy and harvest control rule in the MSC context and how the anticipated milestones relate to the current workplan. 	FIP Participants	Coastal States, ICCAT	May 2020	April 2028	
<p>1.2d: RFMO briefing document on Harvest Strategies (2020). Prior to RFMO plenary 2020 produce a formal briefing document regarding the status of the harvest strategy / stock rebuilding for each stock, the objective of RFMO, the position of key players and likely upcoming proposals, and the outcome preferred by the FIP, to brief the governments and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Milestone: Briefing document drafted.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, ICCAT	March 2020	April 2028	
<p>1.2e: Position paper for a harvest control strategy and HCRs. Prepare a position paper to submit to plenary in support of making significant progress in developing a harvest strategy and control rules for bigeye. Work with the governments</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, ICCAT	March 2020	April 2028	

delegations to obtain their support for the paper, as well as that of other member states as far as possible.					
1.2f: Promote best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding. Promote through the government a process of consultation to inform RFMO members about best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding, to build consensus towards support of proposals of management measures prior to RFMO Sessions.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, ICCAT	May 2020	April 2028	
1.2g: Continue to advocate for progression of harvest strategy development. Intersessional discussions to progress the harvest strategies between like-minded RFMO members and organisations, and formally at the relevant RFMO meetings.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, ICCAT	May 2020	April 2028	

Action Number and Name	1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for bigeye tuna
Action Goal	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for bigeye tuna.
Action Description	<p>To reach SG60 for Sla, harvest control rules are generally understood. HCRs are to be in place or available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached. Pending implementation of the ICCAT rebuilding plan, the HCR is provided through Rec. 16-01, which is extended through 2019 by Rec. 18-01. This is supplemented by some further provisions for the retention of tuna species in 17-01, which has the objective of achieving a substantial reduction in discards of tropical tunas by 2020. The PRI is being approached at the current level of effort, and F is not being reduced sufficiently (with the TAC being exceeded every year, for example catches in 2016-2017 exceeded the TAC by 20% and those in 2018 by 13% (ICCAT, 2019a)) and the TAC does not affect all countries that can catch bigeye (ICCAT, 2019a), so the ability for the TAC to be surpassed can still continue.</p> <p>The FIP must undertake an initial review of the tools which are used to set the exploitation rate in the fishery as determined by the HCRs. This will then be used to advocate for amendment of the tools in use to control the exploitation rate as defined</p>

	by the HCR. These should then be implemented and periodically reviewed to ensure a reduction in catch so current projections do not materialise. The TAC needs to be all encompassing.
Expected Completion Date	April 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: US\$ 5,000 for implementing the actions and updating the review Year 6: Same as Year 5 Year 7: Same as Year 5 Year 8: None
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded ICCAT members and organisations and formally at each ICCAT meeting. Milestone: White paper on options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna harvest agreed.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT	May 2020	April 2027	
1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development to ensure the development,	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT,	May 2020	April 2027	

evaluation, and agreement of a HCR for bigeye tuna, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.					
<p>1.3c: If necessary, provide an independent paper on the scope and needs of HCRs. Conduct a study to identify candidate HCRs and tools for all three for submission to ICCAT. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.</p> <p>Milestone: Study agreed by FIP participants and advocacy begins.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT,	May 2020	April 2027	
<p>1.3d: On-going engagement with coastal States and ICCAT over HCR development. Discussions held regarding the assessment of HCRs and tools for all stocks, including how to address the assessment's findings have occurred through inter-sessional discussions and formally through the ICCAT meeting process. To include intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded ICCAT members and organisations and formally at meetings at each ICCAT meeting.</p> <p>HCR options considered and discussed between sessions and formally through ICCAT meeting processes. ICCAT records reflect discussions and progress.</p> <p>The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT,	May 2020	April 2027	
<p>1.3e: Independent evaluation of HCR robustness and effectiveness. Conduct further study to evaluate progress made in developing HCRs, focussing on their potential effectiveness in reducing exploitation levels when required, and their ability to account for uncertainties that might affect their implementation.</p> <p>HCRs for bigeye tuna discussed and agreed within ICCAT and formally adopted as part of the harvest strategy implementation approach.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT,	May 2020	April 2027	

Action Number and Name	1.5 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy and stock assessment for skipjack tuna (MSC Condition 1)
Action Goal	By the end of the certification period the fishery shall have a harvest strategy which is responsive to the state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy have to work together towards achieving stock management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work with local management authorities as well as request updates in management measures from ICCAT for a skipjack tuna harvest strategy. The fishery will implement the measures of the harvest strategy and evidence this throughout the certification period.
Expected Completion Date	October 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: 5,000 Year 6: As per year 5 Year 7: As per year 5 Year 8: As per year 5
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, ICCAT, Flag States of FIP vessels
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

<p>1.5a: At the first annual audit (expected in 2025) and at each subsequent surveillance audit until the adoption of a new HS, the fishery client will submit evidence that it is working actively through the flag states' fisheries administrations and with other appropriate groups to promote the adoption by ICCAT of an HS with a quantitative objective for eastern skipjack tuna and characterized by elements, in particular HCRs , which are responsive to the state of the stock and work together to keep the stock at MSY level.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Fishery, ICCAT</p>	<p>November 2024</p>	<p>October 2028</p>	<p>Position statements to ICCAT. Updated Harvest Strategy from ICCAT (if applicable) Evidence of the fishery adhering to management measures</p>
<p>1.5b: The SG80 scoring requirements must be met in full for both scoring issues (a). ICCAT must adopt explicit quantitative objective for eastern skipjack tuna, and ICCAT must have evidence that the HS is composed by elements that are responsive to the state of the stock and work together to keep the stock at MSY level. The client will submit evidence that this is the case.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Coastal States, , ICCAT</p>	<p>November 2024</p>	<p>October 2028</p>	<p>Updated Harvest Strategy from ICCAT (if applicable) Evidence of the fishery adhering to management measures</p>

<p>Action Number and Name</p>	<p>1.6 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy and stock assessment for yellowfin tuna (MSC Condition 3)</p>
<p>Action Goal</p>	<p>A harvest strategy for the stock should be put in place which is responsive to the state of the stock, and which includes all relevant elements (including a means of implementation of management actions) such that the elements work together to achieve stock management objectives.</p>
<p>Action Description</p>	<p>Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work with local management authorities as well as request updates in management measures from ICCAT for a bespoke yellowfin tuna harvest strategy and improve PI 1.1.1 for yellowfin tuna The fishery will implement the measures of the harvest strategy and evidence this throughout the certification period.</p>
<p>Expected Completion Date</p>	<p>October 2025</p>

Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: Same as action 1.2
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, Fishery, ICCAT
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.6: The fishery should demonstrate that the work on a tropical tuna management procedure has progressed for Atlantic Ocean yellowfin and the management procedure is agreed and implemented such that stock management objectives can be achieved	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery, ICCAT	November 2024	October 2025	<p>Position statements to ICCAT.</p> <p>Updated harvest strategy from ICCAT (if applicable)</p> <p>Evidence of the fishery adhering to management measures</p> <p>Evidence of meetings and collaboration between the fishery and DPM about adopting the HCRs for yellowfin tuna required by ICCAT</p>

Action Number and Name	1.7 – Harvest control rules for skipjack tuna (MSC Condition 2)
Action Goal	By year 4 the fishery shall (i) have well defined HCRs in place that ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as the PRI is approached, and (ii) shall provide available evidence indicating that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in keeping the stock fluctuating around a target level consistent with (or above) MSY.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work with local management authorities as well as request updates in management measures from ICCAT for a skipjack tuna harvest strategy. The fishery will implement the measures of the harvest strategy and harvest control rules and evidence this throughout the certification period.
Expected Completion Date	October 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: US\$ 5,000 for implementing the actions and updating the review Year 6: Same as Year 5 Year 7: Same as Year 5 Year 8: Same as Year 5
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.7a: Year 1, 2 and 3: At the first annual audit (2025) and at each subsequent surveillance audit until the adoption	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT	April 2025	October 2025-to-2027	Position statements to ICCAT.

<p>of control rules, the fishery client will submit evidence that it is working actively through the flag states' fisheries administrations and with other appropriate groups to promote the adoption by ICCAT of well-defined harvest control rules as well as to promote the development or adaptation of appropriate tools for eastern skipjack tuna. This includes a summary of the actions taken by the client, the governments, and other members of ICCAT to achieve this outcome.</p>					<p>Updated Harvest Strategy and HCRs from ICCAT (if applicable)</p> <p>Evidence of the fishery adhering to management measures</p> <p>Evidence of meetings and collaboration between the fishery and DPM about adopting the HCRs for skipjack tuna required by ICCAT.</p>
<p>1.7b: at the fourth surveillance audit (expected for 2028), the SG80 scoring requirements must be met in full for both scoring issues: (a) ICCAT must adopt explicit harvest control rules for the eastern skipjack tuna stock, and (c) ICCAT must have evidence that the tools are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules for the eastern skipjack tuna stock. The client will submit evidence that this is the case. At this point, the fishery should score at least 80 for PI 1.2.2.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT,</p>	<p>April 2025</p>	<p>October 2028</p>	<p>Updated Harvest Strategy and HCRs from ICCAT (if applicable)</p> <p>Evidence of the fishery adhering to management measures</p>

<p>Action Number and Name</p>	<p>1.8 – Harvest control rules for yellowfin tuna (MSC Condition 4)</p>
<p>Action Goal</p>	<p>A harvest strategy for the stock should be put in place which is responsive to the state of the stock, and which includes all relevant elements (including a means of implementation of management actions) such that the elements work together to achieve stock management objectives.</p>

Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work with local management authorities as well as request updates in management measures from ICCAT for a bespoke yellowfin tuna harvest strategy and improve PI 1.1.1 for yellowfin tuna. The fishery will implement the measures of the harvest strategy and evidence this throughout the certification period.
Expected Completion Date	October 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: US\$ 5,000 for implementing the actions and updating the review
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.8a: The client should demonstrate that the work on a tropical tuna management procedure has progressed for Atlantic Ocean yellowfin and the management procedure is agreed and implemented such that stock management objectives can be achieved	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, fishery, ICCAT	April 2025	October 2025	<p>Position statements to ICCAT.</p> <p>Updated Harvest Strategy and HCRs from ICCAT (if applicable)</p> <p>Evidence of the fishery adhering to management measures</p> <p>Evidence of meetings and collaboration between the</p>

					fishery and DPM about adopting the HCRs for skipjack tuna required by ICCAT.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	2.1 – Secondary species management (MSC Condition 5)
Action Goal	By the Year 3 Surveillance audit, there should be a partial strategy in place at the UoA level for the main secondary species - little tunny (<i>Euthynnus alletteratus</i>). The partial strategy should be expected to maintain or not hinder rebuilding of little tunny at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure the UoA does not hinder their recovery.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work towards encouraging the local and regional governing bodies to implement management measures for little tunny in the Atlantic Ocean. This also includes conducting stock assessments and relating the information from this to inform management measures. The fishery will evidence that it has implemented the management measures into operations via observer and catch data.
Expected Completion Date	October 2027
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: \$2,000 Year 6: same as year 5 Year 7: same as year 5
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.2.2

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
-------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

<p>2.1a: Year 1: For little tunny populations in the north-east Atlantic, the UoA collects information on all UoA sources of mortality and investigates the implementation of a partial strategy to maintain or not hinder rebuilding of little tunny at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure the UoA does not hinder their recovery.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Fishery, Coastal states' ministries (MCS), ports authorities</p>	<p>November 2024</p>	<p>October 2025</p>	<p>Report on the observer data and catch data obtained to highlight the rate of little tunny catch.</p> <p>Meeting information with DPM about management measures.</p> <p>Information, if any about the current management measures in place for little tunny by the DPM.</p> <p>Advocacy letters to ICCAT about including little tunny in management measures.</p>
<p>2.1b: Year 2: For little tunny populations in the north-east Atlantic, the UoA develops and implements a partial strategy to maintain or not hinder rebuilding of little tunny at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure the UoA does not hinder their recovery.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>FIP consultant</p>	<p>November 2024</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	<p>If management measures were discovered in Milestone 1, implement and align the measures with the fishery's bespoke management plan to reduce detrimental impact on little tunny.</p> <p>Report on the observer data and catch data obtained to highlight the rate of little tunny catch.</p> <p>Meeting information with DPM about management measures.</p> <p>Advocacy letters to ICCAT about including little tunny in management measures.</p>

<p>2.1c: Year 3: For little tunny populations in the north-east Atlantic, the UoA provides evidence that the adopted partial strategy supporting the fishery maintains or not hinder rebuilding of little tunny at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure the UoA does not hinder their recovery.</p>	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator	November 2024	October 2027	<p>Report on the observer data and catch data obtained to highlight the rate of little tunny catch to demonstrate that the fishery is not hindering the rebuilding of little tunny at/to levels which are highly likely to be above biologically based limits or to ensure the UoA does not hinder their recovery.</p>
---	---------	------------------	---------------	--------------	--

Action Number and Name	2.4 – Waste management policy
Action Goal	Prevent the detrimental impacts of ghost gears and marine waste on ETP species, habitats, and ecosystems by reducing the amount of waste that is produced by vessels and is introduced to the marine environment.
Action Description	<p>The tasks associated with this action are based on requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard version 3.0, in particular the new requirements on ghost gear. The fishery will implement a waste management policy onto the fleet vessels and design a waste management plan to ensure progress is made in reducing the amount of waste produced by the vessels and lost to the marine environment.</p> <p>ETP species PIs – The fishery will develop a waste management plan and use this to define a policy related to reducing the impact of marine waste and pollution on ETP species.</p> <p>Habitats PIs – The fishery will develop a waste management plan and use this to define a policy related to reducing the impact of marine waste and pollution on habitats.</p> <p>Ecosystems PIs – The fishery will develop a waste management plan and use this to define a policy related to reducing the impact of marine waste and pollution on ecosystems.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2026

Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: No associated costs Year 6: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.4a: Use the new requirements from the MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0 and those set by MARPOL Annex V to inform the questions required to produce a questionnaire. The questionnaire will be sent to the FIP participant to learn about their current awareness and contribution to marine waste and ghost gear impacts.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Waste management questionnaire.
2.4b: Write a report about the results of the questionnaire to outline the main areas that are lacking in information or need improvement to meet requirements of MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0, or the MARPOL Annex V.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Waste management data analysis report using information collected from the questionnaire.
2.4c: Use the questionnaire (2.4a) and waste management report (2.4b) to design and produce a waste management policy to align with the current practices onboard the vessels and how to mitigate against marine waste and ghost gear in the future.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Waste management policy to prohibit or reduce the amount of waste, including ghost gear that is produced by the FIP vessels.

2.4d: Evidence that the waste management policy (2.4c) is implemented on the vessels and that the crew are aware of the policy by taking photos of the policy on the bulletin board of the vessels or conducting FIP vessel audits.	FIP participant,	FIP co-ordinator	May 2023	April 2025	Photographs or FIP auditor report demonstrating the availability of the policy onboard the vessels.
2.4e: Evidence that the policy is being adhered to by the vessel and crew by analysing observer/EM data, which would demonstrate that the crew are not contributing to ghost gear or marine pollution.	FIP participant	FIP coordinator	May 2023	April 2026	Analysis of observer/EM data.
2.4f: Use observer/EM data and photos to write a report about the success of the project and how it aligns with the requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	May 2023	April 2026	Observer data report to demonstrate either compliance or non-compliance with the waste management policy.

Action Number and Name	2.5 – ETP species outcome (MSC Condition 6)
Action Goal	By the year 4 surveillance audit, the fishery should demonstrate that the direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of silky sharks and loggerhead turtles
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work towards obtaining significantly more observer data than was available at the initial assessment stage to demonstrate the accurate impact that it is having on ETP species, specifically for silky sharks and loggerhead turtles. Using this data, a management plan to improve the rate of silky shark and loggerhead turtle bycatch will be produced and implemented to reduce the rate of interaction. Finally, both companies within the fishery will be using fully non-entangling FADs.
Expected Completion Date	October 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: \$2,000

	<p>Year 6: same as year 5</p> <p>Year 7: same as year 5</p> <p>Year 8: same as year 5</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, National management
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>2.5a: Year 1: Evaluate current data collection and options for monitoring of UoA impacts on ETP species that is representative of the entire UoA fleet. Review options for measures so that the direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species, in particular silky shark and loggerhead turtle.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2025	<p>Report on the most recent observer data for the fishery, which emphasises the catch rates of silky shark and loggerhead turtles, including information about ICCAT annual reports of silky shark and loggerhead turtle catches.</p> <p>Training materials and photos of the crew training of ISSF best practice handling and release techniques for ETP species.</p> <p>Evidence of 100% non-entangling FADs. Supplementary photos, materials receipts, etc.</p>

<p>2.5b Implement improved plan for monitoring of UoA impacts on ETP species that is representative of the entire UoA fleet. Implement appropriate management measures so that the direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species, in particular silky shark and loggerhead turtle</p>	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2026	<p>Updates will be provided during surveillance audit.</p> <p>Obtain regular observer data reports and analyse the data to ensure that ETP species are being accurately recorded</p> <p>This observer data should be able to demonstrate improvements in catch rate.</p>
<p>2.5c: Year 3: Continued implementation of improved monitoring plan for UoA impacts on ETP species that is representative of the entire UoA fleet. Continued implementation of appropriate management measures so that the direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species, in particular silky shark and loggerhead turtle. .</p>	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2027	<p>Updates will be provided during surveillance audit</p> <p>Obtain regular observer data reports and analyse the data to ensure that ETP species are being accurately recorded</p> <p>This observer data should be able to demonstrate improvements in catch rate.</p>
<p>2.5d: Year 4: The client provides evidence that the direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species, in particular silky shark and loggerhead turtle.</p>	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2028	<p>Report on the improved plan to monitor silky shark and loggerhead turtle catches using observer data.</p> <p>Produce a report using observer data that demonstrates the direct effects of the fishery on ETP species and whether this has improved over time.</p>

Action Number and Name	2.6 – ETP species information (MSC Condition 7)
Action Goal	By the year 4 surveillance audit, the fishery should demonstrate that the quantitative information available on catches of sharks is adequate to assess the UoA related mortality and impact and to determine whether the UoA may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species. The information should be adequate to measure trends and support a strategy to manage impacts on the ETP species concerned.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work towards obtaining significantly more observer data than was available at the initial assessment stage to demonstrate the accurate impact that it is having on ETP species, specifically for sharks. Using this data, a management plan to improve the rate of shark bycatch will be produced and implemented to reduce the rate of interaction. Finally, both companies within the fishery will be using fully non-entangling FADs and continue to send shark bycatch incident data to DPM and ICCAT.
Expected Completion Date	October 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: \$2,000 Year 6: same as year 5 Year 7: same as year 5 Year 8: same as year 5
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, National management
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
-------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

