

Indian Ocean purse seine tuna FIP (Dongwon)

Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Workplan Update

Version 3.0

March 2026, amended June 2026

Project ref: 0077

Prepared by

Key Traceability Ltd.



Key Traceability Ltd.

+44 7505 122728

info@keytraceability.com

England Registered Company 09730288

70 Londesborough Road, Portsmouth, PO4 0EX

Table 1: Workplan Overview

Workplan Version and Date	Version 3.0 10/03/2026
Start date (expected)	End date (anticipated month/year)
January 2020	January 2030
FIP Lead (organization/individual responsible for Action Plan)	Improvements recommended by (meeting/group that supported the development)
Key Traceability	Key Traceability Dongwon Industries
FIP Coordinator (organization/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	Workplan developed by (consultant or person)
Emily Wardrop – Key Traceability	Key Traceability

Acronyms

Acronym	Explanation
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
FIP	Fishery improvement project
EEZ	Exclusive economic zone
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
TRP	Target reference point
LRP	Limit reference point

Introduction

The vessels in this fishery are flagged to the Republic of Korea, operating in the Indian Ocean (IO) high seas and the following Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs): Mauritius, Seychelles, and Madagascar. The fishery is regionally managed by the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). In October 2024, one of the vessels (ADRIA) was replaced by VASCO, meaning that there are still only two vessels in the fleet (BLUE OCEAN and VASCO).

(Table 1).

Table 1: Vessel list for the eastern Pacific Ocean purse seine tuna FIP

Vessel Name	IMO Number	Flag
BLUE OCEAN	7409138	Rep. Korea
VASCO	7305409	Rep. Korea

Following the publication of the fishery's MSC assessment report one additional action is required for this FIP as a result of some score changes for the performance indicator (PI) 3.2.2. Information on the evaluation can be found in the specific report on the FIP profile.

In February 2026, the fishery's final certification report was published by the MSC and the fishery gained the MSC certificate for the yellowfin and skipjack portions of the fishery. The final report demonstrated that the compliance and enforcement for this fishery was meeting SG80. "The Korea-flagged vessels in the UoAs have to comply with all requirements from IOTC, checked regularly by the MOF through the Fisheries Monitoring Centre (FMC), in order to obtain or keep their Distant Water Fishing Licence. tuna including all IOTC requirements linked to the control of IUU, such as daily VMS and eLogbook activities and catch reporting, prior and entry and exit notifications of EEZ and port entrances (IOTC area, Seychelles, Tanzania, Madagascar, Mauritius EEZ, Port-Victoria and Port-Louis and Korean ports), scientific observers for the larger vessels, and landing declarations". Therefore, this action can be considered to be closed out, and has been struck out in this document (action 3.6).

An additional action was created (1.3) to ensure that the stock status and rebuilding requirements for bigeye tuna are included in the workplan for the FIP. Whilst the original workplan included an action related to stock status and rebuilding for yellowfin tuna, there was no specific action for bigeye tuna. Since the stock status of bigeye is not at a level that meets MSC requirements for SG80, a rebuilding plan for the stock is required. However, there is currently no sufficient plan in place for bigeye tuna in the Indian Ocean and therefore, this action was created as of March 2026.

Therefore, this workplan update has been created to include the new actions associated with the evaluation score. The first part of the workplan describes all existing workplan actions as of March 2026, and the second part of the document describes the new actions.