2.6a: Year 1: Review options for monitoring of UoA impacts on shark species so that the quantitative information is adequate to assess the impact of the fishery on ETP species and measure trends that can support the ETP species management strategy in place.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2025	Observer data report identifying key shark bycatch data, including incidents of accidental bycatch. Shark retention log. Materials of shark identification training Evidence of data submission to CRODT and then to ICCAT about shark catch rates and condition of the catches.
2.6b Year 2: Implement an improved plan for monitoring of UoA impacts on shark species that ensures quantitative information is adequate to assess the impact of the fishery on ETP species and measure trends that can support the ETP species management strategy in place.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2026	Materials of shark identification training Shark retention log Evidence of data submission to CRODT and ICCAT about shark bycatch incidents.
2.6c: Year 3: Continue to implement the improved plan for monitoring of UoA impacts on shark species. The information collected should be adequate to assess the impact of the fishery on ETP species and measure trends that can support the ETP species management strategy in place. If any modification to the plan have been required, these shall be justified at this time.	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2027	Materials of shark identification training Shark retention log Evidence of data submission to CRODT and ICCAT about shark bycatch incidents.
2.6d: Year 4: By the fourth surveillance audit (2028): The client will need to provide data and analysis showing that some quantitative information is adequate to assess the UoA related	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2028	Report outlining the fishery's contribution to shark bycatch, including addressing any and all

<p>mortality and impact and to determine whether the UoA may be a threat to protection and recovery of the shark species. The information provided should be adequate to measure trends and support a strategy to manage impacts on ETP species and should be representative of the UoA fleet.</p>					<p>trends in catch rates, using the shark retention logbooks.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Action Number and Name	2.7 – Habitat management strategy (MSC Condition 8)
Action Goal	By the Year 4 surveillance, there should be an objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy in place for managing UoA impacts on VME habitats, associated with lost and/or abandoned UoA FAD beaching events, will work based on information directly about the UoA and/or habitats involved.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work towards reviewing current management measures in place for habitats and VMEs in the operational area of the fishery and working to develop those where lacking, including ensuring that all vessels within the fleet of the fishery are using 100% non-entangling FADs only. This means that there must be alignment in FAD policies between the two companies.
Expected Completion Date	October 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 5: \$2,000</p> <p>Year 6: same as year 5</p> <p>Year 7: same as year 5</p> <p>Year 8: same as year 5</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, National management

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.4.2
--	-------

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.7a: Year 1: Carry out a review of management options to provide some objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy will work based on information directly about the UoA and/or habitats involved.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2025	<p>Review of the current management measures in place for VMEs</p> <p>Evidence that Grand Bleu is using 100% non-entangling FADs in operations.</p> <p>Meeting evidence with DPM about ensuring compliance with ICCAT management measures.</p> <p>Use FAD logbooks to demonstrate FAD retrieval/recovery incidents</p> <p>Use Zunibal data to estimate FAD losses.</p>
2.7b Year 2, 3 and 4: Present partial strategy, which has some objective basis for confidence that it will work based on information directly about the UoA and/or habitats involved.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator National management	November 2024	October 2026-to-2028	<p>Report on the FAD retrieval/recovery and loss overtime and how this demonstrates that the partial strategy is effective.</p>

Action Number and Name	2.8 – Habitat information (MSC Condition 9)
-------------------------------	--

Action Goal	By the year 4 surveillance, information availability should be adequate to allow for identification of the main impacts of the UoA on coral reef habitats, associated with the beaching of lost and/or abandoned UoA FADs, and should provide reliable information on the spatial and temporal extent of UoA FAD beaching events.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will work towards reviewing current management measures in place for habitats and VMEs in the operational area of the fishery and working to develop those where lacking, including ensuring that all vessels within the fleet of the fishery are using 100% non-entangling FADs only. This means that there must be alignment in FAD policies between the two companies. Likewise, the alignment in FAD management policies must also include alignment in the process of procuring FAD tracking data to observe the number of active, lost, and retrieved FADs across the vessels in the fishery.
Expected Completion Date	October 2028
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: \$2,000 Year 6: same as year 5 Year 7: same as year 5 Year 8: same as year 5
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.4.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
-------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

<p>2.8a: Year 1: Carry out review of available data sources to determine the risk of the UoA reducing structure and function of coral reef habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm, associated with lost and/or abandoned UoA FAD beaching events, and identify additional monitoring needs to support partial strategy. Develop monitoring program.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	November 2024	October 2025	<p>FAD logbooks with FAD and retrieval/removal data</p> <p>Zunibal reports with FAD loss estimates</p> <p>Aligned FAD loss and retrieval reports from both Capsen S.A., and Grand Bleu S.A.</p> <p>Review of the coral reefs in local areas.</p>
<p>2.8b: Year 2 & 3: Implement monitoring program and commence data</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	November 2024	October 2026-to-2027	<p>FAD logbooks with FAD and retrieval/removal data</p> <p>Zunibal reports with FAD loss estimates</p> <p>Updated management measures dependent on findings from the coral reef review in Milestone 9.1.</p>
<p>2.8c: Year 4: The client will need to provide evidence that a monitoring program is in place with associated analyses that is adequate to allow for identification of the main impacts of the UoA on coral reef habitats, associated with lost and/or abandoned UoA FAD beaching events, and provides reliable information on the spatial and temporal extent of these types of events.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	November 2024	October 2028	<p>FAD logbooks with FAD and retrieval/removal data</p> <p>Zunibal reports with FAD loss estimates</p> <p>Updated internal management measures dependent on findings from the coral reef review in Milestone 1</p>

Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	3.5 – Decision-making processes (MSC Condition 10)
Action Goal	The client fishery should demonstrate that at ICCAT level, decision-making processes regarding the yellowfin tuna stock management respond to important issues, specifically to catches in excess of the annual catch limit corresponding to the HCR, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner.
Action Description	Between the date of certification and the reassessment, the fishery will work towards meeting an unconditional score at the MSC level for this Condition. The fishery will collaborate with the local management body in Senegal, DPM to communicate with ICCAT and work towards improving the compliance of yellowfin tuna fisheries in the northeast Atlantic Ocean, which prevents the TAC being exceeded. The fishery will also advocate to ICCAT via DPM to ask that the ICCAT implements a bespoke harvest strategy for yellowfin tuna stocks in this area.
Expected Completion Date	October 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: \$2,000
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.5a: The client must provide evidence that, independently or jointly with industry groups, it has worked with relevant management	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	November 2024	October 2025	Harvest strategy for YFT.

<p>authorities to press for ICCAT action on responding to the issue of total catches in excess of the agreed Catch Limit, by progressing with the harvest strategy (as per Conditions on PI 1.2.1 and PI 1.2.2) or some other evidence.</p>					<p>Evidence that the total annual catch for YFT did not exceed the TAC.</p>
<p>3.5b: The client must provide evidence that ICCAT has responded to the issue of total catches in excess of the agreed Catch Limit, by progressing with the harvest strategy (as per Conditions on PI 1.2.1 and PI 1.2.2) or some other evidence.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Fishery</p>	<p>November 2024</p>	<p>October 2025</p>	

Appendix

Old, closed out actions from the original workplan

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	2.1 – Secondary species outcome, management, and information
Action Goal	Understand all known parameters, for example selectivity of the gear, to increase the susceptibility scoring.
Action Description	<p>Only one ‘main’ secondary species has been identified from the client catch data for both FAD and free-school sets, little tunny (<i>Euthynnus alletteratus</i>). As this species is not managed and reference points are not available, the RBF was used to score this scoring element. Little tunny’s MSC PSA derived score was 62. This may have been because the susceptibility scoring includes unknowns, for example selectivity of the gear. The RBF methodology states that “Where there is limited information available to score a susceptibility attribute, the more precautionary score shall be awarded (Annex PF4.4.2.2 of the MSC Certification Process v2.1). Other attributes also got the highest risk score as the species is retained and the depth of the purse seine net overlaps heavily with the species’ depth range.</p> <p>Whilst ICCAT recognise the importance of addressing bycatch and discards highlighted by the FAO International Guidelines on bycatch management and reduction of discards, there is nothing more specific for little tunny than what is stipulated under Rec. 16-01, paragraph 52 which required CPCs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit to the SCRS information on bycatches and discards made by fishing vessels flying their flag fishing for tropical tunas. • Encourage the vessel owners, masters and crew fishing for tropical tunas under their flag to implement good practices to better manage bycatches and reduce discards. • Consider designing and adopting management measures and/or management plans to better manage bycatch and reduce discards. <p>This allows the SCRS to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the contribution of bycatches and discards to the overall catches in ICCAT tropical tuna fisheries, on a fishery by fishery basis; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise the Commission on possible measures allowing to reduce discards and to mitigate onboard post-harvest losses and by-catch in ICCAT tropical tuna fisheries. <p>Rec. 17-01 (on prohibition on discards from tropical tunas caught by purse seiners) requires the retention of bigeye, skipjack and yellowfin tuna. Whilst designed to reduce wastage of the target species, the Recommendation serves to reduce the number of little tunny discarded during purse seine operations, which are also not discarded and fully utilised in the fishery. The above information constitutes measures, if necessary, which are expected to maintain secondary species at levels highly likely to be above biologically based limits. Sla is met.</p> <p>This Recommendation is very similar to measures imposed by other tuna RFMOs, such as CMM 19-05 by the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and CMM 2020-01 by the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission, both of which create incentives to discourage waste and encourage an efficient utilisation of fishery resources. On this basis, the measures are considered likely to work. SG60 is met for Sib.</p> <p>Sic was not scored, as the SCRS review of the Recommendation is not due until later in 2020 and the scoring issue applies to partial strategies, which is not yet in place for this PI.</p>
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 7,500</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 20,000 to include the assessment and analysis.</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 2,000</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 2,000</p> <p>Year 5: None</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.1a: UoA observer data with associated forms obtained over at least a 3-year period and analysed for shark finning incidents. Based on the findings of this analysis, a management strategy should be validated by the UoA that demonstrates shark finning is not taking place, as required.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery, Coastal states' ministries (MCS), ports authorities	June 2020	December 2024	
2.1b: Determine the need for an Ecosystem Risk Assessment and if necessary, go out to tender to plan and organise that includes finding unknown parameters to complete a PSA.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP consultant	June 2020	December 2024	
2.1c: Analyse, if necessary, the need for EM in the fleet to provide third-party coverage of fleet activities with regard to secondary species.	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator	June 2020	July 2021	
2.1d: Development of a fleet-level generic bycatch reduction strategy to minimise bycatch levels, especially for associated sets. Strategy should include best-practice handling procedures.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	December 2020	January 2024	
2.1e: Put in place additional management measures and data collection, if required.	Fishery	FIP consultant/co-ordinator	June 2021	June 2023	
2.1f: Review effectiveness of management strategy. A short consultancy project to be initiated to review the effectiveness of the management plan for mitigating impacts on ETP species. This is to include the measures and implementation processes to assess implementation successes and barriers, including results of data analysis to provide feedback on best practice procedures.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery, potentially Coastal states' management authorities (MCS) and port authorities	June 2024	December 2024	