Existing workplan actions

Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	IPG 1.2 – Promote the development of a well-managed harvest strategy and harvest control rules (HCRs) for all three tuna species by the IOTC	
MSC PI	1.2.1 and 1.2.2	
Action Goal	The harvest strategy is responsive to the state of the stocks for bigeye and yellowfin tuna and there are well-defined harvest control rules in place for all the target species.	
Action Description	The objective for IOTC management for target stocks is to maintain them at a level capable of producing MSY. Presently, HCRs for bigeye and yellowfin are not in place (catch limits and a number of other tools are in the process of being implemented through the interim rebuilding plan for yellowfin (Res. 19/01)), meaning that all aspects of the harvest strategy are not in place, and therefore cannot work together and be responsive to the state of the stock. Workplan tasks for this action are designed to advocate for the progression of well-defined HCR development for YF and BE so that there are management measures in place that can adapt to stock status fluctuations. For yellowfin, tools are available to apply. Despite the availability, the stock is not demonstrating recovery and so could infer that the HCRs in place are not effective in controlling exploitation. If the same situation (i.e., if the stock status fell below MSY) occurred for bigeye, it is difficult to say whether without well-defined HCRs, current available tools would be effective for this stock either. SG60 is not met for either yellowfin or bigeye. Further to this, workplan tasks for this action revolve around advocacy, following and reporting (briefing documents; letter of position) on HCR development to ensure it is well-defined and effective for the current stocks. Currently the IOTC has developed and adopted HCRs for only skipjack tuna, but are still in the process of being implemented, and the ways in which catch limits will be is not yet clear, evidence is therefore not available to say that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs.	
Expected Completion Date	March 2026	
Priority	High (for BET and YFT)	Medium for SKJ

Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 23,000 plus US\$ 3,000 for expenses Year 2: As per year 1 Year 3: As per year 1 Year 4: As per year 1 Year 5: As per year 1
Responsible Parties	The FIP coordinated by Key Traceability will be advocating to IOTC and Republic of Korea to develop harvest strategies. It is the responsibility of the IOTC to develop and implement them.

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.2a. Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Engage with Korean scientists and delegations. If appropriate to participate with, existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum and ISSF. Further engagement with overlapping MSC fisheries (certified and in assessment) and overlapping FIPs.	IOTC, FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	March 2021		
1.2b: Hold meetings with delegation members with the following purpose: I. Continuing to emphasise the importance of the harvest strategy and build consensus for a process to develop robust harvest control rules to the FIP industry partners and other like-minded fisheries and coastal States in the Indian 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	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal states, NGOs	March 2021		

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
delegations so that they are kept informed of current ideas and proposals at IOTC and within coastal States where the industry partners have links.					
1.2c: IOTC briefing document on Harvest Strategies (2021). Prior to IOTC plenary 2021 produce a formal briefing document regarding the status of the current harvest strategy, the objective of IOTC, the position of key players and likely upcoming proposals, and the outcome preferred by the FIP, to brief the governments and other stakeholders.	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal states, NGOs	March 2021		
1.2d: Position paper for a harvest 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 all three species. Work with the governments delegations to obtain their support for the paper, as well as that of other member states as far as possible.	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal states, NGOs	March 2021		
1.2e: Promote best practice for harvest strategy. Promote through the governments a process of consultation to inform IOTC members about best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding, to build consensus towards support of proposals of management measures.	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal States, NGOs	March 2021		
1.2f: Engage with IOTC scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing YFT and BET tuna to be developed.	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal states, NGOs	March 2021		

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.2g: If necessary, provide an independent paper on the scope and needs of HCRs. Conduct a study to identify candidate HCRs and tools for BET and YFT (candidate HCRs already tested for SKJ) that meet the objective for submission to the IOTC. Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal states, fishery, NGOs	March 2021		
1.2h: On-going engagement with coastal and flag states and IOTC over HCR development. Discussions held with like-minded IOTC members and organisations 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 IOTC meeting process. IOTC's record to reflect discussions and progress. The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.	FIP co-ordinator, IOTC	Coastal States, fishery, NGOs	March 2022		

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	IPG 2.4 - FAD habitats and beaching
Action Goal	The associated actions concerning FADs cover a number of PIs. These have been disseminated below: 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.
Action Description	The following tasks involved in this action are largely research related so that best available studies and knowledge are used to inform fisheries policy and management. 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 concern is regarding FAD beaching. The FAD component of the fishery will have a potential effect on VME habitats, such as coral reefs. Other studies in the Indian Ocean (Maufroy et al., 2015; Davies et al., 2017) suggested that up to 0.4 – 45% beaching likelihood depending on location. The lack of information and understanding of the real nature of this issue and the accumulative effect of years of FAD deployment 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.
Expected Completion Date	June 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: Costs included within IP 2.2 Year 2: No associated costs Year 3: Costs included within IP 2.2 Year 4: Costs included within IP 2.2 Year 5: None
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3
---------------------------------	---------------------