Alternatives measures to be put in place as required.					
<p>2.1g: Update observers with new templates to record adequate information about secondary species fates (retained or discarded), condition (dead or alive), number, and estimated mass to be able to determine the type of secondary species that the fishery interacts with.</p> <p>And/or</p> <p>Use the data from the electronic monitoring (EM) systems on board to learn about the type of species that the fishery interacts with.</p>	Fishery	FIP coordinator	May 2023	December 2024	Better templates for observers to use to ensure they are collecting the correct information
2.1h: Use the data from the updated observer records to analyse the type of species interacted with and write a report about the findings.	Fishery	FIP coordinator	May 2023	December 2024	A report demonstrating the findings of the data analysis
2.1i: Use the observer data report to inform better management to improve and reduce the fishery’s interaction with secondary species.	Fishery	FIP coordinator	May 2023	December 2024	Improved management practices to reduce negative secondary species interactions.

Action Number and Name	2.2 – FAD management
Action Goal	<p>The associated actions concerning FADs cover a number of PIs. These have been disseminated below:</p> <p>ETP PIs – The use of FADs in the fishery will not hinder the recovery of ETP species (such as silky sharks, turtles and other species) and indirect effects are highly likely not to create unacceptable impacts. Relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA impacts (including FADs) on ETP species, including information to develop a</p>

	<p>management strategy (which should aim not to hinder recovery of ETP species and regularly reviews and implements measures to minimise mortality of ETP species), assess its effectiveness and determine outcome status of ETP species.</p> <p>Habitat PIs - The use of FADs in the fishery will not cause serious or irreversible harm to habitat structure and function and there will be a management strategy in place with this objective. Information is adequate to determine the risk posed to the habitat by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage impacts on the habitat.</p> <p>Ecosystem PIs – The use of FADs will not cause serious or irreversible harm to the key elements of the ecosystem structure and function. There will be management measures in place to meet this objective, and the information collected shall demonstrate adequate knowledge of the impacts of the UoA on the ecosystem.</p>
Action Description	<p>ETP species PIs - There are both direct and indirect effects associated with FADs. The behaviour of species such as silky sharks makes them more likely to be directly caught in purse seine operations due to their affinity for floating objects and secondly through FAD entanglement (for species like silky sharks and turtles) adding an unobserved mortality element to associated impacts. Additionally, with respect to indirect effects, tunas and silky sharks are more closely associated with FADs during daytime (Forget et al., 2015¹), making them vulnerable to capture but little information is known about how ETP species' behaviours are affected by interactions with FADs.</p> <p>Habitats PIs - Whilst it is probable that the use of FADs is unlikely to reduce the structure and function of VME (coral reefs) and commonly encountered habitats as to cause serious or irreversible harm, the lack of information and understanding of the real nature of this issue and the accumulative effect of years of FAD deployment in the Atlantic (granted not just from this fishery) means the more information should be gathered to provide higher degrees of certainty in order to produce a management strategy to achieve a habitat outcome PI score of SG80 (i.e. a strategy is in place that is designed to ensure the UoAs do not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the habitats encountered by the fishery).</p> <p>Ecosystem PIs- The effects of FADs used in the fishery on the migration patterns and feeding of tuna and other key predators (e.g. silky shark and oceanic whitetip shark) is a subject of concern. The impact of current FAD numbers on tuna populations and the broader ecosystem are poorly understood. Research (Haillier and Gaertner, 2008²) indicated that tunas associated with FADs eat less than those in free schools, the difference in growth rate and condition potentially</p>

¹ Forget, F. G., M. Capello, J. D. Filmalter, R. Govinden, M. Soria, P. D. Cowley, and L. Dagorn. 2015. Behaviour and vulnerability of target and non-target species at drifting fish aggregating devices (FADs) in the tropical tuna purse seine fishery determined by acoustic telemetry. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 72:1398–1405.

² Haillier, J.P., Gaertner, D. 2008. Drifting fish aggregation devices could act as an ecological trap for tropical tuna species. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*. Vol: 353: 255-264.

	being a consequence of altered feeding patterns. Significant changes in migratory direction and displacement rates were observed in the presence of drifting FADs, supporting the hypothesis that FADs act as a super-stimulus, misleading tunas to make inappropriate habitat selection. However, further studies are required to investigate the long-term effect of FADs on the entire life cycle of tunas.
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 15,000 Year 2: US\$ 7,500 Year 3: TBC dependent on previous years Year 4: TBC dependent on previous years Year 5: None
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Estimated completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.2a: Review current literature to understand the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem to frame the problem and necessary research. This shall then be used to advise task 2.2b.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2020	April 2021	

<p>2.2b: Define the approach to investigate the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP species such as sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem. The objective of this is to add to the information base on indirect effects of the UoAs on ETP species and main impacts of the UoA on these key ecosystem elements. This can then be used to update the pre-assessment and action plan.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2020	December 2024	
<p>2.2c: Verify the fishery has formally adopted best practice non-entangling FADs. Taking into account the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Clarifying latest ISSF recommendations on ‘non-entangling FADs’. Note, the requirement on ‘non-entangling FADs’ in ICCAT Recommendation 19-02 potentially refers to the ‘lower risk entanglement FADs’ according to some ISSF guidelines (where there is conflicting definitions of NE FADs in ISSF guidelines as of April 2021). To meet the MSC standard, it is likely the FIP will have to go further than this. II. Look at promoting the adoption of biodegradable materials (as per Task 4) to help reduce the severity of FAD beaching. 	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery, NGOs	April 2020	December 2021	
<p>2.2d: Species identification training for skippers is needed to improve the accuracy of fishery-dependent recordings of non-target species interacting with the fishery and make sure best practice on board is happening. These species are normally not of commercial interest, so may have been previously overlooked. Training should cover the commonly encountered species (ETP and secondary species) and identification guides provided to each vessel.</p>	FIP co-ordinator, fishery	NGOs	July 2020	December 2024	
<p>2.2e: Fishery-dependent recording of ETP species needs to be improved to allow cross-checking with observer data and EMS analysis to build a more</p>	FIP co-ordinator, fishery	NGOs	August 2020	December 2024	

<p>accurate picture of fishery-specific impacts and identify potential 'hot-spots' for ETP interactions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Design addition to daily catch reporting logbook (electronic or hard copy) to record. II. Using the format described in 1. above, record set-types, locations, numbers and fates of ETP species (to species level) caught in the fishery (by operations and entangled with FADs). This should include those species which are not broad onboard or when found entangled with a FAD prior to remove of the FAD from the water (see 4f Implement FAD management plan). 					
<p>2.2f: Define a fishery specific FAD management plan aimed at reducing the risk of derelict and impact of entangling FADs and to make sure best practice on board is happening. The plan should focus on a number of measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Development and practical implementation of biodegradable FADs. II. Record the number of FADs deployed. III. Removal and recording (location, type of FAD, any entanglements of animals) of abandoned FADs when encountered, regardless of ownership. IV. Gathering more information of lost FADs, spatial extent and interactions with habitats and explore how these may be tracked. A research paper will be compiled gathering more information to allow identification of the main impacts of derelict FADs in this fishery. The focus will be around the issues as discussed in the pre-assessment. An output will include recommendations for mitigating the impacts. V. Avoiding high risk FAD deployment areas. VI. Collaboration in a FAD Watch programme across the WCPO. VII. Limiting FAD deployments. 	FIP co-ordinator, fishery	NGOs	July 2020	January 2023	

2.2g: Implement investigation approach as outlined in task 2.2b.	FIP co-ordinator, fisheries research organisation	NGOs	July 2020	December 2024	
2.2h: Align work with relevant e-NGOs to the fishery to test the difference in the impacts of biodegradable and traditional non-entangling FADs in selected locations.	Fishery/ FIP co-ordinator	NGOs	July 2020	December 2024	
2.2i: Reach out to e-NGOs in relevant countries to determine the potential risk to corals from derelict FADs and entanglement of ETP species. This information will be included to the assessment, and possible additional actions shall be added at a later date.	Fishery/ FIP co-ordinator	NGOs	July 2020	December 2024	
2.2j: Analyse fishery reporting on ETP species in conjunction with observer data to quantify direct effects of the fishery operations and FAD-use (entanglement). This analysis should be done annually to build an information base on the fishery.	FIP co-ordinator		August 2021	December 2024	
2.2k: Improve FAD management strategies at the fishery level, where necessary to fill gaps through advocacy to necessary states. Further advocate for the implementation of sustainable FAD management strategies at the RFMO level.	Fishery, Flag States	FIP co-ordinator	February 2022	December 2024	
2.2l: Implement the FAD management plan (2.2f) and ensure sure best practice (covering points described in the management plan).	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator, observer programme	January 2023	June 2024	
2.2m: Verify application of the FAD management plan in the fishery of through observer data	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator, observer programme	July 2023	December 2024	

2.2n: Present a report that provides evidences that the collected information has been analysed with the identification of the main impacts of derelict FADs on coral reefs, and an understanding of the spatial extent and timing of the interactions (as per 2.2f).	Research group/ institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023	December 2024	
2.2o: Present a report on investigation as outlined in 2.2b. Report will cover: (i) the potential impact of the UoAs FADs on the behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem (including ETP species); and (ii) any other main consequences of the UoAs FADs for the ecosystem that may be inferred (i.e. indirect effects).	Research group/ institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023	December 2024	
2.2p: If necessary, the FIP shall advocate to the authorities to update this document to include the latest guidelines on FAD design as well as other FAD measures.	Research group/ institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023	December 2024	

Action Number and Name	2.3 – Shark finning policy
Action Goal	The fishing operations will not contribute to detrimental impacts on ETP species, including sharks and rays. There will be management and policies in place to meet this objective and prohibit shark finning incidents.
Action Description	The tasks associated with this action are based on requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard version 3.0, in particular the fins naturally attached policy. The fishery will implement a shark finning and FNA policy onto the fleet vessels and demonstrate compliance through photos and future observer data. ETP species PIs - The fishery will be working to improve the current scoring the following ETP species PIs: 2.3.1, and 2.3.2, by updating management of ETP sharks on board the vessels and improving their outcome.
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High

Estimated Cost	Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: No associated costs Year 5: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.3a: Review observer data to understand the fishery interaction with ETP shark species.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Use the observer data to inform the shark finning policy
2.3b: Produce a shark finning policy to be used across the fishery to emphasise that shark finning is prohibited on board the vessels, using language from the requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard (v3.0).	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Shark finning policy
2.3c: The shark finning policy should contain a 'fins naturally attached' (FNA) rule to prevent shark finning of those individuals that are incidentally or intentionally landed, in line with the requirements from the MSC Fisheries Standard (v3.0).	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Requirement of the shark finning policy includes FNA rule
2.3d: Conduct skipper and crew training to ensure that they are aware of the policy and the implications for their practices on board the vessels.	FIP participant,	FIP co-ordinator	March 2023	April 2025	Photographs and FIP audit report
2.3e: Evidence that the shark finning policy and FNA rule is published on the vessels by taking photographs or conducting audits.	FIP participant	FIP coordinator	March 2023	April 2025	Observer data analysis report

2.3f: Evidence that the policy is being adhered to by the vessel and crew by analysing observer data to ensure all incidents are handled according to the best practice handling and release techniques.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	March 2023	April 2025	Observer data analysis report
--	------------------	-----------------	------------	------------	-------------------------------

Action Number and Name	2.4 – Waste management policy
Action Goal	Prevent the detrimental impacts of ghost gears and marine waste on ETP species, habitats, and ecosystems by reducing the amount of waste that is produced by vessels and is introduced to the marine environment.
Action Description	<p>The tasks associated with this action are based on requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard version 3.0, in particular the new requirements on ghost gear. The fishery will implement a waste management policy onto the fleet vessels and design a waste management plan to ensure progress is made in reducing the amount of waste produced by the vessels and lost to the marine environment.</p> <p>ETP species PIs – The fishery will develop a waste management plan and use this to define a policy related to reducing the impact of marine waste and pollution on ETP species.</p> <p>Habitats PIs – The fishery will develop a waste management plan and use this to define a policy related to reducing the impact of marine waste and pollution on habitats.</p> <p>Ecosystems PIs – The fishery will develop a waste management plan and use this to define a policy related to reducing the impact of marine waste and pollution on ecosystems.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>

Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.4a: Use the new requirements from the MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0 and those set by MARPOL Annex V to inform the questions required to produce a questionnaire. The questionnaire will be sent to the FIP participant to learn about their current awareness and contribution to marine waste and ghost gear impacts.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Waste management questionnaire.
2.4b: Write a report about the results of the questionnaire to outline the main areas that are lacking in information or need improvement to meet requirements of MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0, or the MARPOL Annex V.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Waste management data analysis report using information collected from the questionnaire.
2.4c: Use the questionnaire (2.4a) and waste management report (2.4b) to design and produce a waste management policy to align with the current practices onboard the vessels and how to mitigate against marine waste and ghost gear in the future.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023	April 2025	Waste management policy to prohibit or reduce the amount of waste, including ghost gear that is produced by the FIP vessels.
2.4d: Evidence that the waste management policy (2.4c) is implemented on the vessels and that the crew are aware of the policy by taking photos of the policy on the bulletin board of the vessels or conducting FIP vessel audits.	FIP participant,	FIP co-ordinator	May 2023	April 2025	Photographs or FIP auditor report demonstrating the availability of the policy onboard the vessels.

2.4e: Evidence that the policy is being adhered to by the vessel and crew by analysing observer/EM data, which would demonstrate that the crew are not contributing to ghost gear or marine pollution.	FIP participant	FIP coordinator	May 2023	April 2025	Analysis of observer/EM data.
2.4f: Use observer/EM data and photos to write a report about the success of the project and how it aligns with the requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard v3.0.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	May 2023	April 2025	Observer data report to demonstrate either compliance or non-compliance with the waste management policy.

Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	3.1 - Legal and customary framework for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia
Action Goal	Demonstration that a comprehensive legal and customary framework is in place for these countries.
Action Description	<p>Senegal: Senegal is a CPC of ICCAT and is therefore bound to cooperate with its requirements. At the national level there is the Code of fisheries of Senegal, but further details are limited to provide analysis as to whether there is an effective national legal system and a framework for cooperation with other parties, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2. SG60 is not currently met without further information.</p> <p>Mauritania: When offences are found (following a port inspection for example), the control officer draws up a statement of offence, containing the precise statement of the facts, all of the circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence and the possible testimonies. The control officer signs the report, witnesses and the offender, if they accept it. Mention is made where appropriate of the refusal to sign the minutes or to receive a copy (Fisheries Code, 2015; Article 76). There is no further mention of the right to contest the finding, although the Fisheries Code is explicit in the juridical processes available to follow in the cases of infractions. Slb cannot meet SG60 without further information, but it appears there is not a dispute resolution process available at the national level.</p> <p>Artisanal fishing is a vital part of contribution to food security in Mauritania (Belhabib et al., 2012). Imraguen traditional fishing communities depend directly on fish for their livelihood. These communities have the exclusive fishing rights in the Parc National du Banc d'Arguin (PNBA) (Picon 2002, as cited in Belhabib et al., 2012), the largest marine protected area in Africa. Further to this, subsistence fishing is specifically referred to in 2015 Fisheries Code as one of the types of fishing occurring in Mauritania. This goes some way to demonstrate that the management system has a mechanism to at least generally respect or observe the legal rights of communities reliant on fishing to live. Ministerial Order no 9077 (2010) created provisions specifically applying to maritime artisanal fishing, creating local Councils created to manage marine artisanal fishing. No further information could be found to provide evidence of a mechanism to respect the legal rights of subsistence fishers. SG60 could not be awarded for Slc without more information.</p> <p>Cape Verde: According to the "Plano de gestão dos recursos da pesca em cabo verde (Management plan for fishing in Cape Verde) 2019 – 2023, provides the possibility of filing appeals, but the review for this pre-assessment could not cast any light as to the mechanism employed. On this basis, SG60 cannot be awarded for Slb.</p>

Artisanal fishing is an activity with a long tradition in Cape Verde and is closely associated with small fishing communities, contributing to the creation of jobs and the improvement of the living conditions of many families (EU, 2019). The 2019 – 2023 Fisheries Management Plan adopts the system of using territorial rights will be applied both on the basis of traditional historical rights and on the basis of specific agreements. In this case, a part of the territory is reserved for certain fishing communities on a given island, a principle that also directly holds the fishers responsible. Overall, the PI fails due to the <60 score on Scoring Issue b and c.

Guinea Bissau: Regarding dispute resolution, Article 23 of the Decree-Law No. 10/2011 provides opportunity to appeal against a decision to suspend or revoke a fishing licence. The same is true, for example of Article 72 of the same Decree, which allows for administrative or judicial appeal against sanctions imposed. SG60 is met for SIb as the management system is subject by law to a mechanism for the resolution of legal disputes arising. What is not clear from this desk-based review, is whether this process is transparent and considered effective in dealing with most issues. SG80 is not met.

Guinea: There was limited information found on dispute resolution for Guinea. Lenselink (2002) describes the following: that “conflict settlement practices are rather confusing, as there are three distinct government agencies which claim responsibility, the DNPM, the national directorate, the CNSP, the national centre for surveillance and protection of fisheries; the ANAM, the national maritime navigation agency.” “To complicate the matter, relations between the agencies are often such that it is not likely that one agency will contact another to ask for collaboration on a case. The result is that most cases remain unresolved, there is no settlement”. “Even when there are settlements, these tend not to be legally binding, so execution of the sanctions is not certain”. It does at least appear that the management system incorporates a mechanism for the resolution of legal disputes. SG60 is met. The lack of information and doubt to its transparency and effectiveness precludes SG80 from being reached for SIb.