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.4a: Research on FAD impacts on vulnerable habitats and beaching events by starting to collect information on: I. Removal and recording (location, type of FAD, any entanglements of animals) of abandoned FADs when encountered, regardless of ownership. II. 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. III. Collaboration in a FAD Watch programme across the Indian Ocean.	FIP co-ordinator, fishery	NGOs	July 2021		
2.4b: Reach out to e-NGOs in relevant countries to determine the potential risk to corals from derelict FADs. 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 2021		
2.4c: Present a report that provides evidence 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.	Research group/ institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023		

Action Number and Name	IPG 2.7 – Waste management policy
Action Goal	The associated actions concerning waste management, including ghost gear and FADs cover a number of PIs. These have been disseminated below: ETP species PIs – Ghost fishing occurs when discarded or lost pieces of fishing gear perpetuate in the ocean and continue to catch marine fauna, including ETP species, incidentally. These incidental catches can be detrimental to the animals’ populations and because the gear is lost or discarded, the incidents go unreported. Ghost gear can also be in the form of lost or discarded FADs, of which their impacts on ETP species have been described. Habitat PIs – Ghost gear and marine waste produced by fishing vessels can be detrimental to a range of habitats, even those not directly associated with the fishery. Drifting marine waste, including nets and other fishing gear can travel large distances and settle on vulnerable habitats, such as coral reefs, mangroves, and seagrasses. Marine debris and microplastics originating from fishing vessels has been found in the root systems of seagrasses, large portions of netting has been seen to damage or smother corals, and pieces of monofilament line have been demonstrated wrapped around mangrove systems. Marine waste deposits on habitats can be highly detrimental to the structure of the habitat and the animals that rely on it. Ghost gear can also be in the form of lost or discarded FADs, of which their impacts on habitats have been described. Ecosystem PIs – As mentioned, ghost gear and marine waste from fishing vessels has shown to interact with important marine ecosystems, including coral reefs. Physical damage and breakage of delicate corals can cause immediate mortality of the species or introduce pathogens that spread across whole reef systems. Ghost gear can also be in the form of lost or discarded FADs, of which their impacts on ecosystems have been described. The aim of this action is to 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	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. 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. 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.

	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.
Expected Completion Date	March 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, 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
2.7a: 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		Waste management questionnaire.
2.7b: 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		Waste management data analysis report using information collected from the questionnaire.
2.7c: Use the answers from the questionnaire (2.7a) and waste management report (2.7b) to design a waste management workplan aligned with addressing the areas lacking information or that could use improvement.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	February 2023		Waste management workplan to outline and demonstrate the progress needed to reduce

					marine waste produced by the vessels/FIPs.
2.7d: Use the questionnaire (2.7a) and waste management report (2.7b) 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		Waste management policy to prohibit or reduce the amount of waste, including ghost gear that is produced by the FIP vessels.
2.7e: Evidence that the waste management policy (2.7d) 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		Photographs or FIP auditor report demonstrating the availability of the policy onboard the vessels.
2.7f: Evidence that the policy is being adhered to by the vessel and crew by analysing observer data, which would demonstrate that the crew are not contributing to ghost gear or marine pollution.	FIP participant	FIP coordinator	March 2023		Analysis of observer/EM data.
2.7g: Use observer 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	June 2023		Observer data report to demonstrate either compliance or non-compliance with the waste management policy.
2.7h: Ensure that all FADs used are using non-entangling materials aligned with					

Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	3.6 – Compliance and enforcement for Mauritius, Seychelles, and Korea
Action Goal	Obtain further evidence to understand all flag states meet SG80 in the MSC standard (i.e., that the MCS system in place is enforced and sanctions consistently applied).
Action Description	As in other P3 IPGs, overall and outlined in further detail below, the tasks involved in this action are to gather evidence to confirm pre-assessment scores, or if appropriate evidence is found, to update these scores. If evidence cannot be found or is not available work must be undertaken to ensure that the specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery. (though advocacy, consultations, working with stakeholder groups, etc). Mauritius – Sanctions are contained under the Fisheries and Marines Resources Act (2007) under Section 70. Evidence needs to be gathered to answer whether these sanctions are consistently applied. Seychelles – The Fisheries Act (2014) defines enforcement and sanctions. Under this law (Section 8 of Part II), the SFA maintain a record of fishing vessels that have been granted a licence, permit or authorisation. The degree to which enforcement of these regulations can be enforced and whether sanctions are being consistently applied is the objective of this FIP action for the Seychelles. Korea – Korea is the flag state in this assessment. As mentioned in the pre-assessment report, more information is required with respect to whether non-entangling FADs are used 100% of the time (i.e., whether entangling FADs are fished on when encountered opportunistically). As this poses a gap in knowledge and evidence in this assessment, a precautionary score of 60-79 was awarded. This action will however be addressed in the FAD management activities under Principle 2 and not discussed further here.
Expected Completion Date	March 2026
Priority	Medium for all coastal and the flag state
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 5,000 Year 2: US\$ 5,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 2,000 Year 5: US\$ 1,000

Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, coastal and flag state.
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.6a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries of Mauritius, and Seychelles. This should include: 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. A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	April 2021		
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 2022		
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 2023		

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 2024		
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 2025		

New Actions as of March 2026

Principle 1: Stock status

Action Number and Name	1.3 – Stock status and Rebuilding for Indian Ocean bigeye tuna					
Action Goal	There is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.					
Action Description	The stock is not fluctuating around MSY. Recent catch has not been reduced to adjust for the stock status. Therefore, the IOTC stock assessment and the rebuilding timeframe for bigeye tuna should be analysed to ensure it is correct and everything being done to take deliverable action to make bigeye stocks sustainable.					
Expected Completion Date	March 2030					
Priority	High					
Estimated Cost	Year 5: No associated costs Year 6: No associated costs Year 7: No associated costs					
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, FIP participant, IOTC					
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	1.1.1 and 1.1.2					

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

1.3 - Stock status and Rebuilding for Indian Ocean bigeye tuna	1.3a - Analyse IOTC stock assessment and rebuilding timeframe for bigeye to ensure it is correct and everything being done to take deliverable action to make bigeye stocks sustainable	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	March 2026	March 2030	
	1.3b - Collaborate with relevant fisheries in the area	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	March 2026	March 2030	
	1.3c – Conduct rebuilding scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the IOTC Scientific Committee (SC) in developing BET re-building scenarios	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	March 2026	March 2030	
	1.3d - Consistently correspond with the IOTC to shorten the timeframe adopted for the rebuilding of bigeye.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	March 2026	March 2030	
	1.3e - Based on year 1 analyses it may be necessary to initiate actions that will support improvement of the rebuilding plan dependent on new stock assessments	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	March 2026	March 2030	

Principle 3: Effective Management

Action Number and Name	3.7 Decision-making processes - IOTC
Action Goal	Demonstrate that at IOTC level, decision-making processes regarding bigeye tuna stock management respond to important issues, specifically to bigeye catches in excess of the annual catch limit

	corresponding to the HCR, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner. This could be done by implementing the harvest strategy set out in Resolution 16/02, or by some other means as appropriate.
Action Description	Provide evidence that regarding the bigeye stock management, IOTC decision-making processes have responded to the possibility of catches in excess of the set total annual catch by implementing the harvest strategy, or by some other suitable means.
Expected Completion Date	March 2030
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 5: No associated costs Year 6: No associated costs Year 7: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, FIP participant, IOTC
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	3.2.2b

Action	Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.7– Decision-making processes	Prepare and submit position statements to IOTC requesting the adoption of a specific Harvest Strategy for bigeye tuna that is representative of the stock.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	February 2026	February 2027	

	Attend the annual meeting of IOTC to monitor the progress with the adoption of a harvest strategy for bigeye tuna.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	February 2026	February 2027	
	Provide evidence that the fishery is adhering to the management measures of the Harvest strategy and HCRs.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	February 2026	February 2027	
	Fishery will work with MOF to ensure that there is sufficient support for the adoption of harvest strategy for bigeye tuna.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	February 2026	February 2027	