Sierra Leone: There is evidence that the management system is subject to mechanisms for the resolution of legal disputes arising within the system, with for example, the Ministry of Fisheries and the Marine Resources arbitrating fisheries conflicts, for example, settlement of net destruction conflicts and ensure that the industrial fishing companies compensate the victims (Sei and Baio, 2019). The Fisheries and Aquaculture Bill further sets out that there is a mechanism for appeal. “An applicant for a licence who is aggrieved by a decision not to grant or renew any licence or authorisation under this Act may appeal to the Minister within thirty days of receiving notification of such decision, and may further appeal to the High Court within thirty days of receiving notification of the Minister’s decision” Later on in the Bill, further appeal provisions for “any person aggrieved by a decision of the Director... may appeal to the High Court within thirty days of the Director’s decision”. For SIb, at SG60 is met. It is not clear whether the transparent mechanism is considered effective in dealing with most issues, so a higher score cannot currently be given for this scoring issue.

	<p>Liberia: Section 10.13 of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Management and Development Law of 2019 presents a clear process for appeals through a “Licence Appeals Committee”. This allows those whose licence application has been refused a procedure to follow in order to appeal the decision. Decisions are made by consensus and the appellant may seek judicial review in court if necessary. Fishers may also further appeal if their vessel has been seized under Section 12.7 of the Act. The above-motioed sections of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Management and Development Law of 2019 demonstrate that the management system is subject by law to a transparent mechanism for the resolution of disputes. SG60 is met. What cannot be answered from the remote review, is whether this mechanism is deemed to be effective in dealing with most issues. SG80 cannot be met on this basis without stakeholder testimony.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The consultation and review can be managed by the FIP coordinator in collaboration with the relevant FIP participants and flag states. It is estimated that this would cost US\$ 5,000 per flag state (35k total) plus extra US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 3,000</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.1.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1a: Collect information and conduct a review of fishery dispute mechanisms of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	April 2020	April 2025	
3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	April 2020	April 2025	
3.1c: Engage regularly with coastal State management to develop dispute mechanism where absent in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co- ordinator, NGOs	July 2020	April 2025	

3.1d: Engage regularly with coastal State management to develop a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia into the management system where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	July 2020	April 2025	
3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is enshrined in legislation in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia.	FIP co-ordinator	Ministry	January 2025	April 2025	
3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is enshrined in legislation in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia.	FIP co-ordinator	Ministry	January 2025	April 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.2 - Consultation, roles and responsibilities for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau and Guinea
Action Goal	Demonstrate that fishery management systems for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau and Guinea meet the MSC Standard PI 3.1.2. Specifically, that it identifies and actively engages with all interested parties and all roles are understood.
Action Description	<p>Senegal: In the fisheries sector, the Ministry of Fisheries is responsible for the sustainable management of fisheries resources within the country's exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The Ministry of Fisheries includes the Direction des Pêches Maritimes (DPM, Department of Marine Fisheries), the Direction de la Protection et de la Surveillance des Pêches (DPSP, Directorate of Fisheries Protection and Surveillance), The Direction des Industries de Transformations (DITP, Department of Processing Industries) and the Cellule d'Etude et de Planification (CEP, Study and Planning Unit), among other departments (Figure 23.2). The Centre de Recherche Océanographique de Dakar-Thiaroye (CRODT, Centre for Oceanographic Research of Dakar-Thiaroye) supports the Ministry of Fisheries by performing research on fisheries (ACPFish II, 2013). Roles and responsibilities can be describes as generally understood but not explicitly defined. SG60 is met for SIa. In 2000, the government launched a campaign of consultations with professional organisations and NGOs, and the administration revisited fisheries development strategies. The government recognised then the failure of the top-down approach and opted for an inclusive governance strategy. Another consultation process was launched in 2004 to include fishers in reform decisions. As a result, the consultative process yielded the Sectoral Policy Letter, and the elaboration of the Stratégie de croissance accélérée (SCA, Strategy for Accelerated Growth), where fisheries are regarded as a key component in the strategy for poverty reduction (Sarr, 2011). SG60 is met. The fishing industry also has opportunity to participate in consultations and decision-making processes. The Groupement des Armateurs et Industriels de la Pêche au Senegal (GAIPES), is the Senegalese Association of Fishing Companies and Ship Owners. GAIPES exists to defend the interests of its members, all of which are exclusively fishing companies. They have a direct connection to the government in an advisory capacity, offering advice and input on issues related to the development and management of the fishery sector (Bank and Thiam, 2018), but the channel, frequency and freedom to do provide advice is not known at this stage, due to the remote review of this fishery. On a precautionary basis, SG80 is not met, as it is not clear if consultation processes regularly seek and accept relevant information. With more information, it is possible this SI may achieve a higher score. It is not clear is the consultation process provides opportunity for all interested and affected parties to be involved. SG80 cannot be met for SIc.</p> <p>Mauritania: The Fisheries Code makes reference to the agreement of objectives and measures between the ministry and "interested parties". Development or updating of management plans are the subject of consultations with professional organisations and any other stakeholder judged necessary. This at least provides evidence that there is a platform for</p>

discussion for stakeholders when developing management plans. The extent to which the consultation process provides opportunity for all interested and affected parties to be involved is as yet unclear, so SG80 cannot be awarded for SIc without more information.

Cape Verde: According to the “Plano de gestão dos recursos da pesca em cabo verde (Management plan for fishing in Cape Verde) 2019 – 2023, provides the possibility of filing appeals, but the review for this pre-assessment could not cast any light as to the mechanism employed. On this basis, SG60 cannot be awarded for SIb.

Artisanal fishing is an activity with a long tradition in Cape Verde and is closely associated with small fishing communities, contributing to the creation of jobs and the improvement of the living Conditions of many families (EU, 2019). The 2019 – 2023 Fisheries Management Plan adopts the system of using territorial rights will be applied both on the basis of traditional historical rights and on the basis of specific agreements. In this case, a part of the territory is reserved for certain fishing communities on a given island, a principle that also directly holds the fishers responsible.

Overall, the PI fails due to the <60 score on Scoring Issue b and c.

Guinea Bissau: The Decree-Law No. 10/2011 provides statements as to the responsibility of fisheries management. For example, that the Government department of fisheries is responsible for international agreements with other States and ensuring Guinea Bissau’s participation in cooperative management of fisheries resources. It is also responsible for the provision of regulatory measures to ensure the conservation, management and sustainable exploitation of aquatic biological resources and providing authorisation to fish. In this way there is a general understanding of the organisations and respective functions and responsibilities. SG60 is met for SIa. There appears to be a lack of explicit definition of specific department responsible for different roles. SG80 is not met. Consultation and effective participation is required in Decree-Law No. 10/2011 approving the Basic Fishing Legislation during the preparation of fisheries management plans, specifically public and private entities and institutions affected by the fishing activities. This provides some evidence that there is at least consultation processes that obtain relevant information from the main affected parties, which may include local knowledge, to inform the management system. SG60 is met. No further information could be found through this review on the frequency of consultation, so it cannot be said at this stage to be ‘regular’ without further information. SG80 is not met.

Guinea: Whilst there are clearly several agencies who are responsible for different aspects of fisheries management in Guinea, no information could be found with respect to consultative processes further than that “in accordance with the national, sub-regional, regional and international provisions in force, the fisheries management and management plans also associate all the institutions and public and private actors of the fisheries, according to a participative approach, of negotiated governance, favouring the implementation of co-management and participatory monitoring mechanisms”. It

	is not clear how they obtain relevant information and whether there is opportunity for all interested and affected parties to be involved. SG60 can therefore not be awarded for SIb or SIc and this PI fails.
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 3,000 Year 2: US\$ 3,000 Year 3: US\$ 1,00 Year 4: US\$ 1,000 Year 5: US\$ 1,000
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.2a: Conduct investigation and review the degree to which all roles and responsibilities within the fishery are clearly defined. Consult with industry and other stakeholders to ascertain how well the functions and responsibilities are understood.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities	April 2020	April 2025	
3.2b: Identify all relevant stakeholders in the fishery.	FIP co-ordinator	National management	April 2020	April 2025	

		authorities, fishery			
3.2c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework clearly identify the role publicly.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	April 2021	April 2025	
3.2d: Develop a strategy to ensure and encourage wider engagement and representation in consultations.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	April 2021	April 2025	
3.2e: Ensure the fishery management plan clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	April 2022	April 2025	
3.2f: Periodically review the efficacy of the consultation process.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities	April 2022	April 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.3 – Long-term objectives for Senegal, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau
Action Goal	Have evidence of long-term objectives defined by Senegal, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau.
Action Description	<p>Senegal: The objective set by the Senegalese government in the economic and social policy document (2011–15) is to increase the contribution of fisheries and aquaculture to the national economy and food security and rebuild fish stocks by 2015. Although these objectives have not been met – Senegalese fisheries are still facing over-exploitation and overcapacity, particularly because catches are declining despite (or rather because of) increasing fishing effort – clear and concise targets were not established.</p> <p>Mauritania: The Fisheries Code (2015) seeks to define a strategy aimed at protecting marine resources and allowing their sustainable exploitation in order to preserve the balance of ecosystems and aquatic habitat for present and future generations and further mentions the application of the precautionary approach. Included in Code is the development of management plans for conservation and sustainable management of fishery resources. On this basis, it is considered that there are long term objectives to guide decision-making, consistent with the MSC Fisheries Standard and precautionary approach, implicit within management policy. SG60 is met. Without clear long-term objectives, SG80 cannot be met for this PI.</p> <p>Guinea Bissau: Fisheries management objectives are to prevent the overexploitation of live marine resources, to ensure that catches are maintained at a sustainable level, and to promote the development of fisheries (FAO, 2001). This is stated in Decree-Law No. 10/2011 approving the Basic Fishing Legislation. The adoption of the precautionary approach to management measures in lieu of scientific knowledge is listed as one of the general principles of the Decree. Further reference is made to provision of closed seasons or zones, limiting catch volumes for certain species, the adoption of any measures aimed at conservation of aquatic biological resources and protection of the marine environment, setting allowable percentage of bycatches of certain species and minimum landing sizes. Whilst the precautionary approach is explicitly referred to in the Basic Fishing Legislation, objectives relating to the premise of the MSC Fisheries Standard are implicit. For example, no reference is made to maintaining stocks at MSY or the ecosystem-approach to fisheries management. On this basis, only SG60 is awarded for this PI.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	Medium

Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: There is an initial need for research and review of the long-term objectives with led by the FIP coordinator and supported by the relevant FIP participants. Most of the work will be conducted in year 1 (a budget of US\$ 10,000 is estimated) and the subsequent years should involve just following up with consultations and meetings.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 3,000</p> <p>Year 5: none</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.1.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.3a: Conduct a review of long-term objectives in Senegal, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	National management authorities	April 2020	April 2025	
3.3b: Engage with national management authorities of Senegal, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of long-term objectives in relation to MSC. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including a list of participants.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	January 2021	April 2025	

3.3c: The stakeholder group shall meet annually to discuss progress and formulation objectives where not in place.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	July 2021 and July 2022	April 2025	
3.3d: Embed these explicit long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed during meetings with stakeholders into a tuna management plan.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	July 2023	April 2025	
3.3e: Review and report on appropriateness of the objectives implemented and amend as necessary.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/	Fishery	July 2024	April 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.4 - Fishery Specific Objectives for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia
Action Goal	Have a robust fishery specific management plan or obtain and understand the existing Fishery Specific Objectives.
Action Description	<p>Senegal: While governance in Senegal shifted from a top-down approach to be inclusive of other stakeholders such as fishers, fisheries policy shifted from focusing on increasing productivity to managing fish stocks sustainably (Kébé 2008). After independence, fisheries policy concentrated on two main aspects. First, it focused on promoting the development of artisanal fisheries (REPAO 2011). The main objective of this strategy was to increase fish catches and foreign currency through licensing foreign industrial vessels and subsidising domestic industrial and artisanal sectors, which ultimately resulted in an increase in foreign fishing effort, increasing catches (Figure 23.3), and ultimately, over-exploitation. Also, targeting higher-value species to increase exports led to lower supply in local markets (Kébé 2008). Second, efforts were made to emphasise sustainable management and co-management to correct for the effects of the first strategy (REPAO 2011).</p> <p>Mauritania: Specifically, management plans must, amongst other criteria, specify for each fishery; the objectives to be achieved in terms of planning and sustainable management; define the distribution mechanisms for each fishery of the total allowable catch (TAC) and the catch limitation strategy accessories and discards at sea; define, in fisheries subject to individual quotas, the total volume of individual quotas allocated which cannot exceed the TAC fixed for the period. What is unclear is if this applies to the tuna fisheries. In the absence of a fishery specific management plan for fishing taking place in its waters, SG60 is not met for this PI.</p> <p>Cape Verde: There is a management plan for yellowfin tuna in Cape Verde (as stated in the Plano de gestão dos recursos da pesca em cabo verde). The management objectives established for the yellowfin tuna fishery are to guarantee sustainable and optimised fishing; ensure the sustainability of the resource; operate with maximum sustainable yield; improve the economic viability and social Conditions of the sector; ensure the appropriate levels of cooperation in national, regional and international (ICCAT) fisheries management structures. In the 2016 – 2017 Biennial Management Plan for Fisheries Resources, the following measures for the management of industrial tunas (yellowfin, bigeye and skipjack) are defined: specific measures: cautious expansion of the fishing effort through the control of licences fishing. General measures: in the absence of sufficient information on a given resource, the principle of precaution in its exploitation applies; control and certification of the legality of catches in the framework of the fight against IUU fishing; transshipment is prohibited throughout the EEZ, which must be carried out exclusively at designated ports. Whilst there are objectives consist with Principle 1, there appears not to be any general or specific objectives which are aimed at Principle 2, for example management of bycatch or the ecosystem approach. SG60 is therefore not met.</p>

Guinea Bissau: Fisheries Resource Management Plans are mentioned in Article 10 of the Decree-Law No. 10/2011. For each main fishery, a management plan is to be created. Each plan is required to specify the objectives of sustainable management, including the fishing effort admissible. Although possible that a tuna management plan is in place for Guinea-Bissau, it could not be found during this remote information review for this pre-assessment. In the absence of a tuna fishery management plan for the Guinea Bissau fishery. SG60 is not met for this PI.

This PI potentially scored well due to lack of information or access to the data. This must be proved through engagement with authorities to ensure tuna management plans are in place. If they are not, the FIP must work and advocate for these to be developed.

Guinea: No tuna management plan could be found for Guinea. In the absence of a fishery-specific plan, SG60 could not be awarded for this PI.

Sierra Leone: The provision of fishery management plans is expressly considered and requirement in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Bill. "Each fisheries management plan shall take the following into consideration: a) identify the fishery resource and its characteristics, including its economic and social value and interrelationship with other species in the ecosystem; b) assess the present state of exploitation of the fishery resource and potential average annual yields; c) specify the objectives to be achieved in the management and development of the fishery; d) take into account the best information on all relevant biological, social, economic and other applicable factors, determine the maximum sustainable yield". Although possible that a tuna management plan is in place for Sierra Leone, it could not be found during this remote information review for this pre-assessment. SG60 cannot be awarded on this basis.

Liberia: The Fisheries and Aquaculture Management and Development Law of 2019 makes specific reference for the provision of Fisheries Management Plans. They must: "a identify the characteristics of the fisheries resource(s) and the area, including as appropriate the i. current status of the fisheries and the resource; ii. current state of exploitation; iii. relevant fishing methods and practices; iv. boundaries of any relevant area; and v. relevant regional and international context; b. identify the management objectives and strategy for the fishery; c. as appropriate, identify development strategies for the fishery; d. specify the management measures to be applied to the fishery; e. specify arrangements for the monitoring and review of the Fisheries Management Plan; and f as appropriate, provide for any other matter necessary for the conservation, management and sustainable use of the fishery. g. Specify management for the collection and collation of fisheries catch and effort data". Fisheries management plans are reportedly available at a public registry within the Authority's offices (under 8.12 of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Management and Development Law of 2019). A management plan for the tuna fishery could not be found during this remote review of information, which is not to say

	that it does not exist. However, in the absence of a fisheries specific management plan to manage tuna resources in its waters, SG60 cannot be met for this PI.
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 7,500 Year 2: US\$ 5,000 Year 3: US\$ 5,000 Year 4: US\$ 2,500 Year 5: US\$ 2,500
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.4a: Conduct a review of fishery specific management legislation of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	National management authorities	April 2020	April 2025	

3.4b: Engage with national management authorities of Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of a specific fisheries management plan for tuna fisheries. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including a list of participants.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	August 2020	April 2025	
3.4c: The stakeholder group shall meet annually to discuss progress and formulation of tuna management plan where not in place.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	August 2021 and August 2022	April 2025	
3.4d: Promote the production of a tuna management plan for Senegal which explicitly lists the short- and long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed with stakeholders.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	August 2023	April 2025	
3.4e: Review appropriateness of tuna management plan implemented and advocate for amendments as necessary.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	August 2024	April 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.5 – Decision-making process for Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia
Action Goal	Evidence that the management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges
Action Description	<p>Senegal: No evidence could be found that the management authority is disrespecting or defying laws by repeated violation of the same law which is necessary for the sustainability of the fishery. SG60 is met for Sle. No further information could be found regarding whether the management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges. SG80 is not met on a precautionary basis.</p> <p>Mauritania: No evidence could be found that the management authority is disrespecting or defying laws by repeated violation of the same law which is necessary for the sustainability of the fishery. SG60 is met for Sle. No further information could be found regarding whether the management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges. SG80 is not met on a precautionary basis.</p> <p>Cape Verde: Acknowledgement of issues with tuna stocks (bigeye and yellowfin specifically) are stated in the Plano de gestão dos recursos da pesca em cabo verde and are reflected in the management’s requirement to apply the precautionary approach in the absence of information or poor stock status (see PI 3.2.1 rationale). This provides evidence that the decision-making processes response to serious issues identified in relevant research (in this case by ICCAT), and management plans have been adapted accordingly. SG60 is met for S1b. It is not clear if the decision-making processes respond to other issues though, so SG80 is not met. As mentioned about in PI 3.1.2 S1b, there is a monitoring committee, consisting of various relevant stakeholder groups. The committee review subjects such as identification of the constraints and weaknesses in implementing management plans and the current status of implementation. The outcome reports are then circulated to relevant stakeholders as a technical follow up to further support the committee’s future meetings. It can therefore be said that some information on the fishery’s performance and management action is generally available to stakeholders. SG60 is met for S1d. As it is not clear the extent to which information on the fishery’s performance and management action is available and whether explanation are provided for any actions or lack of actions associated with findings and relevant recommendations, SG80 cannot be awarded based on the precautionary approach. No evidence could be found that the management authority is disrespecting or defying laws by repeated violation of the same law which is necessary for the sustainability of the fishery. SG60 is met for Sle. No further information could be found regarding whether the management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges. SG80 is not met on a precautionary basis.</p>

	<p>Guinea Bissau: Given the above information and the fact that Guinea Bissau is a member of ICCAT, it is required to follow Recommendations put in place to respond to serious issues, such as the poor stock status of bigeye. SG60 is met for Slb. What is not clear is whether Guinea Bissau’s decision-making processes also respond to other important issues identified. SG80 is not met following this remote review of information.</p> <p>Guinea: Given the above information and the fact that Guinea Bissau is a member of ICCAT, it is required to follow Recommendations put in place to respond to serious issues, such as the poor stock status of bigeye. SG60 is met for Slb. What is not clear is whether Guinea Bissau’s decision-making processes also respond to other important issues identified. SG80 is not met following this remote review of information.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: As recent as 2019, the MFMR imposed a one month ban on industrial fishing within the EEZ of Sierra Leonian waters, responding to serious issues regarding overfishing that has been identified and IUU, to try and recover some of the fish stocks. However, it cannot be concluded that measures have been adequate and deemed a timely response to the serious Condition of local fish stocks, nor does did the action take into account the wider implications of decisions of the fishery, as IUU was still reportedly taking place via foreign Chinese vessels during the ban. However, as a member of ICCAT, Sierra Leone is required to comply with ICCAT Recommendations and Resolutions put in place to respond to serious issues, such as the poor stock status of bigeye. SG60 is met for Slb. What is not clear is whether Sierra Leone’s decision-making processes also respond to other important issues identified. SG80 is not met following this remote review of information.</p> <p>Liberia: No evidence could be found that the management authority is indicating a disrespect or defiance of the law by repeatedly violating the same law or regulation necessary for the sustainability for the fishery, so SG60 is met for Slc. A higher score could not be awarded at this time as no information could be found that management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges or whether there are even any legal challenges currently on-going. In the absence of legal issues, SG80 could be reached.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The review and reporting would need to be conducted by a qualified team and it is estimated that this could involve US\$ 15,000 of fees. If an in-person meeting is necessary then these expenses would be extra, a budget of \$3,000 per country would be recommended.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 2,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p>

	Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 1,000 Year 5: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.5a: Conduct review of decision-making processes in Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia to fully understand gaps identified in pre-assessment. The reviews should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the process transparent, timely & evidence-based? 2. Does the decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation? 3. Does it include the precautionary approach and use of best science available? 4. Input from management authorities and other relevant stakeholders. 	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant		April 2020	April 2025	

<p>5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery.</p> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
<p>3.5b: Define decision-making processes in the management system. The process shall include, if necessary, how will evidence be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation). 2. Stakeholders be consulted. 3. Utilised from best-available information to ensure the precautionary approach. 4. Outcomes be communicated (information should be made available on request and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity). 5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary. 6. Precautionary approach in management plan. 	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2021	April 2025	
<p>3.5c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate above into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held.</p>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	January 2022	April 2025	

<p>3.5d: Implement the decision-making process, ensuring stakeholder are consulted and informed (for example via email, website, formal report etc.) best-available information (from RFMOs, research etc.) and the precautionary approach are included.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>April 2023</p>	<p>April 2025</p>	
<p>3.5e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>February 2024</p>	<p>April 2025</p>	

Action Number and Name	3.6 - Compliance and enforcement for Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia
Action Goal	Obtain further evidence to understand all flag states meet SG80 in the MSC standard and ensure there is no evidence of systematic non-compliance.
Action Description	<p>Mauritania: Fishers are generally thought to comply with the management system, given the stringent sanctions and procedures in place nationally. Mauritania has not been issued with EU yellow or red cards. Slc most likely reaches SG60. Without some evidence to demonstrate compliance, a higher score could not be awarded.</p> <p>Cape Verde: The fishing operations conducted under the SFPA are generally thought to fully comply with the management recommendations of ICCAT and the fisheries management regulations of Cape Verde. However, Cape Verde has lost its capacity to mobilise observers on EU vessels. There are also concerns regarding non-compliance with reporting Conditions imposed on EU vessels in terms of entry and exit reporting, and submission of catch reports by vessels. Other than this no specific breaches by EU vessels of Cape Verde regulations have been detected meaning. Given the lack of confidence in compliance ability Slc is awarded SG60.</p> <p>Guinea Bissau: Fishers are generally thought to comply with the management system under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery. For example, fishers are required by law (Decree-Law No. 10/2011) to provide catch information to the department of fisheries. SG60 is met for Slc. As this is only a desk-review and no stakeholders were consulted as part of this pre-assessment, evidence was not available to demonstrate compliance with the management system. SG80 was not awarded for Slc. According to a study by Interpol (2014) "Guinea Bissau has an extensive problem with IUU fishing primarily due to the government's limited institutional capacity to regulate the fishing sector." Given the doubts and inactivity to reduce illegal fishing, it was not possible to say that there is no evidence of systematic non-compliance. SG80 is not awarded for Slc.</p> <p>Guinea: With respect to sanctions, the Code of Marine Fisheries 2015, Title VIII covers the infractions that are issued for fishing non-compliance. Sanctions are issued, amongst many others for use of unauthorised fishing gear, use of explosives or toxic substances, violation of the rules that have been defined in relation to the supply of catch data. Sanctions are usually in the form of monetary fines, but fishing licences can also be suspended or revoked. In summary there are sanctions to deal with non-compliance. During the review for this pre-assessment, evidence was not found that these sanctions are applied. With a deeper review, evidence may be found that penalties are consistently applied. At present SG60 cannot be awarded due to lack of demonstrably application, causing the PI to fail.</p>

	<p>Sierra Leone: Sanctions and offences are specified in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Act and include fines, suspension of licences, confiscations of fishing vessels and others. Penalties can be awarded for a wide range of matters including prohibitions of the capture and retention of certain species, prohibited fishing gear, closed areas, closed seasons, fishing in marine protected areas.</p> <p>However, according to the EU Commission, "in Sierra Leone legal texts governing fisheries are outdated and sanctions fail to deter illegal operators operating internationally under the flag of Sierra Leone, without the fisheries authorities' knowledge. In addition, the number of licensed vessels exceeds the available resources and authorities fail to monitor or control their waters (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2016)." With this statement in 2016, the EU issued Sierra Leone with a 'Yellow Card' on their fisheries practices. Although in Sierra Leone, all foreign trawlers must carry a fisheries officer on board who are supposed to report illegal activity, there are issues with systematic non-compliance within the fishery. As recently as 2019, a one month fishing ban was put in place for industrial fishing within the EEZ of Sierra Leone (https://www.dw.com/en/sierra-leones-one-month-fishing-ban-achieves-little/a-48531485). However, it has been reported that foreign Chinese vessels have still been active during this time demonstrating there is non-compliance. SG60 for SIb, SIc and SId are not met.</p> <p>Liberia: Regarding IUU, the European Commission in 2017 issued a warning (yellow card) to Liberia over its lack of effort regarding the fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing (European Commission, 2017). To date some progress has been made, however Liberia still faces the potential of receiving a red card after this initial warning, with the yellow card still yet to be lifted, potentially prohibiting fisheries imports into the European Union. SG80 cannot be met as there is evidence of systematic non-compliance through IUU fishing.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 2,000</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 1,000</p>

Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.6a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries. This should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MCS plans and strategies. 2. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.). 3. Interviews with enforcement personnel. 4. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions and/or court proceedings. 5. Any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems. <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	April 2020	April 2025	
3.6b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2021	April 2025	
3.6c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	January 2022	April 2025	

should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.					
3.6d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2023	April 2025	
3.6e: Review effectiveness of MCS system implemented and adjust where necessary. A report should be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	April 2024	April 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.7 - Management performance evaluation for Senegal, Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia
Action Goal	Ensure regular internal and external reviews are taking place across all flag states.
Action Description	<p>Senegal: One of the main issues in fisheries management in Senegal is the frequent change of leadership, resulting in high institutional instability, a lack of regulatory enforcement and change in priorities (Corten et al., 2012). According to conclusions of a meeting of the APRAPAM, frequent changes in ministries and ministers have a very negative impact on fisheries governance and the policy and strategies that emanate from it. Three main steps contributed to establishing fisheries policy during 2000–2014, a period characterised by major instability within the Ministry of Fisheries (seven nominations) and within the administration (six Directors of Fisheries).</p> <p>Mauritania: Fishery management plans are periodically reviewed. The nature of the review is unclear, i.e. whether it is internal or external and approximately how often these occur. Without further information SG60 cannot be awarded for either scoring issue.</p> <p>Guinea Bissau: No information could be found during this remote review of information as to whether there are mechanisms in place to evaluate some, key or all parts of the fishery-specific management system. Therefore, it is not possible to score SG60 for SIa. The above therefore prevents SIb being scored, as it is not clear from information publicly available if any reviews are completed, let alone whether these are internal or external reviews are completed.</p> <p>Guinea: According to the 2015 Marine Fisheries Code, management plans for a fishery must be periodically revised. What areas are evaluated in this review is not clear from the review conducted for this pre-assessment. In theory, there are at least occasional internal reviews of the fishery-specific management system. Without further information from the fishery management authorities in Guinea, it has not been possible to pass this PI.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: The above reviews are completed at least internally on an occasion basis. SIb meets SG60. There is no evidence of external review, so SG80 cannot be awarded for SIb.</p> <p>Liberia: It appears that there is regular internal review of the fishery-specific management system. What is not clear, is whether there is any external reviews have been conducted. Only SG60 is met for SIb.</p>
Expected Completion Date	April 2025
Priority	High

Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 5,000 Year 2: US\$ 2,500 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 2,500 Year 5: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.4

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.7a: Review fishery-specific management processes currently in place. Ascertain whether these systems are subject to internal and/or external review, the format, the areas already reviewed (tuna management plan, performance, decision-making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these occur.</p> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery authority	March 2020	April 2025	

3.7b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on findings of report.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co- ordinator	March 2021	April 2025	
3.7c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co- ordinator	December 2021	April 2025	
3.7d: Implement finalised plan with binding commitment and requirements to undertake reviews where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure regular internal and occasional external reviews from relevant bodies.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co- ordinator	March 2023	April 2025	
3.7e: Review effectiveness of review system implemented and adjust where necessary. A report should be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co- ordinator	March 2024	April 2025	